

Den arabiske verden vender sig mod øst! Ugens webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Fredag den 9. december. Besøget i Saudi-Arabien af Kinas præsident, Xi Jinping, er “en del af en ny strategisk tilpasning”, forklarede Helga Zepp-LaRouche i sin webcast i dag. “Araberne vender sig mod øst”, og der er indgået aftaler for mere end 30 milliarder dollars. Dette er en del af en ny dynamik, som indebærer en eksplosiv vækst i BRICS-alliancen. Dette udgør ikke en trussel mod Vesten, hævdede hun – Vesten bør “opgive geopolitikken ... og samarbejde” i stedet for at fastholde fortidens fejlslagne politik.

Zepp-LaRouche, som i denne uge blev interviewet af den førende russiske tv-personlighed, Vladimir Solovyov, og som modtog prisen for ytringsfrihed tildelt hende selv og Schiller Instituttet af den mexicanske journalistklub, udtalte, at hun er blevet opmuntret af reaktionen på de ti principper for en ny strategisk og finansiell arkitektur, som hun havde foreslået. Et nyt kor af verdensborgere er ved at finde sammen, hvilket er det bedste håb for menneskeheden i lyset af NATO's fortsatte krigsfremstød.

Transskription af teksten på engelsk:

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Hello, I'm Harley Schlanger. Welcome to our weekly webcast with Schiller Institute founder and chairwoman Helga Zepp-LaRouche. Today is Friday, Dec. 9, 2022.

And Helga, it's been a busy few days, especially for you: There were two events that occurred in the last couple of days. One was an interview with the preeminent talk show host in Russia Vladimir Solovyov, where he asked you about the 10 fundamental principles that you drafted, and then there was the award bestowed on you and the Schiller Institute by the

Journalists Club of Mexico, the Freedom of Expression Award. Why don't we start with the Solovyov interview? This was really quite important, wasn't it?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes, I think it's one of the major talk shows on Russian TV. And I think it's very important that Mr. Solovyov obviously has looked quite in detail at the 10 principles I proposed to have a new international security and development architecture. [<https://schillerinstitute.com/blog/2022/11/30/ten-principles-of-a-new-international-security-and-development-architecture/>] And he said it was very thought-through, and in general he came across with the idea that there is hope, that a diplomatic solution can be found. So I think it was important that, now, millions of Russians now know about these 10 principles. And since we are also spreading it elsewhere, I'm quite optimistic that, hopefully, we can put it on the international agenda.

SCHLANGER: It's important that at the end he said, "I hope you succeed!" And I think the award from the Journalists Club of Mexico is also something which is part of the spread of these ideas.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes. I think Mrs. Celeste Sáenz, the chairwoman of the very prestigious Mexican journalists' association, basically in her opening speech mentioned the fact that it's an outrageous scandal that myself and others are on this Ukrainian list. And she said the Schiller Institute's work is extremely important in times when the freedom of speech is not guaranteed. So, I'm very happy about this award, because sometimes, a prophet is not appreciated in his or her own country, but Mexico is one of my favorite countries, anyway, so that's very, very, good.

SCHLANGER: Mine, too, having lived in Texas for years, and done a lot of work in Mexico. It's a very interesting country, and very beautiful.

In terms of the spread of these ideas, I think it's quite important to look at the motion toward the new financial and strategic architecture: This week, Xi Jinping was in Saudi Arabia, for meetings with a number of Arab countries in the Middle East. This is an extension of the Belt and Road Initiative, but also the new diplomacy. What do you make of this?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, this is really important: Because this has been, in one sense, prepared since Xi Jinping visited the Middle East in January 2016, when he went to Iran, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia. And this time, he's participated in three summits, one with the Saudi government; one with the Arab states, and one with the Gulf Cooperation Council. And China's Foreign Ministry spokeswoman Mao Ning said this is "epochal" historic visit. It puts the Chinese-Arab and Chinese-Saudi relationship on a completely new strategic level. And generally, the press coverage and observers are saying that the Arabs are turning East.

Now, that obviously is very big. Not only in this visit to Saudi Arabia were there economic deals for \$30 billion, concluded 34 contracts. China imports 25% of the Saudi export of crude oil. But I think even more important than that is that Xi Jinping was treated with top honors. Six Saudi fighter jets accompanied his plane, and they colored the sky with the colors of the Chinese flag, that is, red and gold. And that is in total contrast to the rather subdued way how Biden was treated in July when he visited.

And it is very clear that there is a new strategic alignment going on. This involves the whole BRICS dynamic, because there are now many countries that want to join the BRICS-Plus, that is Argentina, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Algeria, Turkey, Iran; and Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov said that there are altogether 17 countries that have lined up and applied for full membership in the BRICS. Now, already now, the BRICS has a GDP which is larger than the G7, and if you add all of these

countries, it is very clear that the power center of the world economy, which already has shifted to Asia, will be amplified a lot in the direction of the countries of the BRICS-Plus, plus the countries that work with this organization which is very quickly growing.

So I think this is very important, and in one sense revives the spirit of the ancient Silk Road, because the Chinese-Arab relationship dates back about 2,000 years, and obviously, it will have an impact on the entire dynamic in the Middle East. Also, important, is that Xi Jinping had meetings, I think with 40 leaders from regional countries, including the new Prime Minister of Iraq, Mohammed Shia al-Sudani, and there, also, a strategic partnership was agreed. And the oil-for-technology agreement that had existed before, but was dormant because of all kinds of sabotage and intervening problems, but that means, also, that Iraq is now looking in the direction of cooperation with the Belt and Road Initiative.

I think the Western countries, rather than trying to fight this, which they continue to do with all kinds of racist statements, like coming from Chatham House almost every day, they would do so much better if they would adjust to the new emerging reality, give up the geopolitical confrontationism, and rather start to cooperate! This is a new world economic order which is emerging, and it is based on non-interference in the internal affairs of the other one, it's based on respect for the sovereignty of the other one, non-meddling with the social system, and this is just a much more durable concept for peace in the world than what we have seen with the "right to protect" and humanitarian interventions, especially with the wars against Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Yemen, Libya, which only resulted in millions of people dying for nothing, 17 million refugees—I mean, this is the biggest human rights violation which you can imagine. Obviously, it is not being discussed, but I think the West should really draw the conclusion out of the failed policies of the last decades, and

join this new arrangement which is emerging, and which brings hope for many millions of people throughout the entire region.

I'm actually quite optimistic that this is a very, very important game-changer in the entire region and beyond.

SCHLANGER: And it reflects what you wrote in your article on the Spirit of Bandung [https://larouchepub.com/hzl/-2022/4945-the_role_of_the_nonaligned_mov-hzl.html] which is being published in a book, which I should have mentioned at the outset that this is coming out, now. But it also raises the question that you brought up: Why would the West be angry or upset, as though they're being betrayed, by countries that are looking out for their own interests and moving into this new architecture?

Now, in that context, we had the statement from a Trilateral Commission member from Japan, who raised the question of why are you forcing us to choose? This is a completely absurd approach from the West but it's a self-isolation, isn't it?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Given the fact that the Trilateral Commission is an organization which basically represents the establishment, and then, somebody from Japan saying, don't force us to choose, because if we have to choose, we will choose China over the United States—I think this is also a sign of the times.

SCHLANGER: We have a very interesting story unfolding in Germany, of the attempted coup that the German police supposedly foiled—I think there were 3,000 police and security officials involved in it—what do you know about this, Helga?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, this is, on the one side, a farce, but it has a serious background. The farcical part of it is that this was the biggest raid in the history of the Federal Republic of Germany, since the Second World War: 3,000 police, special intervention units, the SEK, and various other units, they raided altogether 130 apartments; they arrested 25 people.

This was supposedly because they had information that the Reichsbürger, an association of people who basically say the Federal Republic of Germany does not exist, and since we never had a peace treaty and there was never a referendum on a new constitution, they say that the old Kaiser Reich, or the old Weimar Republic, or whatever, still exists, or they want to go back to a monarchy. There may be 20,000 people in Germany who believe this; most of them, and that is also shown by the pictures, are pensioners, gray-haired people. Supposedly they were planning a coup, that they were planning to take over the government.

Now, I think this is a PR stunt if you ever have seen one, because one parliament member from the Linkspartei said that she knew about this two weeks ago, as she also knew that many of the media were informed: Selected mainstream media knew about it; they had time to prepare background articles, which suddenly, the records were published on the day of the raid, so everything was there. The media were along with the deployment of the police, filming everything—it was the big story. So, if these Reichsbürger would have been that dangerous, and with weapons and everything—maybe they have some weapons—but it's so out of proportion; if they would have been so absolutely dangerous then the police should have been very secretive, not warning anybody ahead of time. But obviously, the purpose of it was quite different: The purpose was to discredit these Reichsbürger and all the other demonstrators, which—we should not forget the role of the Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz national police agency in previous deployments of the NSU and other deployments against the rightwing.

So this is a very dubious thing, and it's like you take something which has a little kernel of reality, and then you blow it up in such a way as to discredit the whole thing. And everybody knows that there are many people taking to the streets because of the sanctions, which they feel is a

blowback against the German economy; many firms are going bankrupt; energy prices are going through the roof; people are afraid of inflation; many people fear that they won't get through the winter because of the exploding energy prices. So there is a total social ferment, and therefore, if you do what looks like such a staged operation beforehand, you discredit those kinds of protests. And then Interior Minister Nancy Faeser said, "We were looking into the abyss of a terrorist threat," with all of these people with their walking canes and rollators! It's just not real.

And I think the former President of Russia Dmitry Medvedev also satirized it, because naturally Russia was blamed again that they have some hand in that. But the White House immediately offered support to Germany because these are people who believe the same QAnon conspiracy narratives, and this is exactly like the January 6 raid on the U.S. Capitol building. Now that is also very questionable, and there are a lot of questions that have arisen as how that was staged.

I think it has a serious background, that it's being staged because there is a social ferment, but we should really keep a clear head about it.

SCHLANGER: And it occurs at a moment when the German government is losing popularity. The new polls that are coming out show that they're dropping fairly quickly, like a rock in water. And at this point you have Chancellor Scholz, and Economy Minister Habeck and Foreign Minister Baerbock taking the point against China. How does that fit into the situation?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: You know, Scholz went to China, and he also keeps saying that he is not for breaking off relations with China, and so forth. So he has a slightly different position, but we have learned from people who are in the business, that Baerbock, whose Foreign Ministry has prepared a China paper, she apparently—I can only say, we have this from a source—she apparently sent out her paper to all the German embassies

internationally, pretending this was already accepted German policy. So, I thought that the Chancellor defines the rules for foreign policy, but one has to see if this so-called “foreign minister” decides what Germany’s policy is, or the Chancellor. In any case, it is completely idiotic: If Germany wants to really commit hara-kiri, then they should continue to alienate China. And I think Xi Jinping’s state visit to Saudi Arabia hopefully wakes some people up, that the momentum is not against China but it is with China. And I hope this is a wakeup call for some people.

SCHLANGER: Also news from Germany was the admission by former Chancellor Angela Merkel that the Minsk Agreement was designed to buy time for Ukraine. That was said by former Ukraine President Petro Poroshenko before, and now it’s coming from Merkel. This tasks the whole situation of the pre-special military operation by Russia in an entirely different light, doesn’t it?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think this is *really* incredible! Because we always made the point that Germany and France, which were supposed to be the countries enforcing or encouraging the Minsk Agreement [for negotiations between the Ukraine government and the Russian-speaking Donbass region], and we always said they didn’t do anything. But now it turns out— and Merkel said it in two interviews, one with *Der Spiegel* and then again with *Die Zeit*—that there was no intention to go ahead with Minsk 2! That there was an intention to gain time for Ukraine to rearm and become stronger.

I mean, this is incredible—and Russian Foreign Ministry spokeswoman Maria Zakharova correctly said that this means the whole credibility of Germany is completely destroyed, that Merkel has admitted that she did not intend to work for peace, but that the idea was to use lies and manipulation to prepare for war! This is incredible! And I think it should be at rest for good the idea that Putin attacked Ukraine without a reason and out of the blue. Obviously, if Merkel has admitted, as

Poroshenko did, that they were just lying to Russia, misleading Russia in order to arm Ukrainian troops on a NATO standard, it is putting the truth into the whole story, and it shows the lies.

Now, this is dangerous, because Putin obviously knows about that as well, and he said that he now thinks it was a mistake to wait for eight years to react to the attacks on Donbass by Ukrainian armed forces, which killed 14,000 people, and about which Russia complained many times to the OSCE; and the OSCE had never done anything about it. And Putin now says, he thinks it was a mistake and he should have responded to the coup in 2014, militarily, immediately. And also, it has strategic implications when you do that.

So Putin is now also saying that the fact that the United States is putting all these modernized tactical nuclear weapons into Germany basically may force them to rethink the Russian nuclear doctrine which says that Russia will never make a first strike, because they only will use nuclear weapons when the existence of the Russian Federation is at stake. Now, he says, putting these weapons in such close vicinity to the Russian border means that Russia may not have time to go for a second strike—I mean, this is really escalating the spiral toward nuclear war, and it is just totally disgusting.

SCHLANGER: You also have the discussion under way about the Ukrainian strikes on Russian air bases inside Russia. Some people are saying it's a provocation to force Russia to respond, it would lead then to a further escalation. So it does appear as though the whole situation is escalating as you are warning.

Now, there was an event on Dec. 6 by Chatham House on "Russia's War on Everybody" [<https://www.chathamhouse.org/-events/all/members-event/russias-war-everybody>] and what they laid out is their racist view that Russia has an imperial

doctrine that predates Putin, that that is the danger. And this, of course, fits in with the talking points that have come from the British from the beginning. I don't know if you've had a chance to watch the video, but what do you make of this kind of discussion going on now in this context?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, it just is one more confirmation that it is, again and again, the British who are instigating the escalation. As Boris Johnson, who in April personally flew into Kiev to sabotage the then-existing negotiations to which Zelenskyy had already agreed. And you can actually say that it was to Boris Johnson's credit that 100,000 people have died since—including Ukrainians. So it's just totally disgusting.

I think this double standard, people should really look at that. The former Prime Minister of the Czech Republic Jiří Paroubek, he just came out and said that all the upset about Russia attacking the infrastructure in Ukraine, targetting the electricity supplies, that that is completely phony. And then he quotes the NATO spokesman James Shea from the time of the 1999 NATO bombing of Yugoslavia, who said, yeah, sure, we're bombing the electricity because that's also used by the military and this is completely legitimate to do. So, Paroubek says that after these statements, you cannot apply a double standard, because Russia just learned from NATO what you do in such a situation.

SCHLANGER: Not to mention what was done in Iraq by the United States and NATO.

Now, Helga, this does bring us back to what we started with, which is the importance of the 10 fundamental principles that you laid out, to move to a new strategic and financial architecture. I know there's a lot of discussion that's going on. It has to continue, and in fact, be raised to a higher level, and should be discussed by governments. But what's your sense of where we have to go from here, to bring these ideas into the policies of governments?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, I'm quite encouraged, because a lot of people who have looked at these 10 principles are reacting very well. They say it's a very serious and well thought-through conception, because these 10 principles are not programmatic points: They're principles and I try to look at the situation and say what must be remedied about what prevents peace? I took the Peace of Westphalia as an example, where one of the principles that came out of that was the idea that if you want to have peace, you have to take into account the interest of the other. There can be no lasting peace, if one or two or more parties are neglected. That's a very important principle.

So my 10 principles start off with the idea that you have to have an alliance of perfectly sovereign nations, because otherwise you have no accountability; supranational institutions just don't work. So the principle of sovereignty is the first idea.

Then the idea of overcoming poverty as *the* most important task, because if there are 2 billion people threatened with starvation, that is right now the most urgent task.

Naturally, a world health system.

And then the second part basically goes into the philosophical considerations which have to be the underpinning of such an approach: And I refer to those conceptions in the different cultures which say that there is a higher lawfulness which has to be respect, which in European history was called "natural law"; in India it's called "cosmology," which needs to be applied on the planet; in China, it's called the "Mandate of Heaven."

These are important ideas. I refer in one principle to Cusanus' [Nicholas of Cusa] "Coincidence of Opposites" as a way of thinking: How you can think the One, which has a higher power than the Many—the one humanity which is more important

than the many nations.

And then finally, the 10th principle is that the nature of man is that man is essentially good, and that all evil comes from a lack of development.

Now, I'm just referencing these very briefly, but I think these ideas must be discussed, because we have to come to principles which unite humanity, and not divide it. So I would encourage you, our viewers, to read these principles, and if you want, write something about it. We will introduce, on the Schiller website a page where important articles that are contributed will be published. And then hopefully, we will get other organizations to enter such a dialogue, because we need actually a chorus of world citizens who say, we need a change in the paradigm, because if we are going into nuclear war, there will be nobody left. So that means that everybody has to take responsibility to remedy this present, very dangerous, but also very hopeful situation, and bring it to a better direction. [<https://schillerinstitute.com/blog/2022/11/30/ten--principles-of-a-new-international-security-and-development-architecture/>]

SCHLANGER: The responses that I've been getting are people who are saying, initially, well, this is hard to do on a philosophical level. But then if you ask them, "How far has pragmatism and *Realpolitik* gotten us? That's why we're in this crisis." And in fact, you only overcome this kind of crisis by moving to the higher basis for agreement."

Helga, I thank you for joining us today. I think the developments of this last week, including the interviews that you and your associates are doing, the award in Mexico, the developments around China and the Middle East, all point in a hopeful direction. But we still have to engage more people in this process, and the fundamental principles drafted by Helga Zepp-LaRouche will be appended to the webcast today, at the bottom of the description section, so you can read them and

comment on them.

So Helga, thanks for joining us, and we'll see you next week.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes, till next week. [hzl/hcs]

‘Solovyov Live’ Interviewer Helga Zepp-LaRouche om de Ti Principper

Dec. 7, 2022 (EIRNS)—Vladimir Solovyov aired a 21-minute interview with Helga Zepp-LaRouche on Dec. 7.

VLADIMIR SOLOVYOV: Well, unfortunately, that's about my German, so if you don't have anything against it, we'll try English. I'm sorry for being a late a couple of minutes. You know, those Russians, they're never good on time. There's always a problem with Russians being good on time! [laughter]

I have to say: I was quite impressed with your very tough point of view, should I say that? very revolutionary. Definitely not mainstream of current European political ideas. How come? It looks like the *Dawn of Europe*, the book that was written more than a 100 years ago, suddenly comes true. What are we facing right now? And what should be done, in order to save the world?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, I think the problem is that we are, as some of the Russian officials have stated recently, we are already at a state of war between NATO and Russia, and many people in many countries are extremely worried that this may lead to nuclear war. And if it would come to that, I don't think it would be a limited nuclear war. I think regional war,

the use of only tactical nuclear weapons, I think this is all ruled out. And if it comes to the use of only one single nuclear weapon, it would have the danger of a global nuclear and that would mean the annihilation of civilization.

And for me, I think you have to start with that: This is why I have suggested principles, 10 principles for a new international security and development architecture, which is drawing very much on the example of the Peace of Westphalia which ended 150 years of religious war in Europe. And I'm really fighting very hard to put this on the agenda before it is too late.

SOLOVYOV: So what are those 10 principles? And what makes you think that current political power in Germany, but basically in U.S.A.—we realize that; whatever is there right now in Germany, it's just a reflection, it's just another projection of American point of view—that they will hear you? That you won't be punished severely for your point view. Because now it's not—it's impossible to talk about the freedom of speech and the freedom of philosophical ideas in Europe.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I know it's not allowed, and you are being ostracized immediately, and worse. But I think we are in a situation—I mean, this is not a tenable situation. Germany, for example, has lost all of its sovereignty with the present government, at least concerning certain ministers. We are running against a collapse in Germany: The economic situation is absolutely devastating. The result of the sanctions, which Germany imposed against Russia, on orders practically of the United States, is boomeranging, and the blowback is threatening the existence of Germany as an industrial nation. So this will become apparent in the next weeks and months.

And I think we are in an epochal change: It's not just a war between the West and Russia, but the result of the policies imposed against Russia in particular, have led to a counterreaction: The entire Global South is in a revolutionary

spirit to establish a just new economic order, and this is a revival of the Non-Aligned Movement, which was already on that course in the 1970s, and now I think it is unstoppable. You have the emergence of a completely new system, which is the BRICS, the SCO (the Shanghai Cooperation Organization), the Eurasian Economic Union, all of these countries are reacting to the policies coming especially from the British and the United States, and they're forming a new world economic order.

Some people may think it is enough if you have a multipolar world; the unipolar world is definitely over. But I am of the opinion that even multipolarity is not sufficient, because it still has the potential of a geopolitical confrontation. So this is why I think the most advanced proposal to overcome that in the present world comes from President Xi Jinping, who is talking about the "shared community of the future of mankind." My 10 principles are basically an effort to elaborate principles how we can get people to understand what the new paradigm is, in which we have to move. That is a very deep philosophical conception: I've been working together with my late husband, Lyndon LaRouche, on that for the better part of the last 50 years. So I'm convinced that this is resonating with what the world right now urgently needs, which is a new conception—the question, really, is can we as a human civilization give ourselves an order which allows the long-term survivability of our species? So this is the biggest challenge to our intelligence you can have. And since I'm—and that's the 10th point of my 10 principles—I'm convince that man is fundamentally good, and that the evil in the world is the result of a lack of development.

So I'm confident. I think the danger is incredibly big, but on the same time, I'm also extremely optimistic that a solution to this present calamity can be found.

SOLOVYOV: So what are those 10 principles? What are they? How dare you bring those 10 principles to the world of Schwab! Who is saying that humanity is a disease, and it's better to be

without humanity for the world! So how come that, nowadays, you're coming with basically, let's say "humanitarian tradition" of understanding humanity? Instead of modern liberal, Nazi view, where basically humanity should be destroyed?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, I think the present world order, in large part suffers from the problem of oligarchism: That is not a new phenomenon. You had empires, the Roman Empire, the Byzantine Empire, the Venetian Empire, the British Empire, which in one sense still exists, and these forms of government were based on the idea that you have a small, powerful elite, sometimes the aristocrats, sometimes the financial elite, and that they have all the privileges and rule over backward masses of people. That system is the origin of what a former President of the Czech Republic, Vaclav Klaus, calls the "green delirium," which is the idea that we are living in a world of finite resources, that you have to have management of scarcity, and all of this.

But that's not the real universe. The good thing is that man is different from animals, because we are capable of discovering universal principles about the physical universe. This is called scientific and technological progress, and when we apply that progress in the production process, then it leaves to an increase in the living standard, the longevity of people. So, I think we have reached the point now where the evolution of mankind is at a point where we have to adjust the political and economic order to the actual lawfulness of the physical universe, if we want to survive. That is not a new idea: That was actually a philosophical conception in Europe, it was called "natural law." You have the same idea in other cultures. In India, for example, it's called "cosmology," where basically politics is supposed to implement the lawfulness of the cosmos. You have the same idea in Chinese philosophy, with the "Mandate of Heaven." So in all great cultures, you have the idea that there is a higher lawfulness

which we have to respect, or bring about destruction.

So I think we are in a very optimistic change of an epoch. I would call it that mankind is about to reach the age of adulthood.

SOLOVYOV: [laughs] That is very optimistic, should I say! But by reaching the age of adult, we have to face quite new challenges. One of them is that Europe is basically put in an Iron Curtain, by trying to recognize Russia as a “sponsor of terrorism” state, they are just cutting all possible ties that have been left, and it’s leading us to a completely new scenario. Europe without Russia is basically a very small place!

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Right now, the mainstream media and the major political parties, as they are represented in the European Parliament, which made this resolution about Russian being a terrorist state, that is the surface. And if you only look at the mass media, you get the impression that that is everything there is. But we are organizing people: Look, there are demonstrations in all European countries, to end the war, to have a peaceful negotiation, use diplomacy already, and many people are demonstrating in east Germany, in Belgium, in France, in Italy, even in Great Britain. So I think, this is a very dangerous moment, obviously, but I think that as the crisis will become bigger, and you have hyperinflation, the energy prices, the food prices, I think we are heading towards a very big moment of decision. And what the Schiller Institute is trying to do, is we are organizing international conferences, which have to be virtual because of the still existing pandemic conditions, and we are trying to bring together people from all over the world.

I have initiated something which is called—I should explain—Friedrich Schiller, after whom the Schiller Institute is named, had the idea that there must not be contradiction between patriots and world citizens. So, given the fact that

the danger of nuclear war makes everybody, instantly a world citizen, because the whole world is challenged, so I've called for a world citizens' movement. And since I was born in Trier—which some people may recognize the importance of that—I have called for “World Citizens of All Countries, Unite!” [laughs] in which I find a certain irony.

But many people have responded. We've had three conferences already with many sitting and former parliamentarians, and former ministers and Presidents from Latin America, who have issued a call to all parliamentarians and elected officials of the world to join this movement, and fight essentially for these 10 principles, and a new security and development architecture.

SOLOVYOV: So you are still an optimist? Do you still think that humanity is going to survive?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Oh, yes! You know, obviously, the danger is enormous, because if it comes to nuclear war, there will not be even an historian left to investigate the reasons why it came to this point. So I'm not unaware of the incredible danger. But I believe that the majority of the world is already creating a new system: The BRICS countries already have a GDP which is higher than that of the G7. And you saw at the recent G20 meeting, despite incredible pressure, the majority of the countries of the Global South do not want to change sides! Even the Trilateral Commission, which is really—not exactly my kind of organization—the Japanese representative of the Trilateral Commission just recently said, telling the United States and Great Britain, do not force us to choose sides between China and the United States, because if we are forced, we will choose China. This came from Japanese Trilateral Commission members!

So the spirit is really not—people do not want this geopolitical confrontation any longer. And I think there is a tremendous chance—look, Modi, who will chair the G20 in the

coming year, just wrote a very beautiful statement, where he echoed essentially what I'm saying, that there are people who say that man is evil, but he says, no, the fact that there are so many aspirations in religion and philosophy that man is fundamentally good. And I think that with the leadership of India in the G20, you will see that the Global South will have a much great voice.

And we are trying to convince people in the United States and in Europe to join with that new system, rather than trying to oppose it. And, OK, maybe that will not function, but I'm optimistic that it's the only choice: Because we have to get the United States and Europe to cooperate with the countries of the Global South and China. If the United States and China, which are the two largest economies of the world, are not working together, then no problem of the world can be solved. On the other side, if we succeed in showing that there is an advantage for everybody, to solve poverty—I mean poverty should be eliminated! It is the biggest violation of human rights you can imagine. So, all I want to say, is that what we are proposing is actually in cohesion with the wishes and desires of the world population.

SOLOVYOV: Well! But how can you imagine those guys in U.S., in U.K., in Germany, giving up the complex of superiority, where they still consider the other part of humanity, according to Kipling, half-beast, half-humans, as in the burden of the white man? So how can you imagine Americans suddenly recognizing that they're not the chosen nation? They won't count it! They don't want to do it! No one ever gave up the complex of superiority before being defeated. There is no brain to apply to: Look at Biden! There is no *brain* to apply to! There is a number of stereotypes! And that's about it.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yeah, but look, Josep Borrell from the EU made this incredible statement that the EU is a beautiful garden...

SOLOVYOV: Yes, surrounded by jungle.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: And that made him the laughingstock of the whole world!

SOLOVYOV: But he is an idiot! And he represents the diplomacy of the EU! What kind of *idiot* right now represents the EU as the top diplomat? That's annoying!

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes. But, in a certain sense, you have to laugh about it, as many countries of the Global South are doing.

The countries of the developing sector are right now in a mood where they recognize that this is the effort to keep the colonial order. But that is not—Look, all of these countries have a different tradition. The United States, for example, made their independence in the War of Independence against the British Empire. And the Constitution of the United States was the first real republic in the history of mankind, and if you look at the principles of Benjamin Franklin, of George Washington, of John Quincy Adams—John Quincy Adams said exactly what we are saying today, that you need a partnership of perfectly sovereign republics and the United States should not go out and look for foreign monsters. And then, Lincoln had the same idea. Franklin D. Roosevelt, when he designed the Bretton Woods system, it was meant as the first priority to overcome the underdevelopment of the developing countries. Even Kennedy had a beautiful idea about the role of technology would solve all the poverty in the Third World. So there *is* a tradition in the United States which is completely different. The problem with the United States right now is that they have adopted the model of the British Empire as the basis to rule the world in a unipolar world, in a unipolar style. But that is not the whole United States! The people of the United States are essentially good. It is what some people call the “MICIMATT”—you know, Ray McGovern—

SOLOVYOV: Right.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: It's the military-industrial complex, plus the

Congress, plus the media, plus Silicon Valley, but that is a small minority. They look like the all-powerful force right now, but I think this other tradition of America is there, and we are trying very hard to make a revival of the best traditions of the United States.

SOLOVYOV: I hope that you succeed. I hope you succeed! Unfortunately, our time is running out. And excuse my smile: The reason is that my wife's name is Olga Sepp [ph], so when I see Helga Zepp, I feel like I'm talking to a relative, should I say! [laughter]

ZEPP-LAROCHE: That's funny!

SOLOVYOV: Yes, that's quite unusual. And, I love what you're saying! And I love your very sweet, idealistic, but very thought-through, based on the belief that human are better than they are.

The only minor thing is: The Founding Fathers of the United States, after all about democracy and "human rights," shall we say, so they all owned slaves. So, their definition of free men, were only for WASPs, and that's what makes us Russians being so careful when we're dealing with the West—the definition of every word. You have to be sure that you understand words in the same way. In any other case, we're running into problems all the time.

It was a pleasure, and I to continue our discussions in the coming future. [hzl]

Definitionen på succes: LaRouche-faktoren i den nuværende strategiske situation

Den 7. december 2022 (EIRNS) – “Jeg håber, at I får succes. Jeg håber det lykkes for jer!”

Det var de afsluttende bemærkninger fra Vladimir Solovyov, vært for “Solovyov Live”, Ruslands store tv-talkshow, der følges af millioner af seere, ved afslutningen af et 21 minutter langt interview i morges med Schiller Instituttets grundlægger, Helga Zepp-LaRouche. I diskussionen havde Zepp-LaRouche advaret om, at “vi allerede befinder os i en krigstilstand mellem NATO og Rusland, og mange mennesker i adskillige lande er ekstremt bekymrede for, at dette kan føre til atomkrig”. Hun hævdede, at en sådan krig ville betyde civilisationens udslettelse, og at “det er derfor, jeg har foreslået principper, 10 principper, for en ny international sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur, som i høj grad tager udgangspunkt i eksemplet med den Westfalske Fred, der afsluttede 150 års religionskrig i Europa. Og jeg kæmper virkelig meget hårdt for at få dette på dagsordenen, før det er for sent.”

Efter at have adspurgte Zepp-LaRouche om, hvordan dette var muligt, i betragtning af den nuværende forpligtelse i Vesten til unipolær plyndring og angreb på suveræniteten; og efter at have lyttet opmærksomt til hendes detaljerede forklaring om, at “der er en tradition i USA, som er fuldkommen anderledes” end den nuværende politik, en tradition, der går tilbage til Washington, Quincy Adams, Lincoln og FDR; svarede Solovyov: “Jeg elsker det du siger!”, og roste Zepp-LaRouches “idealistiske, men meget gennemtænkte” politiske forslag –

samtidig med at han med forsigtighed bemærkede, at russerne skal være "så varsomme, når vi har med Vesten at gøre".

Senere på dagen tildelte Mexicos Journalistklub deres prestigefyldte 2022-pris for "fremme af ytringsfrihed" til Schiller Instituttet og dets grundlægger, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, for instituttets modige kamp for retfærdighed og udvikling for alle nationer.

I sit videobudskab med påskønnelse, som blev afspillet ved prisoverrækkelsen i overværelse af en stor del af den nationale og internationale presse i Mexico samt landets øverste politiske repræsentanter, understregede Zepp-LaRouche endnu en gang, at "vi befinder os på et utroligt afgørende tidspunkt i verdenshistorien, hvor vi på den ene side er truet af en mulig global atomkrig, på den anden side af den hurtige fremkomst af en ny retfærdig økonomisk verdensorden". Hun tilføjede, at "Mexico kan spille en enestående rolle, ikke blot for at hjælpe med at få hele Latinamerika til at arbejde med Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet, men i betragtning af dets historiske og geografiske placering kan det gøre noget, som menneskehedens eksistens kunne afhænge af: at få USA og Kina, de to største økonomier på planeten, til at arbejde sammen om en fælles udvikling af det latinamerikanske kontinent og hele det Globale Syd."

Der opnås imponerende fremskridt i retning af en sådan ny international arkitektur for sikkerhed og udvikling i mange dele af verden – uden for USA og Europa. Den kinesiske præsident, Xi Jinping, ankom f.eks. i dag til Saudi-Arabien for at deltage i tre beslægtede topmøder (Kina-Saudi-Arabien, Kina-arabiske stater og Kina-Golf Samarbejdsrådet). Udenrigsministeriets talskvinde Mao Ning meddelte, at besøget "vil udgøre en epokegørende milepæl i de arabisk-kinesiske forbindelsers historie", og at "vi håber, at vi i fællesskab kan handle i forbindelse med det Globale Udviklingsinitiativ og det Globale Sikkerhedsinitiativ, gøre fremskridt med hensyn til Bælte- og Vej-samarbejdet af høj kvalitet og bidrage til

fred og udvikling i Mellemøsten og i verden som helhed”.

På samme måde har den kinesiske regering netop annonceret færdiggørelsen af en 10 km lang tunnel under Yangtze-floden, som vil indeholde tre naturgasrørledninger, hvilket er en afgørende komponent i den 8.100 km lange østrute-rørledning, som Kina og Rusland aftalte at bygge tilbage i 2019, og som vil forsyne Shanghai med russisk gas inden 2025.

I mellemtiden er Storbritannien sunket ned i en depression, som ifølge Confederation of British Industry vil være ensbetydende med “et tabt årti” for den økonomiske vækst – det næstværste i Europa, kun overgået af Tyskland. Ungarn har erklæret en energikrise, da folk er begyndt at hamstre den knappe benzin og andre produkter, og forventer en 30 % mangel på de nødvendige energiforsyninger. Og i USA har FED’s desperate renteforhøjelser været med til at udløse et fysisk økonomisk sammenbrud og hyperinflation på samme tid.

Således LaRouche-faktoren. “Vi forsøger at overbevise folk i USA og Europa om, at de skal tilslutte sig det nye system i stedet for at forsøge at modsætte sig det”, forklarede Zepp-LaRouche i sit interview med Solovyov. “Jeg er optimistisk og tror, at dette er det eneste valg: Fordi vi er nødt til at få USA og Europa til at samarbejde med landene i det Globale Syd og Kina.”

Vil der ske et gennembrud for diplomatiet?

Den 5. dec. 2022 (EIRNS) – Selv mens Victoria Nuland (planlæggeren af kuppet i 2014) stormer til Kiev for at fremme en ubarmhjertig kamp mod Rusland, snarere end nogen form for

forhandling, og mens ukrainske embedsmænd stiller betingelser for forhandlinger, der effektivt fuldstændigt udelukker diskussioner med Rusland, er der voksende kræfter i hele verden, der modsætter sig USA's, Storbritanniens og NATO's hensigt om at knuse Rusland og Kina. Men vil disse kræfter finde den nødvendige organisering og ledelse til at fremtvinge et paradigmeskifte?

De seneste begivenheder tyder på, at dette er en tid for store forandringer:

Elon Musk gør rent i Twitters beskidte, "augeiasiske" stalde, ved gennem journalister at offentliggøre samarbejdet bag kulisserne med regerings- og politiske embedsmænd for at træffe afgørelser om mådeholdenhed, herunder op til valget i USA i 2020. Hvis en sådan koordinering ikke er indblanding i valget, sagde Musk, så ved han ikke, hvad der er det. Den proces, han har sat i gang, kan spille en vigtig rolle i frigørelsen af den velovervejede tankegang, og modvirke tendensen til stigende censur under dække af at afsløre (endog på forhånd) det der kaldes "misinformation".

At den franske præsident Emmanuel Macrons lunkne forslag om støtte til Ruslands sikkerhedsinteresser blev mødt med et ramaskrig af modstand fra ukrainske embedsmænd afspejler ikke styrken af den ukrainske position, men hvorledes dens opretholdelse afhænger af at forhindre diskussion af situationen i området.

I Kina blev protesterne mod COVID-foranstaltningerne offentliggjort af vestlige medier som værende muligvis et varsel om præsident Xi Jinpings undergang. Men Kina har blot foretaget en fornuftig opdatering af sine COVID-foranstaltninger i samarbejde med sundhedseksperter og ledere af tænketanke.

I mellemtiden viser den kaotiske situation i USA's politiske diskurs, at der er behov for en ledelseskvalitet, som ellers

mangler hos offentlige personligheder “fra gængse rækker”.

Menneskehedens fælles mål ses i den ceremonielle start på opførelsen af “Square Kilometer Array-teleskopet” den 5. december og den 207 sekunder lange affyring af Artemis’ Orion-kapsel kun 126 km. fra Månen, hvilket sætter den på kursen til at vende tilbage til Jorden i løbet af næste uge.

Men den kvalitet af drøftelserne, der er nødvendig for at skænke verden en fred præget af bekæmpelse af fattigdom, infrastruktur og økonomisk fremgang samt kulturel forbedring – den eneste mulige form for fred i dag – leveres fortsat af LaRouche-bevægelsen, og er senest illustreret i de ti principper for en ny verdensarkitektur, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche har fremlagt til videre diskussion. (<https://laroucheorganization.com/article/2022/11/24/ten-principles-new-international-security-and-development-architecture>)

Former Colonizers Now Colonized by Former President Donald Ramotar

Former Colonizers Now Colonized
by Former President Donald Ramotar (Guyana)

Russia’s military operations in Ukraine are bringing to light many things that for most of the world’s peoples were obscured. One of these is the real reason that the United States did not disband the North Atlantic Treaty Organization

(NATO), when the Cold War ended and no military threat existed.

The reason is that NATO is the tool that the United States uses to control the politics and economics of Europe. Its control is so all pervasive that we can conclude that the countries of Europe have become colonies of the United States.

The European countries are aware that Russia had/has genuine security concerns about NATO bases. Former Chancellor of Germany Angela Merkel objected to President Bush, expanding NATO to Russia's borders. She warned that it could lead to war. However, despite that she succumbed to US pressure and, against her will agreed to the expansion. This decision laid the basis for war in Europe.

As Ukraine continued to threaten Russia and ceaselessly bombed the Russian population in Eastern Ukraine, Germany and France, recognizing the dangers, took steps to avert what was surely leading to confrontation. They worked with Russia and Ukraine to hammer out an agreement to avoid a war.

Thus we had the Minsk Agreement, which was to offer the overwhelming Russian population living in Donbas and Luhansk more autonomy. That would have allowed those people to use their native language, Russian. It would have allowed these locations to remain Ukrainian. The French President and the German Chancellor committed their countries to be the guarantors to see that agreement implemented.

That did not fit in with the US plans to push Russia to war. Recently NATO's Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg revealed that NATO was preparing to go to war with Russia since 2014. Therefore the US/NATO had to destroy the Minsk Agreement.

The American first pressed Ukraine to abandon that agreement, which Ukraine had signed. They then ordered France and Germany to back off. That is why those two former powerful states also disregarded their own commitments thereby they destroyed the

Accord. They did not demonstrate the will to keep their own commitments.

Under pressure from the US they refused to give Russia any security guarantees even though they made that commitment since 1990 not to expand NATO one inch towards Russia after Germany's re-unification.

The European states were forced to do this on the insistence of the US, knowing fully well that they were bringing war to their doorsteps. The United States is very well protected by two huge oceans, but the Europeans are on the front line. So US seem to be ready for war at the expense of Ukraine and their vassals in Europe.

There is an economic aspect to the US imperial plans. For a long time the US was pushing Europe to stop buying cheap oil and gas from Russia. They wanted that market for themselves. They made Germany abandon the North Stream Two pipeline which was to take Russian gas directly to Germany. This was after the Germans themselves spent millions of Euros to help build it.

Therefore by forcing Russia to mount military operations to prevent Ukraine from becoming a NATO's military outpost and to protect the Russian people living in eastern Ukraine a perfect excuse was created to stop buying Russian energy. It means that the Europeans would be forced to buy American gas and oil which is far more expensive.

This of course will make European industries less competitive and more dependent on the United States. Yet the Europeans are meekly going along with this. All of which are against the interests of their own people.

This is similar to classical colonial times when the colonies were forced to buy more expensive goods from the "mother country", while having to sell their commodities cheaper to the colonizers.

Added to this is a military aspect.

The Europeans are now being forced to spend more on their military in the face of a so called "Russian Threat". This money will be spent to buy weapons from the US thus enriching their military industrial complex. The main reason is to supply NATO's aggression throughout the world.

When one considers that the US military budget is at least 10 times bigger than that of Russia's and when we add NATO countries military expenditure they are probably spending about 15 times more on their military than Russia. Therefore one has to ask "who is threatening whom?" clearly this argument does not hold any water.

Then of course we have the sanctions. These sanctions were prepared months before since the US/NATO were giving Russia no other option but to employ its military in Ukraine. The harsh measures were worked on with the intention of destroying Russia's economy and force regime change in Moscow.

They boasted about "the mother of all sanctions" and of turning the Russian ruble into rubble.

However their sanctions, which no doubt is hurting Russia, also had a boomerang effect. In attempting to destroy Russia's economy the US is damaging Europe's as well. It is even damaging itself; their experts who designed the sanctions seem not to have thought through their strategy and appear to have been oblivious of the impact it would have had on the NATO countries.

What this war has also made clear to the Russian people is the hatred and contempt that the West have for them. In the past the world was led to believe that the hostility to Russia was ideologically based. It was a contest between two systems, Capitalism and Socialism.

Now however, Russia is capitalist, probably it has a purer

capitalist system than the US and its allies. Therefore, the hatred seems to be based on some form of Racism since Russia is seen to be Euro-Asian. They are looked down upon by the West.

From their statements the Russian leaders appear to have realized that. They are clearly preparing to drastically reduce their relations with the US and Europe. Their focus is now turned towards Asia.

So while the US and Europe believes that they are going to isolate Russia from the West, the Russians are actually voluntarily distancing themselves and moving east.

What is clear in all of this is that the Europeans have lost their sovereignty. All of their actions are against their own interests. One of the United States main objectives is to control Europe and bend it to its will. It has succeeded. This is colonialism in everything but name!

Foto: CC0 Wikipedia

Webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Vi kan få en uventet overraskelse inden årets udgang

Den 2. dec. 2022 (EIRNS) – Webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Goddag, jeg er Harley Schlanger, og velkommen til vores ugentlige webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche, grundlægger og formand for Schiller Instituttet. I dag er det

den 1. december 2022.

Som vi har rapporteret for nylig, vokser faren fortsat for at snuble eller fumle sig ind i en atomkrig med aldeles ukontrollerede udtalelser fra forskellige NATO-embedsmænd, amerikanske embedsmænd, som briterne støtter: Så vi vil starte med en gennemgang af dette, fordi det generelt ikke bliver afdækket på en fyldestgørende måde for det vestlige publikum. Helga, du nævnte tidligere udtalelsen fra Ryabkov: Russerne tager situationen meget alvorligt, ikke sandt?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Viceudenrigsminister Ryabkov udtalte, at han er ganske bekymret over, hvor afslappet folk taler om en begrænset atomkrig i Europa, at det er meget farligt, og det er præcis det, jeg har understreget ved de seneste taler og konferencer. Hvis man begynder at tro, at det er naturligt at bruge et atomvåben, så overskrider man virkelig grænsen. Vi har flere videoer på vores hjemmeside – og se dem venligst – hvor vi meget tydeligt viser, hvad der sker i en atomkrig [<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=X0zlyfhz7hk>]. Det er civilisationens undergang, og det er det som disse mennesker er i færd med at lege med.

Det er altså ikke folk, der er sådan, det er regeringerne: Det er NATO-regeringerne, det er den amerikanske, den britiske og den tyske regering (og vi kommer til det om lidt), men det er ikke befolkningerne. Vi har i mange diskussioner, i Europa, i Tyskland – især dér, fordi jeg tror, at der er større bevidsthed om hvad krig er, end det er tilfældet i USA – folk er ved at blive ret desperate, fordi de ser hvordan flere våben sendes til Ukraine, som blev nævnt igen på NATO's udenrigsministtermøde den 29.-30. november, eller ideen om, at der ikke er nogen grænse for støtten til Ukraine, hvad det så end betyder. General Kujat (pensioneret) har dybest set ment, at hvis man påstår det, overdrager man en del af sin statsmagt til den ukrainske regering, for det er op til dem at afgøre, hvornår det er nok. Dette er ved at bevæge sig ind i en meget farlig retning.

Derefter følger disse usaglige udtalelser fra Ursula von der Leyen om, at EU vil konfiskere de russiske aktiver, som europæiske banker på en eller anden måde har fået fat i, hvilket blev imødegået meget skarpt af Maria Zakharova, talskvinde for det russiske udenrigsministerium. Hun erklærede, at de vil reagere, det er endnu ikke klart hvordan, men hvis det sker, vil de træffe lignende foranstaltninger: De kan konfiskere europæiske virksomheders ejendom: Dette er en spiral med optrapning, som helt og aldeles er imod Europas interesser.

For ganske kort tid siden så jeg yderligere en video af Scott Ritter fra en tysk platform ved navn "Counterpole" – Gegenpol – og jeg kan kun anbefale jer alle at se den, fordi han udfordrer nu den tyske befolkning for anden gang [<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RL6Su8YARJg>] eller tredje gang på en meget direkte facon, hvor han udtaler: Hvad er denne regering? Har de været medskyldige i sabotagen af Minsk-processen? Tyskland og Frankrig havde ansvaret for at sikre, at Minsk-aftalen ville blive gennemført, og de foretog sig tydeligvis ikke noget i flere år. I mellemtiden har Ukraines tidligere præsident Porosjenko meget åbent tilkendegivet, at "de udelukkende lod som om, at de ville gå med i Minsk-aftalen, som alligevel aldrig rigtig blev gennemført, for at have yderligere fire og et halvt års tid til at træne de ukrainske tropper op til NATO-standard".

Så Scott Ritter påpeger på en meget polemisk facon: "Hvad er der galt med den tyske regering? Vidste de noget om det? Vidste de, at hele Minsk-arrangementet var en fuser for at forberede de ukrainske tropper på kampen mod Rusland? Eller, hvis de ikke vidste det, er de så en del af NATO? Han siger i bund og grund, hvilket desværre er ret indlysende, at denne tyske regering bare tumler af sted, at de ikke tager initiativ til noget, at de reagerer; i mellemtiden er den tyske økonomi ved at blive skudt i sæk. Amerikanske LNG- [gas-] og andre virksomheder opnår en gigantisk fortjeneste, mens de

europæiske økonomier bryder sammen. Vi er på vej ind i det største sammenbrud af industrien i den tyske økonomi, men derefter vil det på grund af den tyske økonomis størrelse og betydning for hele Europa føre til en gigantisk økonomisk nedtur for Europa! Ritter spørger altså ganske polemisk: Er det jeres venner? Er det jeres allierede?

Jeg mener, at det er en utrolig situation. Han siger endda i endnu skarpere toner, at disse embedsmænd, der accepterer denne politik, begår forræderi mod det tyske folk.

Det er stærke ord, men hvis man tænker på, hvad der er på spil, og hvilken utrolig propagandakrig der udkæmpes, hvor NATO-landene og de såkaldte vestlige demokratier lader som om, at de er de gode, og Rusland og Kina og alle disse "autokratiske regimer" er de onde, ser virkeligheden helt anderledes ud; befolkningen bliver imidlertid tilpasset til at følge med, men de går med til deres egen undergang. Så på en måde er det bedre, hvis folk polemisk rejser disse spørgsmål, før det er for sent, men det er en meget, meget farlig situation.

Resten på engelsk:

SCHLANGER: You mentioned von der Leyen, and one of her statements was on making Russia and its oligarchs pay to compensate Ukraine. She said, "We have the means to make Russia pay," which sounds a lot like Biden, when he promised that the Nord Stream pipeline would not be brought online. Now, at the same time, the European Union issued a call for a special court for a war crimes tribunal to prosecute Russian senior officials. I don't think they ever did that for the U.S. policy of Cheney and others to destroy Iraq, Afghanistan—Hillary Clinton and others in Libya—this is the height of arrogance coming from the European Commission and von der Leyen, isn't it?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: And hypocrisy. You know, it is that an Iraqi

court right now has indicted Trump and Pompeo for the assassination of Iranian General Qasem Soleimani on Iraqi soil. So, at least, there is some reaction of this sort. But you are absolutely right, the blatant hypocrisy and double standard of accusing Russia and China for everything, but the West is condoning these things and covering it up, and this is definitely something we have to raise.

SCHLANGER: You had mentioned some of the problems coming out of Germany from the German government. German President Steinmeier had made some comments. There just seems to be no end to the piling on, to make it seem as though Germany is the most loyal member of NATO.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yeah. Steinmeier is now so concerned about human rights in China, and the protests against the COVID measures. On that, I should just note, if you calculate how many people died in China, 5,700; and if you extrapolate the number of people living in China, which is more than three times, almost four times as much as the United States—if China would have had the same death ratio as the United States, they would have had 4.7 million deaths, and compare that to the 5,700. So, it is quite possible that some people are annoyed by the continued measures China is taking for its zero COVID policy, but these are a few thousand people as compared to 1.4 billion in the whole country.

And the idea that Steinmeier is so concerned about their freedom of expression, I can only laugh about that: Because one German court, and I think the Bundestag as well had made a legislation, confirmed a change in paragraph 130 of the Criminal Code, article 5, which was an attachment to other legislation, and it means a tremendous sharpening of the law against so-called “incitement.” According to that, if you cover up any war crimes, or if you say something which could lead to an increase in hatred, but, as several legal experts have noted, this is such a rubble paragraph, that it gives room for the courts and police, it opens up the floodgate to

completely suppress any opinion! If you take that together with another atrocity, namely an EU guideline for teachers, whereby they're supposed to "pre-bunk" pupils, that is, children, against Russian propaganda. Now, "debunking" means if somebody says something bad, you can always debunk it: You say this is not true, and say what you think is the truth. But "pre-bunking" means that you inoculate people in such a way that they don't even get the idea to ask questions. So they have made a whole list of things you are not allowed to say, for example, "NATO expansion is hurting the interest of Russia"; "NATO is aggressive"; and there's a whole list of things, or there is even a pre-history to the war in Ukraine, all of these things are supposed to be forbidden. And pupils, that is, children, are supposed to be psychologically vaccinated against any such interpretation.

Now, in my view, this is not "freedom of expression" Mr. Steinmeier, this is a dictatorship. This is mind control. And we are now doing an investigation into the various, many, many efforts to completely manipulate the debate. Many people complain about the fact that there is no more discourse, you cannot have different opinions; and I'm afraid this does not mean we are living in a democracy, it means we are living, increasingly, in an authoritarian regime.

SCHLANGER: On this note, an interesting development this last week, Nina Jankowicz, who was run out as the attempted disinformation czar in the United States, has now returned as a registered British agent. So it makes it clear where these narratives are coming from.

I'd like to bring up, on this question, the proliferation of discussion from the Pentagon and leading officials, of the threat from China. One of the topics taken up at the NATO foreign ministers' meeting, with Blinken and [NATO head] Stoltenberg joining arms on this, was the need to have a global NATO, to confront China. You have all sorts of developments around this. Helga, what do you have on that?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: The Pentagon must put out their annual global "China Military Power Report," where they characterize China as a pacing threat, and they say that the idea of China that they want to have a "rejuvenation" of the Chinese nation by 2049 is a pacing threat, an existential threat to the United States. [<https://www.defense.gov/CMPR/>] Now, that shows you how absolutely ideological these people are. I'm familiar with the effort of China, or the programmatic intention to have this rebirth of the Chinese nation. Now what is wrong with that? China has been in history for millennia—and I emphasize, for millennia—the leading scientific and cultural nation in the world. That only stopped basically around the 15th century; and then they had the "century of humiliation," which was the 19th century, and then they had the struggle which led to the formation of the People's Republic of China, in 1949. And they have now defined as a goal that they want to have the rejuvenation of China by the 100th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China, by reviving the 5,000 years of history, by creating a modern socialist, culturally advanced, democratic country which is supposed to create happiness for the people.

Now, from everything I know, and I'm in contact with China experts from Western countries—from Germany, from Spain, from Italy, from Denmark, from other places. And people who are China experts, that is, not that you are blind to what is happening in China, but that you know something about Chinese history, Chinese economics, Chinese policies, that all the things that are being said about China, in terms that they want to change the world order to replace the American empire with a Chinese empire, it's just completely wrong! It does not go along with what Chinese history is. And in a certain sense, it is their absolute sovereign right if they want to revive their tradition of being a great cultural, civilizational nation. And I think this is completely crazy, and it really something people should not fall for.

So I really think that the idea of the United States and China being in an adversarial relationship, who can it help? Not the United States, not the American people, but the British. And the British have put out another report: They have a Council on Geostrategy, it's called. They have just put out a report, about being concerned about the Himalaya, and that has been a British Empire concern since way back, when, because of their manipulation at the point of Indian Independence, they split what are today Bangladesh and Pakistan from India; and they defined certain areas in the Himalayas as contested areas between India and China, for only one purpose—to keep stirring it up for future conflict. And in this report, they define the Himalayas as the “northern front of the Indo-Pacific” scenario.

(<https://www.geostrategy.org.uk/research/geopolitics-in-the-himalayas-towards-a-british-strategy/>)

This is ridiculous! The countries of Asia do not want to be pulled into this geopolitical confrontation, having to choose between the United States and China. And it is quite interesting that the Japanese representatives at the recent meeting of the Trilateral Commission, they invited the press for the first time to participate, and then, these Japanese participants said—warning from the Trilateral Commission of all places—they warned the U.S. not to force the countries of Asia to choose, because if they would be forced to choose, they would choose China.

So the sentiment of Asia is not to be pulled into this confrontation, but they want to cooperate in the BRICS-Plus, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, and the Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU), in all of these countries are moving under the pressure of the sanctions, with the exclusion of Russia from the SWIFT agreement, they're now moving to create their own financial system; and the West is pursuing policies which are contrary to the interest of the nations of Europe and the United States. So we should really not fall into this

trap.

SCHLANGER: I think it's interesting: This Council on Geostrategy is essentially putting forward the old arguments from the Great Game, as you mentioned, from the mid-19th century, as part of this pivot to Asia, and we see Adm. Charles Richard, who can't seem to keep his mouth shut on these things, once again surfacing, talking about China as the "big one," it's coming up soon. But at the same time, we just had this very interesting vote in Taiwan elections, where it appears as though the people of Taiwan don't want the United States to force them to choose independence. What's your assessment of this?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: This is very interesting, because the DPP, the party of President Tsai Ing-wen, they just lost in a local elections in 21 jurisdictions, they only won 5 and Kuomintang (KMT) won 13. President Tsai resigned as the party leader of the DPP (she's still Taiwan President), but it is very clear this was an overwhelming vote by the Taiwanese people for peace, they don't want this confrontation. And the interesting thing is, this was not reported by the Western media at all. If you didn't know about it, you would not find this information except as maybe a tiny note in one or two papers—but at the same time, there were massive reports about the "huge" demonstrations in China of maybe a couple of hundred people, with the white piece of paper, and it has all the signs that it was exactly like it happened in 1984 with the Tiananmen Square demonstration, that a lot of these people have been paid by foreign intelligence services. Some of them have confirmed that, already.

So you see how the manipulation occurs. But that does not change the fact that China is moving ahead. They just have sent three taikonauts to their Chinese space station, where they will be there for a short period of time with the three taikonauts who were already there. Then those three will return and new taikonauts will take over the post. Now, this

is incredible, you know, and that is not reported as a great accomplishment.

And what's even bigger, in my view, is the fact that the thermonuclear fusion research facility in Hefei just announced that they are confident that they will be able to have a continuous plasma fusion process by 2028 and that they will be able to put fusion-generated electricity directly into the grid by 2035! Now, that is an accomplishment for all of mankind, because once we have thermonuclear fusion, we have energy security on Earth, and that will mean that one major reason for war and conflict will be gone—but that is not newsworthy to these geopolitical warhawks. But that does not mean that China is not moving ahead on that, for the benefit—and they just have basically donated a tokamak fusion reactor to Thailand, for which they manufactured all the parts in China, and then is shipping it to Thailand. And that is what's newsworthy, but that's not being reported.

SCHLANGER: It's mind-boggling when you look at the media, trying to find out what's going on, and it's nothing but a City of London/Wall Street continuing narrative.

You brought up the question earlier of mind control and the use of narratives, and censorship, and threats, open threats: that's what the Committee to Counter Disinformation (CCD) of Ukraine is being used for by NATO to silence opposition. What do you make of the possibility that the situation around NATO unity is in grave danger. There was a former Reagan administration official, Bruce Fein, who came out this last week saying the United States should leave NATO. Do you see more of that tendency developing?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: I think so. Obviously, there are these demonstrations in all of Europe, in Italy, in France, in Belgium, in Germany, where people demand a stop in sending weapons to Ukraine, a stop to the sanctions, a stop to the inflation of the energy prices. So there is a lot of motion,

and there is a big divide between the populations and the governments, that's one thing. Then, there is obviously rifts in the trans-Atlantic unity. Politico for example, has an article in which they quote an unnamed EU official expressing anger about the fact that the American energy firms are becoming mega-rich, while Europe is going into a deep depression because LNG gas is being sold to Europe; it is four times as the energy prices were before, or even more.

So there are these tensions, and naturally, von der Leyen is on a rampage against Hungary. If they keep doing that, you may have Hungary exit–Hungexit, you would call it. And the EU is in general not in such a unity, whatsoever.

I think there are lone voices which make it into the news, like Oskar Lafontaine has made very sharp statements. [<https://www.nachdenkseiten.de/?p=90778>] He has a new book out, in which he also demands that Europe should take its own self-interest. And there are some people who recognize that. But I think it's far below what would be necessary. Because we are, right now, with this government–Chancellor Olaf Scholz is one thing; he has a mixed character; but I think Economy Minister Robert Habeck is completely ruining the Germany economy! If people are freezing to death in the winter, they can thank Habeck! If we get into a war with Russia, thank Baerbock: This woman, who is supposedly the foreign minister, she has no knowledge, she's the most uninformed, most inadequate foreign minister Germany ever had! She has no knowledge of Russia, she has no knowledge of culture. She's just a NATO tool, and the sooner people wake up to that, the better.

SCHLANGER: And then, in terms of shaping the opposition, you released this document of the 10 fundamental principles for achieving peace and security. (<https://schillerinstitute.com/blog/2022/11/30/ten-principles-of-a-new-international-security-and-development-architecture/>) Last week, when we talked about this, we asked people to

engage with us in a dialogue, circulate it, become involved in promoting it. We're seeing some motion on that, but how do you see this moving? It seems to be somewhat slow, but starting to move.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think many of the participants in the conferences are quite active. [<https://schillerinstitute.com/blog/2022/11/21/conference-stop-the-danger-of-nuclear-war-now/>] That may not show every day, because it takes time. We have the call by Mexican Congressman Robles, calling on elected officials all over the world. (<https://schillerinstitute.com/blog/2022/11/16/letter-to-current-and-former-legislators-of-the-world/>) That is moving. Then, the former President of Guyana Donald Ramotar just wrote a very biting article, which I find actually useful, because he says, the former colonial powers of Europe, are now the colonies. And he basically says the same thing as Scott Ritter, but he says it from the standpoint as a former President of a developing country.

So a lot of things are happening, and I can only say, it's important to discuss these principles, because there's also a discussion, are these 10 principles a programmatic statement? No, they are not. They are not a program: There's a difference between a program, where you say we want to have certain projects economically, or Glass-Steagall or whatever. These are supposed to be principles which define the orientation of the effort: Like the Peace of Westphalia accomplished the very important principle that if you want to have a peace order, you need to take into account the interest of the other. That's a principle, that's not a program. And the idea to eliminate poverty, to absolutely have sovereignty, and the partnership of sovereign countries, these are principles, and not a program.

So, I can really only encourage people to engage in a discussion, because, it is the question, in light of the danger of nuclear extinction and a collapsing Western system,

an emerging new system coming mainly from the BRICS countries and the Global South, can we give ourselves a political order which allows the long-term survivability of humanity? And that is something everybody should be concerned with, because if you're not concerned with it, the oligarchy, for sure, is, and you're just leaving them the room to make the rules.

SCHLANGER: So I think the point is, the discussion goes into the philosophical realm, not the pragmatic realm, and your husband, Lyndon LaRouche, was always insisting that one of the weaknesses of people engaging in politics is that they're looking for short-term pragmatic solutions, when, in fact, the solutions exist on a higher level.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes, this is why we not only have the effort to build a world movement of world citizens, in line with Friedrich Schiller, who stated there is no contradiction between a patriot and a world citizen. And the idea that people have to start thinking about the one humanity first, to think as a world citizen, is really a very important question, because you will not be able to solve this incredible conflict if you are thinking only in terms of national or regional considerations. And that is why the adjunct campaign, if you want, is very important: Namely, we have started to have our own Schiller choruses in many corners of the world, to perform this beautiful canon "Dona Nobis Pacem"—Give Us Peace—which is not only an expression of the desire to have world peace, it's appeals to the higher nature of human beings. And we have now choruses singing in France, in Denmark, in Germany, in the United States, and we want to encourage any choir, church choir, other choirs, to join with us and sing this canon, as an expression of wanting to have world peace and avoid the annihilation of the human species. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UXMhxZ2KBlw] So, go to our website, look at some examples, and become inspired, because that is bringing in this higher quality of humanity which is needed right now.

SCHLANGER: And also, in the Schiller Institute website, while you're there, download Helga's 10 principles for peace that she drafted as part of the followup to the meeting on Nov. 22 (<https://schillerinstitute.com/blog/2022/11/30/ten-principles-of-a-new-international-security-and-development-architecture/>). And you can also watch that video, because it's very relevant for this discussion

Get involved in the discussion, send us your thoughts! You can always contact us through <https://schillerinstitute.com>.

Helga, anything else?

ZEPP-LAROCHE: No. But I think we're going now into Advent, the Christmas period, where people are distracted by a lot of running around, shopping. And I am afraid that we are in for a surprise: There are now reports, both from Col. Douglas Macgregor (ret.) who said that he sees signs for a coming Russian offensive. Then there are Western reports about satellite pictures that 500,000 troops are amassing and a lot of activity is indicating that a new Russian offensive may be in the works. Various Ukrainian officials have said that they want to "take back" Crimea; British think tanks have said it should happen this year. So, I'm not so sure that we will have a peaceful Christmas, but that we may go into a period of heightened danger to civilization. And that's why the idea to have an end to this war, to have negotiated solutions, diplomacy, is more urgent than ever. And obviously, the catalogue of a new security architecture is really what is required.

SCHLANGER: You can join us in building that new security architecture. And again, if you're not a member, become a member of the Schiller Institute! (<https://schillerinstitute.nationbuilder.com/membership>)

So, Helga, thanks for joining us again this week. And if all things work out, we'll see you again next week.

Dit valg: Ubegrænset fusionskraft – eller ubegrænset krig

Den 30. november 2022 (EIRNS) – Kinas “Science and Technology Daily” rapporterede den 28. november om status for den omfattende forskningsfacilitet for fusionsteknologi (CRAFT), der er ved at blive bygget på Hefei Universitetet for videnskab og teknologi. Kina, fremgår det klart af rapporten, mener det alvorligt med at nå sit mål om at generere stabil fusionsenergi inden 2028 til anvendelse i et hybrid fission-fusionskraftværk og at skabe fusionsenergi direkte til elnettet inden 2035. Materialer og teknologier, der er nødvendige for at kontrollere fusionsreaktioner, afprøves i forvejen på CRAFT, et gigantisk kompleks, der vil være fuldt udbygget i 2024, som en del af det overordnede fusionsprojekt, forankret på universitetet, som er hjemsted for den superledende EAST-tokamak (Experimental Advanced Superconducting Tokamak) og det kinesiske videnskabsakademis institut for plasmafysik.

Det er en glædelig nyhed for alle på verdensplan. Det fænomenale fremskridt i menneskehedens magt på Jorden og i solsystemet, som vil følge af at beherske kontrollerede termionukleare fusionsreaktioner, har været velkendt i årtier. Lyndon LaRouche grundlagde Fusion Energy Foundation i 1974 for at fremme dens udbredelse, og da den amerikanske regering nedlagde den i 1987, var stiftelsens månedlige tidsskrift, Fusion, et af de mest populære videnskabelige tidsskrifter i

USA.

Udviklingen af en økonomi fuldstændig baseret på fusionsenergi har taget så lang tid af rent politiske grunde, ikke af tekniske eller videnskabelige årsager. Det malthusianske, imperiale oligarki har været dens dødsfjende, men når folk forstår det næsten ubegrænsede fremskridt, som fusionskraft og de dertil knyttede teknologier kan tilvejebringe, er det slut med den malthusianske tankegang.

Kina er ikke udelukkende engageret i at udvikle fusion, men involverer også andre nationer for at få del i denne udvikling. For 12 dage siden meddelte Kinas institut for plasmafysik, at en af instituttets fire fungerende tokamaks (reaktorer) var blevet demonteret, forsvarligt pakket ned i seks containere og nu er klar til at blive sendt til Thailand i midten af december, hvor den vil blive monteret og sat i drift på Thailands Institut for Atomteknologi!

Kina donerer tokamakken til Thailand og uddanner de thailandske videnskabsmænd og ingeniører, som skal betjene den. Når den officielt er sat i gang i første halvdel af næste år, vil videnskabsfolk og ingeniører fra alle de sydøstasiatiske lande kunne modtage den uddannelse, de ligeledes har brug for med henblik på at drive fremtidige fusionseksperimenter og -reaktorer i deres egne lande.

Denne handling er et mikrokosmos af en verdensorden, i samklang med menneskeheden.

Forestil dig, hvilke fremskridt der kunne gøres for at forbedre livet for alle mennesker på denne planet, hvis USA, Japan, Frankrig og Tyskland – for eksempel – handlede på samme måde.

Men i stedet truer de hidtil urystelige anglo-amerikanske magter og deres europæiske medløbere med deres bestialske syn på menneskeheden til stadighed med at udrydde selve menneskeheden. De er ikke tilfredse med den ødelæggelse, som

deres krig mod Rusland har bragt over verden (herunder Ukraine), men forbereder sig på "den store", som lederen af USA's strategiske kommando, admiral Charles Richard, udtrykker det: en krig mod Kina.

I dag offentliggjorde Pentagon sin årlige "China Military Power Report", hvori det erklæres, at Kinas beslutsomhed med hensyn til at fuldføre "den kinesiske nations opblomstring inden 2049" er det, der gør Kina til en trussel mod USA. Dagen før meddelte den amerikanske Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), at den har oprettet en "Kina-missionsgruppe", der skal integrere alt arbejde, som DIA udfører om Kina, fordi Kina udgør "en eksistentiel trussel mod USA's langsigtede succes".

Den britiske neokonservative tænketank, Council for Geostrategy, har lanceret en kampagne for at få Hans Majestæts regering til at hæve sine operationer mod Kina i Himalaya-regionen op på samme niveau som sit engagement i dets maritime Indo-Stillehavs-"udfald". En af anbefalingerne er bl.a. at fremme den indisk-kinesiske grænsekonflikt. Modstand mod Kina stod højt på dagsordenen for NATO's udenrigsministtermøde på dets anden dag. NATO's generalsekretær Jens Stoltenberg og udenrigsminister Tony Blinken erklærede inden mødet begyndte i dag, at NATO er forpligtet til at stå sammen mod Kina, idet Stoltenberg pralede med, at NATO har trænet og udrustet Ukraines væbnede styrker siden 2014.

USA's militær fremviste for tredje gang demonstrativt en af sine ballistiske missilubåde, denne gang på den britiske militærbase på Diego Garcia midt i Det Indiske Ocean. Ligeledes meddelte USA's strategiske kommando, at den tidligere i november havde gennemført en øvelse, Spirit Vigilance 2022, hvor det blev demonstreret, at otte stealth-bombefly kunne rulle ud og lette på én gang fra en flyveplads i Missouri.

Og de beklager sig over, at russiske og kinesiske strategiske bombefly fløj en fælles patrulje over Det Japanske Hav og Det

Sydkinesiske Hav i dag?

Det er meget, meget skræmmende og fuldstændig unødvendigt, hvor dette er på vej hen. Mennesker er skabt til noget bedre, nemlig til at samarbejde om gensidig udvikling og til at glæde sig over det. Lad verdens borgere fatte mod og slutte sig til Schiller Instituttet for at etablere en verdensorden, der er værdig til princippet om, at mennesker er i stand til at regere selv, på vegne af hinanden.

Foto: Miguel Á. Padriñán, Pexels CC0

Ti principper for en ny epoke

Den 29 november, 2022 (EIRNS) – “Dette utroligt vigtige øjeblik i historien ... er fyldt med fare for, at den nuværende geopolitiske konflikt mellem NATO på den ene side og Rusland og Kina på den anden side eskalere til en atomkrig, som kunne indebære menneskehedens udslettelse, men som også har potentiale til at udgøre vendepunktet til en helt ny og meget bedre epoke i menneskehedens historie,” indledte Helga Zepp-LaRouche sin tale til et publikum af videnskabsfolk, diplomater og studerende i dag på den internationale BRICS-skole.

At skabe denne meget bedre epoke forudsætter skabelsen af et nyt grundlag for relationer mellem nationer. Zepp-LaRouche har fremlagt ti principper for at gøre netop dette og præsenterede dem indledningsvis til diskussion ved et arrangement den 22. november i Schiller Instituttet. De er blevet offentliggjort i skriftlig form på dette link:

<https://schillerinstitut.dk/si/2022/11/ti-principper-for-en-ny-international-sikkerheds-og-udviklingsarkitektur/>

Mens LaRouche-bevægelsen organiserer ledere og verdensborgere omkring dette perspektiv, er det nyttigt, at Patrick Lawrence (The Nation) har genset den historiske baggrund for Zepp-LaRouches forslag i en nylig artikel om Zhou Enlais fem principper for fredelig sameksistens – og deres udvidelse til de ti principper, der blev diskuteret af Den alliancefri Bevægelse i 1955 – som et alternativ til den såkaldte “regelbaserede orden”, der ikke er andet end en USA-Storbritannien-NATO-orden.

De fem principper er det første punkt på dagsordenen i Zepp-LaRouches koncept med en række specifikke mål og fremgangsmåder: afskaffelse af fattigdom, sikring af global sundhedspleje, universel uddannelse. Det transatlantiske finansielle/økonomiske system skal omorganiseres med disse mål for øje for gennem målrettet kredit at støtte den infrastrukturplatform, som er nødvendig for at bringe den økonomiske produktivitet op på et langt højere niveau. Geopolitik og truslen om atomkrig må afskaffes gennem indførelse af en fornuftig international fremgangsmåde, illustreret ved Nicolaus af Cusas tilgang til modsætninger. En optimistisk kultur af videnskab og skønhed, der er baseret på menneskets enestående fuldendte fornuft, er vejen til at overvinde det onde, som den utilstrækkelige udvikling udgør.

Der er hårdt brug for en sådan tilgang, og tiden er moden til, at store, nye idéer kan vinde indpas.

Truslen om atomkrig får flere og flere ledere til at bryde deres indre barrierer for at tale sandheden. Bidens patetiske bedrag som en ny FDR er helt åbenlyst i hans brutale krav om, at Kongressen skal tvinge jernbanearbejderne tilbage på arbejde uden selv den mest basale sygeorlov. Og mange af dem, der erkender den enorme fare ved at starte en atomkrig mod Rusland, bliver draget i retning af at opfordre til en revolution i Kina!

Tiden for en ny epoke er kommet. “Forudsat at vi kan samle den

bedre del af menneskeheden omkring sådanne principper og således sætte den samlede menneskeheds interesse før alle særinteresser, vil vi være aktive skabere af det, der kan blive en smuk 'Sternstunde der Menschheit', en stjernestund for menneskeheden", konkluderede Zepp-LaRouche, da hun afsluttede sine bemærkninger til BRICS-forsamlingen. "For Friedrich Schiller var der ingen modsætning mellem en patriot og en verdensborger, der ville tage hele menneskehedens skæbne i sit hjerte og sind. Så lad os skabe en verdensbevægelse af verdensborgere!"

Foto: Pexels, CC0

Egeland advarer om, at Europa står over for hundredtusindvis af ukrainske flygtninge denne vinter

Den 28. nov. 2022 (EIRNS) – Jan Egeland, lederen af Norges Flygtningehjælp (NRC), sagde i et interview med Euronews, at der vil komme hundredtusindvis af ukrainske flygtninge den kommende vinter. "Det er i realiteten et valg mellem at fryse eller flygte", udtalte han. "Derfor flygter rigtig mange mennesker frivilligt... Europa må forberede sig på hundredtusindvis af nye flygtninge denne vinter, fra Norge i nord til de sydeuropæiske lande."

"Vi befinder os i et kapløb med uret," sagde Egeland. "Jeg har rejst rundt i hele det sydlige og østlige Ukraine... og hver eneste by man kommer til er mørk, og folk fryser."

Sunak lover, at briterne vil øge den militære bistand til Kiev, og kritiserer Kina

Den 28. november 2022 (EIRNS) – Den britiske premierminister, Rishi Sunak, meddelte i sin første udenrigspolitiske tale til Lord Mayor's Banquet (i City of London), den 28. november 2022, at Storbritannien vil øge den militære bistand til Ukraine i 2023, meddelte hans embedsværk.

“Vær ikke i tvivl. Vi vil stå sammen med Ukraine, så lang tid som det tager. Vi vil fastholde eller øge vores militære bistand næste år. Og vi vil yde fornyet støtte til luftforsvaret for at beskytte det ukrainske folk og den kritiske infrastruktur, som de er afhængige af. Ved at beskytte Ukraine beskytter vi os selv”, erklærede Sunak.

Den 19. november udtalte Sunak under sit besøg i Kiev, at omfanget af Storbritanniens militærhjælp til Ukraine havde oversteget 3 mia. pund (3,6 mia. dollars). Storbritannien har allerede bevæbnet Ukraine med tæt på 7.000 NLAW-panserværnsmissiler, over 100 pansrede køretøjer, selvkørende luftværnskanoner “Stormer” med Starstreak-missiler, flere dusin M109 haubitser og L119 bugserede kanoner, M270 MLRS, over 16.000 artillerigranater, løs ammunition og 4,5 tons plastisk sprængstof.

I sin tale gik han ligeledes til angreb på Rusland, og han smed virkelig fløjlshandskerne for at angribe Kina, idet han proklamerede afslutningen på den “gyldne æra” i relationerne

med Kina, som hans forgængere havde bebudet.

“Vores modstandere og konkurrenter planlægger langsigtet. Efter i årevis at have skubbet til grænserne, udfordrer Rusland de grundlæggende principper i FN-pagten. Kina konkurrerer iøjnefaldende om global indflydelse ved at anvende samtlige af statsmagtens værktøjer. ... Vi er derfor også nødsaget til at tilpasse vores tilgang til Kina. Lad os gøre det klart, at den såkaldte “gyldne æra” er overstået, ligesom den naive idé om, at handel automatisk ville føre til sociale og politiske reformer. ... Vi erkender, at Kina udgør en systemisk udfordring for vores værdier og interesser, en udfordring, der bliver mere akut, efterhånden som landet bevæger sig i retning af en stadig mere autoritær styreform.” (<https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-speech-to-the-lord-mayors-banquet-28-november-2022>)

Den britiske premierministers kontor bekræftede, at Storbritannien i øjeblikket er i gang med at revidere og opdatere den integrerede gennemgang af sikkerhed, forsvar, udvikling og udenrigspolitik fra 2021, for at imødegå de “massive geopolitiske skift” som har fundet sted, siden gennemgangen blev offentliggjort.

Foto: Pexels. CC0

Uddrag fra Schiller Institutts webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Den 25. november 2022

SCHLANGER: Jeg tror, at hvis folk ser på forløbet af

diskussion og de forskellige præsentationer på Schiller Instituttets sidste konference, som du kan finde på Schiller Instituttets hjemmeside for den 22. november på <https://schillerinstitute.com/blog/2022/11/21/conference-stop-the-danger-of-nuclear-war-now/> , vil man kunne se, at denne proces er i færd med at udvikles. Det ser ud til, at vi med deltagelsen af nuværende og tidligere folkevalgte borgere fra Latinamerika, Mellemamerika og Europa nu faktisk er ved at etablere denne diskussion. Så jeg kunne godt tænke mig at vide, hvad er det næste skridt i denne proces?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Hvis man ser på de tre konferencer, som vi havde – to i oktober og en i november – så bragte vi inden for fem uger denne organiseringsproces til blomstring. Jeg tror, at årsagen hertil afspejler, at der er flere og flere mennesker rundt om i verden, som er meget bange for muligheden for en tredje verdenskrig. Man kunne måske mene, at Latinamerika er langt væk fra Ukraine, men hele processen startede i virkeligheden med en diskussion mellem nogle parlamentarikere i Mexico, Peru, Bolivia og Ecuador, og den bredte sig hurtigt. I denne omgang deltog allerede to forhenværende ministre, den tidligere præsident i Guyana, en tidligere minister fra Argentina og Ecuador, og disse mennesker opfordrer på det kraftigste deres kolleger rundt om i verden, ledere af Den alliancefri Bevægelse, lovgivere og andre folkevalgte fra hele verden til at skabe en bevægelse af folkevalgte for at appellere og lægge pres på regeringerne med henblik på at stoppe denne vanvittige krigspolitik.

I denne sammenhæng er jeg også meget glad for, at vi oplevede en betydelig deltagelse fra Europa, især fra nogle mennesker, der har deltaget i disse demonstrationer, i særdeleshed fra det østlige Tyskland: håndværkere, borgmestre, fredsaktivister, der går på gaden, fordi de bestemt ikke ønsker at fungere som kanonføde for en vanvittig NATO-krig, som kun kan føre til ødelæggelse af alle. Så denne gang deltog også borgmestre fra Frankrig, som støttede et fredsinitiativ

fra den tyske by Stralsund, som har tilbudt at være vært for fredsforhandlinger på byens landområde. Dette går tilbage til et initiativ fra byen i 1370, hvor de indledte en lignende fredsproces. Jeg synes virkelig, at det er meget, meget opmuntrende, og den grundlæggende idé er, at i et øjeblik, hvor der er fare for atomkrig, som kan føre til udslettelse af hele menneskeheden, gør det automatisk ethvert menneske på planeten til verdensborger. Vi har derfor kaldt dette en verdensbevægelse af verdensborgere: "Verdensborgere fra alle lande, foren jer!" var idéen.

NYHEDSORIENTERING OKTOBER 2022: Stop NATO's krige: Samarbejde: Fred gennem udvikling

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Ti principper for en ny international sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur

Den 24. nov. 2022 (EIRNS) – Da det kortlægger den tilgang, der er nødvendig for at løse den samlede krise, som den samlede

menneskehed nu er stillet over for, og derfor er i centrum for LaRouche-bevægelsens aktiviteter på alle fronter internationalt, samt kræver den bredest mulige undersøgelse og overvejelse, gengiver vi nedenfor det afsluttende afsnit af Helga Zepp-LaRouches tale til Schiller Instituttets konference den 22. nov.: "Stop faren for atomkrig nu; tredje seminar for politiske og sociale ledere i verden", som blev afholdt af Schiller Instituttet den 22. november.

Det nye paradigme, som vil være karakteristisk for den nye epoke, og som den nye globale sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur skal rettes mod, skal derfor fjerne begrebet oligarkisme for altid og videreføre organiseringen af den politiske orden på en sådan måde, at menneskehedens sande karakter som den skabende art kan realiseres.

Derfor foreslår jeg, at følgende principper skal drøftes og, hvis der opnås enighed, realiseres. Disse ideer er tænkt som stof til eftertanke og som en dialog mellem alle mennesker, der er interesseret i at finde et grundlag for en verdensorden, der garanterer menneskeartens varige eksistens.

Første: Den nye internationale sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur skal være et partnerskab mellem fuldstændig suveræne nationalstater, som er baseret på de fem principper for fredelig sameksistens og FN-pagten.

Andet: Den absolutte prioritet skal være at afhjælpe fattigdommen i alle nationer på planeten, hvilket er fuldt ud muligt, hvis de eksisterende teknologier anvendes til gavn for det fælles bedste.

Tredje: Den forventede levetid for alle levende mennesker skal forlænges til det fulde potentiale ved at skabe moderne sundhedssystemer i alle lande på planeten. Dette er også den eneste måde, hvorpå de nuværende og fremtidige potentielle pandemier kan overvindes eller forhindres.

Fjerde: Da menneskeheden er den eneste kreative art, der

hidtil har været kendt i universet, og da menneskelig kreativitet er den eneste kilde til rigdom gennem den potentielt ubegrænsede opdagelse af nye universelle principper, skal et af hovedmålene i den nye internationale sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur være at sikre adgang til universel uddannelse for alle nulevende børn og voksne mennesker. Menneskets sande natur består i at blive en smuk sjæl, som Friedrich Schiller omtaler det, og den eneste person, der kan indfri denne betingelse, er geniet.

Femte: Det internationale finanssystem må omorganiseres, så det kan tilvejebringe produktive kreditter til opfyldelse af disse mål. Et referencepunkt kan være det oprindelige Bretton Woods-system, som Franklin D. Roosevelt havde tænkt sig, men som aldrig blev gennemført på grund af hans alt for tidlige død, og de Fire Love som foreslået af Lyndon LaRouche. Det primære mål med et sådant nyt kreditsystem skal være at øge levestandarden betydeligt, især for nationerne i det Globale Syd og for de fattige i det Globale Nord.

Sjette: Den nye økonomiske orden skal fokusere på at skabe betingelserne for moderne industrier og landbrug, begyndende med infrastrukturudvikling af alle kontinenter, der på sigt skal forbindes med tunneller og broer for at blive til en verdenslandbro.

Syvende: Den nye globale sikkerhedsarkitektur skal afskaffe begrebet geopolitik ved at afskaffe opdelingen af verden i blokke. Der må tages hensyn til alle suveræne nationers sikkerhedshensyn. Atomvåben og andre masseødelæggelsesvåben skal straks forbydes. Gennem internationalt samarbejde skal der udvikles metoder til at gøre atomvåben teknologisk forældede, sådan som det oprindeligt var hensigten med det forslag, der blev kendt som SDI, som LaRouche foreslog, og som præsident Reagan tilbød Sovjetunionen.

Ottende: Tidligere kunne en civilisation i et hjørne af verden gå til grunde, og resten af verden ville først opdage det

flere år senere på grund af afstanden og den tid, der var nødvendig for at rejse. Nu sidder menneskeheden for første gang i samme båd på grund af atomvåben, pandemier og andre globale virkninger. Derfor kan en løsning på den eksistentielle trussel mod menneskeheden ikke opnås ved hjælp af sekundære eller delvise ordninger, men løsningen skal opnås på niveauet af den højere Ene, som er mere magtfuld end de mange. Det kræver tænkning i retning af {Coincidentia Oppositorum}, Modsætningernes Sammenfald, af Nikolaj af Cusa.

Niende: For at overvinde de konflikter, der opstår som følge af indbyrdes stridende opfattelser, som er den måde, imperier har bevaret kontrollen over de underordnede, må den økonomiske, sociale og politiske orden bringes i sammenhæng med lovmæssigheden i det fysiske univers. I europæisk filosofi blev dette diskuteret som væren i karakter med naturloven, i indisk filosofi som kosmologi, og i andre kulturer kan man finde tilsvarende begreber. Moderne videnskaber som rumvidenskab, biofysik og termonuklear fusionsvidenskab vil løbende øge menneskehedens viden om denne lovmæssighed. En lignende sammenhæng finder man i de store værker af klassisk kunst i forskellige kulturer.

Tiende: Den bærende antagelse for det nye paradigme er, at mennesket grundlæggende er godt og i stand til uendeligt at perfektionere sit sinds kreativitet og sin sjæls skønhed, og at det er den mest avancerede geologiske kraft i universet, hvilket beviser, at sindets lovmæssighed og det fysiske univers er i overensstemmelse og sammenhæng, og at alt ondt er resultatet af manglende udvikling og derfor kan overvindes.

En ny økonomisk verdensorden er ved at opstå, som omfatter langt størstedelen af landene i det Globale Syd. De europæiske nationer og USA skal ikke bekæmpe denne indsats, men ved at gå sammen med udviklingslandene samarbejde om at præge den næste epoke i menneskehedens udvikling, så den bliver en renæssance af de højeste og mest ædle udtryk for kreativitet!

Lad os derfor skabe en international bevægelse af verdensborgere, som i fællesskab arbejder for at forme den næste fase i menneskehedens udvikling, den nye epoke! Verdensborgere fra alle lande, foren jer!

Tyrkisk udenrigsminister: Der er ingen løsning for Ukraine på slagmarken

Den 24.nov. 2022 (EIRNS) – Som TASS rapporterer, vil Rusland og Ukraine uundgåeligt skulle sætte sig ved forhandlingsbordet for at løse den igangværende konflikt, sagde Tyrkiets udenrigsminister, Mevlüt Cavusoglu, på en konference onsdag. Militære aktioner vil ikke bringe en afslutning på konflikten og vil udelukkende forlænge fjendtlighederne, tilføjede han.

“På den ene eller anden måde vil denne krig ende ved [forhandlings]bordet”, sagde ministeren til en forsamling på Bilkent-universitetet i Ankara. “Vi tror ikke, at kampen vil blive afsluttet gennem militære sejre på landjorden”, tilføjede han, og advarede om “risiko for en krig, der kan vare i årtier”.

Ifølge Cavusoglu var Rusland og Ukraine allerede “meget tæt på en våbenhvile” under samtaler i Istanbul i foråret, inden de “fjernede sig” fra forhandlingsbordet. De to parter har ikke mødtes for at forhandle siden samtalerne i Istanbul i slutningen af marts. Moskva var oprindeligt optimistisk med hensyn til udsigterne til en fredsaftale, men beskyldte senere Kiev for at sabotere forhandlingerne.

Virkeligheden er siden da blevet “mere kompleks”, indrømmede

Cavusoglu, og Tyrkiet vil stadig være nødt til at gøre en indsats for at presse på for en diplomatisk løsning. "At være en NATO-nation er ikke ensbetydende med, at vi ikke kan [holde møder] med Rusland eller andre lande", forklarede Cavusoglu, og tilføjede at Tyrkiet skal "opretholde balancen" på dette område. Han tilføjede, at denne afbalancerede tilgang var nødvendig, fordi den moderne æra er en "usikkerhedens tidsalder", efter at det "unipolære system", der begyndte at opstå efter Sovjetunionens sammenbrud, viste sig at være kortvarigt. Det unipolære system skiftede "hurtigt" til multipolaritet, sagde ministeren, og tilføjede at verden "stadig søger efter en identifikation af systemet".

Billede: pexels

Panel 1: At standse dommedagsuret – det fælles gode for hele menneskeheden Helgas tale

Den 22 november, 2022. [delvis udskrift af panel 1-talerne]

DENNIS SMALL: Den første taler i dag er Helga Zepp-LaRouche. Hun er stifter af Schiller Instituttet. Hun er den ledende kraft i Schiller Instituttet og i LaRouche-bevægelsen internationalt, og hun er naturligvis hustru og enke efter Lyndon H. LaRouche samt hans nærmeste politiske samarbejdspartner i over 50 år.

Hun vil holde dagens hovedtale under overskriften "Principper for en ny sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur".

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Jeg hilser jer velkommen, hvor end i måtte befinde jer.

Det, der har bragt folk fra hele verden sammen til denne konference, er erkendelsen af, at menneskeheden står ved en skillevej. Der er helt klart en fare for, at den nuværende geopolitiske konfrontation mellem de kræfter, der ønsker at hævde, at den vestlige liberale demokratimodel bør være den eneste "gode" og accepterede model, og de kræfter, der insisterer på, at idéen om en unipolær verden uigenkaldeligt er fortid og allerede er blevet erstattet af en multipolær verdensorden, kan medføre en atomkrig. En sådan krig kunne blive udløst, med vilje eller ved et uheld, i nær fremtid som følge af stedfortræder-krigen i Ukraine. En sådan krise kunne bryde ud inden årets udgang, hvis de forslag, der blev fremsat tidligere i år af folk som Malcolm Chalmers, vicegeneralsekretær for Royal United Service Institute (RUSI), om at "koge den russiske frø" ved at fremprovokere en "Cuba-krise på steroider", som han siger, gennemføres som følge af et ukrainsk forsøg på at generobre Krim. Rusland kunne opfatte dette som en eksistentiel trussel og aktivere sit atomarsenal på højeste alarmberedskab og true med at anvende det, siger Chalmers. "Det ville være et øjeblik med ekstrem fare", siger han, men på grund af den ekstreme overhængende fare i en sådan situation kunne det gøres "enklere" for alle parter at finde kompromiser.

At foreslå en politik, der har til formål at drive den strategiske konflikt til randen af menneskehedens udryddelse, afføder ikke engang en kommentar fra regeringerne i den regelbaserede ordens åh-så-gode regeringer, men at argumentere med fakta om, at den russiske intervention i Ukraine har en forhistorie, kan i værste fald give en fængselsstraf i henhold til en ny lov, der blev vedtaget af det tyske parlament den 20. oktober, med en ændring af straffelovens artikel 130, stk. 5.

I tråd med dette britiske perspektiv er tilsyneladende

Ukraines viceforsvarsminister Havrylov, som netop i et interview med Sky News har udtalt: "Vi kan trænge ind i Krim inden udgangen af december", og understregede om generobringen af Krim: "Det er kun et spørgsmål om tid. Selvfølgelig vil vi gerne gennemføre det hurtigst muligt."

Briterne er tilsyneladende villige til at udmærke sig ved at skabe verdenskrige, da det var Boris Johnson, der i april personligt sørgede for, at løftet om at afslutte krigen gennem forhandlinger blev saboteret. Desværre ser det ud til at hovedparten af det transatlantiske sikkerhedsetablisement, hvorefter mange netop har mødtes til den internationale sikkerhedskonference i Halifax, er enige: "Måden at beskytte det globale demokrati på nuværende tidspunkt er med våben og støtte til Ukraines kamp mod Rusland, ikke gennem forhandlinger", og de afviser ligefrem forslaget fra general Mark Milley, chef for USA's forsvarskommando, om at det nu måske er tidspunktet for diplomati.

Det er denne kriminelle politik for atomar balancegang, som indeholder faren for udslettelse af hele menneskeheden i en global atomkrig og den efterfølgende atomvinter, som automatisk gør hvert enkelt menneske på Jorden til verdensborger, der må tage ansvar for resultatet af denne nuværende fase af menneskehedens historie. Vi ønsker derfor at katalysere en international bevægelse af verdensborgere, som er engageret i at foreslå en ny international sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur, der vil tage hensyn til de enkelte landes interesser på planeten. Dette begreb, at tage hensyn til alle landes interesser, var princippet i den Westfalske Fred, som dannede grundlaget for fred efter 150 års religionskrig i Europa, og som var begyndelsen på Folkeretten og grundlaget for FN-pagten, som vi skal opretholde og bekræfte.

Hvad er de grundlæggende principper, som en sådan ny global sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur skal baseres på?

Det ufravigelige udgangspunkt for en sådan ny arkitektur må være et menneskesyn, som alle nationer kan blive enige om. Mennesket adskiller sig fra alle andre arter ved at være begavet med kreativ fornuft, at det er det eneste væsen, der igen og igen kan opdage nye gyldige principper i det fysiske univers, og kan, gennem anvendelse af disse videnskabelige og teknologiske fremskridt i produktionsprocessen, øge livskvaliteten, levetiden og antallet af levende mennesker. Det er dette kreative potentiale, som kendetegner mennesket som værende helligt.

Den epoke, der er ved at nærme sig sin afslutning, består af de sidste ca. 600 år, som begyndte med fremkomsten af den suveræne nationalstat, der er baseret på Nikolaj af Cusas' skrifter og den første suveræne nationalstat under Ludvig XI i Frankrig i det 15. århundrede, som for første gang var optaget af befolkningens fælles bedste, og modstanden mod denne idé fra det venetianske imperiums side. I 600 år har der været en uafbrudt kamp mellem disse to styreformers, mellem den suveræne nationalstat og den oligarkiske samfundsform, der har svinget frem og tilbage og til tider har vægtet den ene eller den anden tendens i en højere grad.

Alle imperier baseret på den oligarkiske model var orienteret mod at beskytte den herskende elites privilegier, mens de forsøgte at holde befolkningsmasserne så tilbagestående som muligt, fordi de som "får" er lettere at kontrollere (og det skal vi høre noget om lidt senere). Det blev anset for "normalt" at holde en vis andel af befolkningen som slaver, eller "helotter", som Schiller beskriver det i sit skrift om "Solons og Lycurgus' love", der kan slås ihjel, hvis de bliver for mange. Det var den samme oligarkiske anskuelse, som var grundlaget for Malthus' ideologi og den underliggende forudsætning for al kolonialpolitik, også i de moderne former for kolonialisme, som præsident Sukarno havde advaret imod i sin tale på den første Bandung-konference i 1955.

Det er modstand mod denne moderne kolonialisme, der nu er en

kraftig renæssance for i den alliancefri bevægelse, som arbejder på et nyt økonomisk system, der omfatter BRICS-Plus, som flere og flere lande ønsker at tilslutte sig, Shanghai-samarbejdsorganisationen (SCO), den eurasiske økonomiske union (EAEU) og andre organisationer i det globale syd.

Kristendommen opstod allerede under Romerriget, og for første gang i den europæiske civilisation indfandt sig ideen om, at det enkelte menneske er helligt som et billede af Skaberen og begunstiget med den skabende kraft, "{vis creativa}", som Cusa kalder det, der udgår fra hans eller hendes lighed med Skaberen. Den samme idé forekommer også i de to andre monoteistiske religioner, jødedommen og islam, samt i den sekulære humanisme, konfucianismen og den indiske filosofi og religion i traditionen fra de vediske skrifter, og der findes genklang af denne idé i andre kulturer. Hver gang der opstod strømninger i disse religioner, som afveg fra ideen om, at alle mennesker er hellige, som i korstogene eller inkvisitionen, betød det, at de blev redskaber for de oligarkiske eliter til deres formål.

Det nye paradigme, som vil være karakteristisk for den nye epoke, og som den nye globale sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur skal rettes mod, skal derfor fjerne begrebet oligarkisme for altid og videreføre organiseringen af den politiske orden på en sådan måde, at menneskehedens sande karakter som den skabende art kan realiseres.

Derfor foreslår jeg, at følgende principper skal drøftes og, hvis der opnås enighed, realiseres. Disse ideer er tænkt som stof til eftertanke og som en dialog mellem alle mennesker, der er interesseret i at finde et grundlag for en verdensorden, der garanterer menneskeartens varige eksistens.

For det første: Den nye internationale sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur skal være et partnerskab mellem fuldstændig suveræne nationalstater, som er baseret på de fem principper for fredelig sameksistens og FN-pagten.

For det andet: Den absolutte prioritet skal være at afhjælpe fattigdommen i alle nationer på planeten, hvilket er fuldt ud muligt, hvis de eksisterende teknologier anvendes til gavn for det fælles bedste.

For det tredje: Den forventede levetid for alle levende mennesker skal forlænges til det fulde potentiale ved at skabe moderne sundhedssystemer i alle lande på planeten. Dette er også den eneste måde, hvorpå de nuværende og fremtidige potentielle pandemier kan overvindes eller forhindres.

For det fjerde: Da menneskeheden er den eneste kreative art, der hidtil har været kendt i universet, og da menneskelig kreativitet er den eneste kilde til rigdom gennem den potentielt ubegrænsede opdagelse af nye universelle principper, skal et af hovedmålene i den nye internationale sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur være at sikre adgang til universel uddannelse for alle nulevende børn og voksne mennesker. Menneskets sande natur består i at blive en smuk sjæl, som Friedrich Schiller omtaler det, og den eneste person, der kan indfri denne betingelse, er geniet.

For det femte: Det internationale finanssystem må omorganiseres, så det kan tilvejebringe produktive kreditter til opfyldelse af disse mål. Et referencepunkt kan være det oprindelige Bretton Woods-system, som Franklin D. Roosevelt havde tænkt sig, men som aldrig blev gennemført på grund af hans alt for tidlige død, og de Fire Love som foreslået af Lyndon LaRouche. Det primære mål med et sådant nyt kreditsystem skal være at øge levestandarden betydeligt, især for nationerne i det Globale Syd og for de fattige i det Globale Nord.

For det sjette: Den nye økonomiske orden skal fokusere på at skabe betingelserne for moderne industrier og landbrug, begyndende med infrastrukturudvikling af alle kontinenter, der på sigt skal forbindes med tunneller og broer for at blive til en verdenslandbro.

For det syvende: Den nye globale sikkerhedsarkitektur skal afskaffe begrebet geopolitik ved at afskaffe opdelingen af verden i blokke. Der må tages hensyn til alle suveræne nationers sikkerhedshensyn. Atomvåben og andre masseødelæggelsesvåben skal straks forbydes. Gennem internationalt samarbejde skal der udvikles metoder til at gøre atomvåben teknologisk forældede, sådan som det oprindeligt var hensigten med det forslag, der blev kendt som SDI, som LaRouche foreslog, og som præsident Reagan tilbød Sovjetunionen.

For det ottende: Tidligere kunne en civilisation i et hjørne af verden gå til grunde, og resten af verden ville først opdage det flere år senere på grund af afstanden og den tid, der var nødvendig for at rejse. Nu sidder menneskeheden for første gang i samme båd på grund af atomvåben, pandemier og andre globale virkninger. Derfor kan en løsning på den eksistentielle trussel mod menneskeheden ikke opnås ved hjælp af sekundære eller delvise ordninger, men løsningen skal opnås på niveauet af den højere Ene, som er mere magtfuld end de mange. Det kræver tænkning i retning af {Coincidentia Oppositorum}, Modsætningernes Sammenfald, af Nikolaj af Cusa.

Niende: For at overvinde de konflikter, der opstår som følge af indbyrdes stridende opfattelser, som er den måde, imperier har bevaret kontrollen over de underordnede, må den økonomiske, sociale og politiske orden bringes i sammenhæng med lovmæssigheden i det fysiske univers. I europæisk filosofi blev dette diskuteret som væren i karakter med naturloven, i indisk filosofi som kosmologi, og i andre kulturer kan man finde tilsvarende begreber. Moderne videnskaber som rumvidenskab, biofysik og termonuklear fusionsvidenskab vil løbende øge menneskehedens viden om denne lovmæssighed. En lignende sammenhæng finder man i de store værker af klassisk kunst i forskellige kulturer.

Tiende: Den bærende antagelse for det nye paradigme er, at mennesket grundlæggende er godt og i stand til uendeligt at

perfektionere sit sinds kreativitet og sin sjæls skønhed, og at det er den mest avancerede geologiske kraft i universet, hvilket beviser, at sindets lovmæssighed og det fysiske univers er i overensstemmelse og sammenhæng, og at alt ondt er resultatet af manglende udvikling og derfor kan overvindes.

En ny økonomisk verdensorden er ved at opstå, som omfatter langt størstedelen af landene i det Globale Syd. De europæiske nationer og USA skal ikke bekæmpe denne indsats, men ved at gå sammen med udviklingslandene samarbejde om at præge den næste epoke i menneskehedens udvikling, så den bliver en renæssance af de højeste og mest ædle udtryk for kreativitet!

Lad os derfor skabe en international bevægelse af verdensborgere, som i fællesskab arbejder for at forme den næste fase i menneskehedens udvikling, den nye epoke! Verdensborgere fra alle lande, foren jer!

I stedet for krig bør vi kæmpe for visionen om en fremtid

Den 18. nov. – “Jeg taler derfor om fred som det nødvendige rationelle mål for rationelle mennesker. Jeg er klar over, at bestræbelserne på at opnå fred ikke er lige så dramatiske som bestræbelserne på at opnå krig – og ofte falder stræberens ord for døve ører. Men vi har ingen mere presserende opgave.”

– John F. Kennedy, American University, 10. juni 1963

Schiller Instituttets arrangement "Stop faren for atomkrig", det tredje i rækken, finder sted tirsdag den 22. november, på 59-årsdagen for mordet på præsident John F. Kennedy. Skyggen af en mulig, pludselig, total udslettelseskrig, som blev kastet over jordens overflade i sidste uge, da Ukraine (måske) ved et uheld bombede Polen, bør understrege, hvorfor enhver bestræbelse i de næste tre dage bør gøres for at gøre Schiller Instituttets og dets grundlægger Helga Zepp-LaRouches stemme kendt i den internationale offentlighed. Zepp-LaRouches forslag til en ny sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur, som for nylig blev offentliggjort i et essay med titlen: "Den alliancefrie Bevægelses rolle i et nyt paradigme for de internationale relationer", er nu genstand for en diskussion af en voksende liste af nuværende og tidligere nationale kongresmedlemmer, statslige lovgivere fra forskellige nationer og andre, som vil deltage i tirsdagens virtuelle møde.

Denne vej til fred, som bør udforskes i ånden af en ny "Bandung II"-bevægelse for alliancefrihed, der er imod organiseringen af konkurrerende blokke af nationer, er en vej, som Kinas præsident Xi Jinping og Italiens premierminister Giorgia Meloni omtalte i deres respektive kommunikéer, der berettede om deres møde den 16. november på G20-mødet. Begge omtalte de "tusind års kontakt og dialog" mellem kulturerne i Italien og Kina – et virkelig "særligt forhold", der ikke er baseret på krig eller forretning, men snarere på kunst, musik, videnskab og handel. Denne vej til fred, især fordi Lyndon LaRouche med succes havde banet vejen for dialog med præsident Ronald Reagan og Sovjetunionen for 40 år siden gennem LaRouches forslag om et Strategisk Forsvarsinitiativ, udgør den rette standard inden for diplomatiet, som burde være fremherskende i amerikansk kontakt med andre nationer. Den bør erstatte den inkompetente "amatøragtige" proces, der har fået den russiske viceudenrigsminister Sergej Ryabkov til at erklære, at Rusland "fortsat er nødsaget til holde fast i en politik, hvor vi ikke på forhånd informerer nogen om vores planer på det militære område. Jeg henviser til vores

virkelige modstander, en magtfuld modstander, i dette særlige tilfælde, USA.”

Fortvivlelse er ikke berettiget. Tag det næstfarligste øjeblik i forholdet mellem USA og Rusland, Cubakrisen. Præsident John F. Kennedy og hans bror Robert, der nægtede at bøje sig for presset fra en fejlvurderende “utopisk” militærfraktion, befandt sig i centrum af en potentiel atomar ildstorm, der kunne have udslettet menneskeheden. I en resolut opvisning af lederskab fik JFK og hans forhandlingspartnere i Sovjetunionen verden tilbage fra afgrundens rand. Den nuværende situation kan imidlertid være langt farligere end den i 1963, fordi rationelle mænd og kvinder er færre og mere sjældne og sværere at finde i den transatlantiske sektor end dengang. Frem for besindighed, opfordrede en joker-lignende forhenværende komiker, der optrådte som Ukraines præsident, i denne uge verden til at starte en Tredje Verdenskrig. Ifølge visse rapporter nægtede Biden at tale med Zelenskyj, mens “affæren om missilet” udspillede sig. Biden har tilsyneladende ikke talt med ham lige siden.

I betragtning af, hvad repræsentanter for City of London har anført i de seneste numre af The Economist, kan vi ikke afvise muligheden for, at den seneste uges næsten-atomare konfrontation mellem USA/NATO og Rusland simpelthen var en generalprøve på det, der skal komme, muligvis i denne uge, muligvis i næste uge eller måske i perioden inden årets udgang. Det indebærer ikke nødvendigvis, at de britiske styrker planlægger en atomkrig på en bestemt dag eller et bestemt tidspunkt, men det betyder at milliarder af mennesker på denne planet står over for det mest mareridtsagtige scenarie, nemlig at der ikke længere er nogen der bestemmer, og at det derfor er umuligt at undgå strategiske fejlvurderinger. Som Lyndon LaRouche hævdede i en hovedtale i sommeren 1978 til International Caucus of Labor Committees: “Briterne foretog i deres uendelige visdom en fejlberægning, og verdenskrigen begyndte.”

Men hvorfor så ikke fortvivle? Det har været heldigt for dem, der har tilknytning til Lyndon LaRouche, at have indgået i en organisation, der blev sammensat som en filosofisk forening i stil med de bedste af Athens civile soldater, som Sokrates, som Aischylos, og ikke som Spartas civile soldater. Det er lovgiveren Solon fra Athen, ikke Lykurgus fra Sparta, og Solons forfatning, der er komponeret som et digt, og som af medlemmerne af LaRouche-organisationen opfattes som standarden for praksis i statskundskab, gennem offentlige møder, uddeling på gaden og politisk dannelse gennem publikationer, pamfletter og uafhængig research ved hjælp af originale kilder. Kandidater til embeder udvælges og opmuntres med denne standard for øje. Der tilskyndes f.eks. til interventioner, dvs. afbrydelser af den uerkendte, men gennemgribende sociale accept af ondskabens banalitet i den politiske klasse. Sådanne indgreb konfronterer på ikke-voldelig vis dem, der ikke hører hjemme i Kongressen/parlamentet, men på anklagebænken ved en nystiftet Nürnbergdomstol (som begyndte den 20. november 1945), med offentlig identifikation og offentlig anerkendelse af deres forbrydelser.

Den bevægelse, der blev dannet og ledet af LaRouche gennem valgprocessen til præsidentvalget, gjorde det muligt for LaRouche gennem sit kandidatur til præsidentposten at spille en rolle i amerikansk politik i et halvt århundrede, som var enestående, især på grund af den måde, hvorpå dybe ideer, ideer af Nikolaus af Cusa, Gottfried Leibniz, Bernhard Riemann, Alexander Hamilton, Edgar Allan Poe, Friedrich Schiller og mange andre, blev gjort let tilgængelige for millioner af mennesker på gadehjørner og i indkøbscentre, lufthavne og kongrescentre i mange lande i omkring 50 år. Det var i høj grad på grund af dette, at LaRouche var i stand til at få en præsident fra USA til, under sin tale om Det strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ den 23. marts 1983, at sige: "Jeg er efterhånden blevet mere og mere dybt overbevist om, at den menneskelige ånd må være i stand til at hæve sig over at behandle andre nationer og mennesker ved at true deres

eksistens. Da jeg føler dette, mener jeg, at vi grundigt må undersøge enhver mulighed for at mindske spændingerne og indføre større stabilitet i den strategiske planlægning på begge sider.... Efter omhyggelig drøftelse med mine rådgivere, herunder stabscheferne, mener jeg, at det er en mulighed. Lad mig dele en fremtidsvision med jer, som giver håb.”

Det er vores opgave at skabe, dele og forsvare denne vision af en fremtid, der giver håb, og det er emnet for Schiller Instituttets konference tirsdag den 22. november.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Schiller Instituttets video interview (med afksrift) efter han blev fyret af Folkeuniversitetet for politiske årsager

Mandag den 14. november 2022

Her er afskriftet på engelsk, som kom i Executive Intelligence Review Vol. 49, Nr. 46, November 25, 2022

Interviewet af Michelle Rasmussen, næstformand.

Videoen findes også på Schiller Instituttets amerikanske YouTube kanal her, hvor knap 6.000 personer har set den indtil den 20. november.

Her er en pdf version. En tekst version findes nedenunder.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

INTERVIEW: Jens Jørgen Nielsen

Danish Historian Fired After Ukraine Blacklists Him

Jens Jørgen Nielsen has degrees in the history of ideas and communication, was the Moscow correspondent for the major Danish daily Politiken in the late 1990s, is the author of several books about Russia and Ukraine. He is a leader of the Russian-Danish Dialogue organization, and an associate professor of communication and cultural differences at the Niels Brock Business College in Denmark; he has been a teacher at the Copenhagen adult night school Folkeuniversitetet for eight years.

Mr. Nielsen has participated in several Schiller Institute conferences, including the Institute's Danish-Swedish videoconference on May 25, 2022 for a new international security and development architecture. Then, on July 14, 2022 he, along with other speakers at the May 25 conference, was put on the blacklist of "information terrorists" put out by Ukraine's UK-supported and U.S.-funded Center For Combating Disinformation. There was widespread coverage of this in the major Danish media. The Danish parliament conducted a consultation about this affair with the Danish Foreign Minister Jeppe Kofod on Aug. 28, 2022.

He was interviewed for EIR and the Schiller Institute by Michelle Rasmussen in Copenhagen on Nov. 14. The transcript has been edited, and subheads added.

EIR: You have just been fired from one of your teaching posts for political reasons. You are currently teaching a course about the history of Crimea, which you will be allowed to finish, but next year's courses about "Russian Conservatism" and "History of Ukraine" have been canceled.

Why have you been fired, and what led up to that?

Nielsen: Well, I would say I was not fired for anything which took place in the classroom. Because there have been some evaluations of my teaching and they have always been very good. The latest evaluation was from February this year. And when people were asked about the professional level, 100% were very satisfied. So that's nothing to do with it. And I'm not politicizing in my teaching. When I teach, I objectively lay out various interpretations and sources, the interests of various nations and actors in the political process. So, it's not for something I've done in the classroom. It's obvious. Even though the board of directors who wrote me this letter tries to legitimize it by saying that I may be politicizing in the classroom, but they have never attended any of my lessons. They didn't know what's going on there, and they never invited me to talk about it. They never invited any of the students who attended the courses. So it's obvious.

There's no doubt that it was for something which happened outside the classroom. I was on this Ukrainian blacklist that you mentioned. And I gave also an interview to Vladimir Solovyov, a Russian on a Russian TV channel. And I didn't endorse the war, like some would say. We talked about the explosion of Nord Stream 2, and who may have done it, who might not have done it, what the Danes thought about this kind of thing, and things like that.

I was not endorsing the war. That's very important, because I have my doubts about this Russian engagement in Ukraine. That is another question. But I didn't endorse it. But the fact that I gave an interview brought about a crisis in the board. The old board had left, and there was a new board. And the old, original board supported me, and the leader of the school said it was okay because there was nothing wrong with my teaching.... What I do outside the classroom, which points of

view I had, was up to me. They didn't have anything to do with it as long as the teaching in the classroom was done objectively and people were satisfied with this.

So it was because I was considered to be a person who showed understanding for Putin. Showed understanding for Putin. And I was asked by a journalist, do you really show understanding for Putin? I said, you have to be aware that you use the word understand. What does it mean? It is very important to understand Putin, what his situation is, his background and his way of thinking, and things like that. It's absolutely not the same thing as to say it is very good, but you have to understand him. But I think in the Danish media, journalists think it's an offence, in itself, to understand Putin, and to understand Russia, not either endorsing or not endorsing, but to understand them...

%%'No, We Don't Have Freedom of Speech'

Well, it seems like we are living in—our thinking—something has happened. It resembles something that happened in Stalin's time. You have very strict control with people at the university, or you're allowed to say some things, and you have a lot of taboos you're not allowed to talk about.

So, for me, it was really a surrealistic experience in my own country, which I was brought up to believe is one of the best countries. We have freedom, and we have freedom of speech. We have all these kinds of things. No. It doesn't really work that way today. And I was surprised about it because I had some illusions about my own country, which I don't have now. So, freedom of speech. No, we don't have freedom of speech.

Of course I have not been killed. I will not be put in the gulag... But when you fire people, you indirectly also tell people at other universities, "Beware about what you write and what you say. Don't try to say something which is opposed to government policy right now." This is the logic. This is the

conclusion I have reached, that you have to get in line with the government policy...

So I think it's a sad day. Firstly, I think it's a sad day for democracy, because in a democracy, we come up with various points of view, and we discuss them, and we find a solution. Secondly, how do you develop new knowledge, if the young people who enter a career as a researcher in this field, indirectly they have been told, 'Beware. Look at what happens to people who have some controversial points of view... And I think this is the sad thing. For me, of course, personally, but a sad thing for the country, in terms of developing and knowledge, in terms of having a vibrant working democracy. I think it's a disaster for those two endeavors, for those two very, very important things in a democracy.

EIR: One of the things that immediately tipped off the controversy was that three of your fellow teachers resigned, saying that if you were allowed to continue, then they would resign. And then, the board of directors started an investigation and they accused you of "politicizing your teaching in favor of the Russian understanding of the war in Ukraine." On the radio interview on Radio 24/Seven after you were fired, the chairman of the board of directors simply said that you have very strong, very biased opinions.

First of all, is this this true in terms of "politicizing in favor of the Russian understanding of the war in Ukraine" in your classroom? Have have you brought your own political views into your classroom?

Nielsen: No, of course not, because normally when I start a course, I say that I have my own points of view, of course, but I will work here as a professional historian. I will present various interpretations and various viewpoints about this conflict, the situation, because I'm also teaching very ancient history. Regarding Crimea, the first two, three classes were from ancient times and from the Middle Ages, 2000

years of history. So it's impossible. Putin has not really anything to do with Crimea a thousand years ago. That's one thing.

And secondly, these people who criticize me, those of my colleagues who would not want to teach if I teach, they have never attended even a second of any of my courses. So, I don't know what is going on there. And there was one colleague who also participated in this debate on the radio. He has never read any of my books. He did not understand the interview with Vladimir Solovyov because it was in Russian. Well, I asked very humbly, on what basis have you made this decision? Because you don't know anything whatsoever about me, apart from what some people say on Facebook, and other social media.

So I couldn't call it anything other than a witch hunt. It seems like a kind of a witch hunt, because it's as much a witch hunt, as we had here in Denmark and northern Europe 400 years ago, where we picked out some women, and we killed them because, we said that they were probably evil, but we didn't know exactly how, but probably, they were evil....

%%Students Shocked

We are not discussing anything I said, anything I wrote, anything I have done. We are discussing a picture which someone has made about me being like a Putin follower who likes what is going on, who likes to kill Ukrainian children, and things like that. That's what's going on. And I think it's not at all worthy for a democracy like the Danish democracy. I think it's outrageous.

EIR: You said that neither you, nor any of your students were spoken to by the board of directors. Have any of your students complained that you were politicizing your teaching, and now, after your firing, have any of the students protested against your being fired?

Nielsen: Yes. Of course. Many of the students there have been

protesting now. And if you go back, there was one remark in February. But an evaluation was made where 100% were satisfied with the professional level of the teaching. And 75% were very satisfied and 25% were satisfied. There was no one who was dissatisfied or less satisfied. But there was one who mentioned that it was a little bit too pro-Putin. That was one among 30 people who made this remark. But that was compared to the other 29 or so. It couldn't, by any means, be a reason for this. Of course, it's not. Because you could also say that it was at the beginning of the war, and actually, in the classroom, there were several people who were very staunch supporters of Putin—a small group—and a small group who very much disliked Putin; and they had some quarrels between themselves, which has nothing to do with me, because I was not part of that. I think that this was the reason why one person said this. But before that, there hadn't been anything like that. Nothing of the sort. There have been several evaluations, and apart from this, there haven't been any remarks at all.

EIR: And you said that that many of your students have written to you protesting your being fired.

Nielsen: Yes. I don't know exactly how many, but many said they would protest it. How many actually have done it? I'm not quite aware, but I think that there probably will be a lot, because it was a shock, because people have been following me for years. Some of those ... have attended all my courses, or many of my courses, and they were shocked, because they didn't understand it at all.

And I also gave a course on the history of Ukraine last year, and there were really many participants. And the people said they were in shock because I didn't politicize, I didn't do anything. I just put forward some facts and various viewpoints. Because when you're talking about Ukraine, you have very different narratives about what Ukraine is. And even inside Ukraine, you have very different points of view. What

constitutes actually a country like Ukraine? I have several Ukrainian friends who have very, very diverging ideas and concepts of what Ukraine is, what constitutes Ukrainian identity. It's not a simple or unambiguous concept, because it's very controversial, what it actually constitutes. It's not that easy. So I had to put forward something.

But many of the people who criticize me, they criticize me because they think I should say exactly what the Western governments and the Ukrainian government say. This is the thing, that I have to say something exactly like the public version of the Ukrainian nationalist government's interpretation of Ukrainian history. But as an historian, that's very easy to criticize. Because there are historical facts which run counter to much of the Ukrainian [government's] way of thinking.

EIR: Along that line, the one thing that the board of directors did do, besides referring to these very few student remarks, was that they read one of your books called Ukraine in the Field of Tension. What did they criticize about your book?

Nielsen: They criticized me when I wrote about the so-called annexation. First, I would say that it's a book written six years ago. So a lot of things have happened since then. But there was a discussion about what does annexation mean? Because, I admit also that the Russian troops did not adhere to the agreement between Russia and Ukraine regarding the lease of the Sevastopol naval port. They were allowed to have 25,000 soldiers to defend the fleet and the port, but the Russian troops had no right to stay in Simferopol. They went from Sevastopol to Simferopol. It's true. But on the other hand, it's a very strange annexation where there was hardly any bloodshed. There were two or three people who were killed

by accident, and there were 21,000 soldiers in the Ukrainian army in the Crimean garrison, but 14,000 decided to join the Russian side.

So it means that it's a very split country, whatever you may call it. And I also said that, I think it was in the Summer of 2014, Q International American Polling Institute made a survey in Crimea saying that 80 or 90% of the population endorsed the status as a part of Russia. And the same result was arrived at by the German polling company GfK in 2015. So, when the majority of the population accepts this transfer from Ukraine to Russia, is it an annexation? I had a discussion in the book about it: Because you can say, on the one side, it depends, if you look at it like that, you can consider it to be an annexation. But in other ways, it's not a very typical annexation, because of what I've just mentioned.

So they really made a mistake, because they said it shows that I am teaching the history of Russia in favor of the Russian war in Ukraine going on right now. So they are manipulating things to get it to fit into their own narrative. It's not serious. Not at all. And I'm open to debate about this. Of course I am. But they are not interested in a debate. I wrote a letter to them and they have, of course, not answered the letter.

And whatever I wrote six years ago, it is not what I'm saying in the classroom.

%%Liberties Only in Time of Peace?

EIR: As a teacher at the Folk University, don't you have the right to take part in the public debate, even if some may object to your views? What do you think about that? And why do you participate in the public media debate about Russia and

Ukraine?

Nielsen: Well, my case seemed to prove the fact that if you take part, and have some points of view, which do not suit public opinion, or does not suit the government, you will lose your livelihood. You will lose your job. So this is what it proves, that you can lose your job. I have lost two jobs because of this. So it's obvious that there are some costs connected to it. It shouldn't be like that. You should not be fired because of some points of view you have, and that you bring into the public discussion such a very, very important question as the war going on in Ukraine right now. So it's difficult. At any rate, it comes with big costs for those who participate. They can be fired. There can be a witch hunt against them. There can be a campaign against them, smear campaigns, and such kind of things. It has taken place here, and I also understand—I just followed some of my German colleagues, and they have been exposed to something like that.

EIR: Yes, you liken this to a German word "Berufsverbot". What is that?

Nielsen: Beruf means your work. Verbot means you're blocked, you're fired, you're not allowed to work there. And some years back, 40 or 50 years ago, we had this discussion. Are you allowed to work at university, if you have certain points of view? And also at this time, there were people who were fired, some from the right and some from the left, by the way. And we had a discussion. Well, I don't recall precisely, but it was in around the '70s, Vietnam, the '80s, where we had this discussion. I was very young at this time. And I think it ended up with the fact that we agreed that you should not be fired because of your public opinions. One of the leaders of the Nazi Party in Denmark was a teacher at Aalborg University. I knew this guy. I didn't like him. But that is off the mark. But there was discussion, and actually, he was allowed to stay there, because there was no complaint about his teaching. He was teaching German language and literature. There was a

discussion about it.

So it's not a new thing. We didn't have this discussion for many years. Now it's come back, and it tells that when you have some tension, some conflict, and things like that, our highly valued liberties, they immediately fly away. So it's a thin layer. Our democracy, the democratic culture here, is maybe a very thin layer. So I wonder, if Denmark enters the war more directly, I think we'll probably lose all our liberties. We can have liberties when you have peace. There's no danger. But when you have some tension, they should prove themselves. These liberties should prove themselves in times of tension.

%%'Europe Should Not End Up in Nuclear War'

EIR: And why is it that you have participated in the debate about Russia and Ukraine in the public media?

Nielsen: Because I'm very dissatisfied with the policy. I think that the policy the West is pursuing towards Russia—and also Ukraine—I think it's hopeless. I think it's very, very foolish, and is very dangerous, by the way. Well, for Russia, of course, but also for ourselves. I think we're playing with fire. It's a very dangerous situation. I think this is the most dangerous situation we have, including the Cuban Missile Crisis, which was 60 years back. Of course, I'm driven by this, that the West, that Europe should not end up in nuclear war. Because I know exactly, that if there will be a nuclear war, Europe will be the first theater which will be hit, and it will really, really, really have consequences which we have not seen in the history of mankind, ever.

We know the potential for nuclear war. We know where it is. And you can be angry with Putin around the clock. But, at the end of the day, there's no alternative to have some kind of agreement with Russia to find some kind of solution. To defeat Russia is stupidity. And I'm not talking, maybe, because I

feel sorry for the Russians. I feel sorry for ourselves. I feel sorry for the Europeans who are following a very shortsighted policy, especially from America, the United States of America. I think Europeans, we should find another approach to the policy, because it's obvious for everyone now, because of the sanctions, Europe is really in straits. Europe is the part of the world which is hit most by the sanctions. It's actually not really Russia. It's Russia to some extent, of course. But Russia can sell their oil anywhere. And we buy their oil. Much of the gas and oil from Russia goes to India, and China, and they sail around the globe, and they end up in Germany for four-five times the price. It's stupidity. It's pure stupidity, and that's why I engage in the debate.

EIR: You've also said that in your media debates, you have not legitimized Russia's military intervention in Ukraine, but that you have stressed that it's important to find out how we got here. Also the responsibility on the western side. I have made interviews with you, actually, before the start of the war in February. I interviewed you in December of last year, and you were warning about—that was at the point where Russia had just proposed two treaties to try to avoid crossing their red lines. But you said that you have also participated in the media debate to find out how can we reach a peaceful solution?

Do you think that you being put on the Ukraine blacklist, and that being widely publicized in Denmark, could have been a factor that led to this situation where you've been fired?

%%Arrogance of the West

Nielsen: Definitely, among other factors. But it definitely has played a role, There's no doubt about it.

And I also need to just add that the two questions are actually interrelated, because to find out what brought us to this point, it will also be very meaningful when you find out how we proceed from here, how to get to a more peaceful

solution. So those questions are interrelated actually. You can't find a road to peace, really, if you don't find out how we got here and how to proceed. So I think that is very interrelated.

But when I look at many of the researchers in Denmark, they have some strange ideologically fixed pictures of Russia. There's a lot of things to criticize in Russia. That's not the point. But to find out, more exactly, what's taking place. And I think that the West should take off their ideological glasses, and look much more realistically at what's happening on the ground. And then, they will probably, maybe, come to some more effective solutions, I don't know. But then there's a chance of it, at least.

EIR: You have also warned in your media debates that people who think that if you just get rid of Putin, then the problem is solved—you have warned that there are factions which are very anti-Western.

Nielsen: Yes, sure. Because I think many in Denmark, and in the West in general, tend to forget that Putin was actually very pro-Western in the beginning of his term when it started more than 20 years back. He was President in 2000. They seem to forget it. He actually wanted Russia to become part of NATO. He appealed to the West in his speech in the Bundestag, in the German parliament, and so on, and met with George W. Bush, and things like that. He was very good friends with Tony Blair, I think. There was a hope for the world, but things changed, and I think is very interesting to understand what changed in those years. I think that there were many steps. It's a little complicated to put it shortly here, but a lot of it, I think, was the West's arrogance, and the West saying we can do anything, without asking Russia.

The first thing was the bombing of Serbia in 1999, and the

extension of NATO, and things like that. And secondly, was the Iraq war, and things like that. So things changed in Russia.... I lived in Russia in the '90s, and I talked to the Russians. I had another picture. I knew, at this time, that Russia would rise again as a superpower.

And it was important, also, to have some kind of confidence in each other, and to get into a more comprehensive cooperation with Russia. It didn't happen for several reasons.... And does the West's attitude have anything to do with it? It definitely has. But this is the discussion.

I think that's also where many of the discussions tend to stop today, because in the West, many politicians, and also people from think-tanks in the West, tend to think that our way of thinking is the only way of thinking.... I think it's a very, very dangerous way of thinking. I think they will end up with conflicts.

So, I think it's important to have, in universities, but also among politicians, to have a discussion. Where has this American-led world brought us today? It has brought us to the brink of catastrophe, to the brink of a breakdown of a lot of things. And many of the Russians are aware of this. They look at it this way, but many in the West have difficulties to see it, because we are blindfolded, more or less, ideologically, and it's dangerous.

%%Voices of Dissent Are Important Now

EIR: Just to conclude, what has to change now, on the western side, and also in Russia, to make it possible for us to switch over to peace negotiations to avoid nuclear war?

Nielsen: The first thing is to have a ceasefire. And it's interesting: Everyone knows that there had been some steps to make ceasefire in March and April. And it's very interesting

to see who stopped it? It was actually not the Ukrainians, in the first place. It was first, the European Union, and then Boris Johnson from the UK, and also Biden. It was the West that stopped it. There were some attempts in Belarus in the first place, and later on in Turkey. Erdogan invited Russia and Ukraine to some talks, and there are still some talks. There are still some talks about the export of wheat from Odessa, and they're sitting in Istanbul, while we are talking. And it was because of Erdogan. There are many people in the West who do not like Erdogan. I'm not very much in love with Erdogan, but this is a very, very—it's the most reasonable step which has been taken. It's been taken from Erdogan, because he invited Russia and Ukraine.

And now, maybe, it could seem that it's too late. I don't know exactly, But it seems now that—because the Ukrainians, Zelensky has now changed his mind. He wants to go to the end, to have a military victory. So he believes that Ukraine can kick all the Russian soldiers out of Ukraine, and the Crimea included. I don't believe it will be that easy. Definitely. If you look at it a little cynically, it might seem that the Americans want a war of attrition against Russia, so that Russia will be weakened. Because they're saying that what happened, probably in the beginning of the '80s, ... the Americans made some new armaments, and the Soviet Union could not follow. Eventually, the Soviet Union collapsed. And maybe they are thinking about the same strategy now, which they had in the '80s with the war in Afghanistan, and also with the armaments, that it will break the back of Russia. But it's a very dangerous game they're playing.

I'm definitely not sure it will happen this time, because Russia and China are allied this time, and Russia has strong allies, also, in India, Pakistan and all the Asian countries. Russia has integrated itself into the Asian environment. And I think that it's not a realistic policy from the United States and Europe. So I think, eventually, it will be bad for us,

definitely.

I think it's important for us that there is a voice of dissent. As I said, that there are some people who will present some other ways of thinking, because many of us who think like that, we are in a minority right now. But things can change very quickly. And I wouldn't be surprised if, suddenly, there will be a situation where people in the West, people in Europe, and also in America, will say enough is enough. We can't do it any more, because this huge amount of money we're sending to Ukraine, I mean, we are taking the money from other projects: infrastructure, education, hospitals, health care system, things like that. So I think that there's a limit to how long time we can continue this war. And I also think that that goes for Ukraine. How much can they destroy the country, and how many people should be killed? It's very important that some voices in the West demand that we have this peace process taking place as fast as possible.

EIR: Jens Jørgen, thank you very much. And thank you for your courage in standing up for your views, for your personal views in the media, and for having a professional attitude towards your teaching, where you have been presenting different viewpoints.

**Webcast med Helga Zepp-
LaRouche og vært Harley
Schlanger**

Fare for tredje verdenskrig på grund af et dødeligt missilangreb i Polen bekræfter behovet for en ny strategisk arkitektur

Torsdag den 17. november 2022

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Goddag, velkommen til den ugentlige dialog med Schiller Instituttets grundlægger og formand, Helga Zepp-LaRouche. Jeg er Harley Schlander, og det er torsdag den 17. november 2022. Helga, i de sidste par dage i den forgangne uge, så det ud til, at vi har undveget et potentielt atomprojektil med missilhændelsen i Polen. Jeg er endnu ikke sikker på, at de fleste mennesker er klar over, hvor alvorligt dette er, men jeg tror, at det er meget vigtigt for dig at forklare folk din opfattelse af, hvad der foregik i forbindelse med denne hændelse.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Jeg mener, at vi virkelig alle bør studere denne hændelse, fordi den anskueliggør, hvor hurtigt vi på grund af dumhed, provokationer, overreaktioner, en kombination af alle disse ting, kan komme i en situation, hvor man har en fuldbyrdet NATO-Rusland-konfrontation, for det var det, der var på nippet til at indtræffe.

I tirsdags kom nyheden om, at et missil havde ramt et sted i Polen, og straks var der en hel række medier og nogle politikere, der påstod, at dette var et russisk angreb på Polen, et NATO-medlem. Folk begyndte endda at tale om NATO's artikel 5, dvs. den forsvarsmæssige betingelse, hvor hele NATO skulle have forsvaret Polen. Nogle af medierne, især de britiske medier, Daily Telegraph, The Mail, gik grassat og

talte om et russisk angreb på Polen; Bildzeitung og flere tyske medier gik helt amok med overskrifter som "Putin leger med Tredje Verdenskrig". Sådan lød overskrifterne onsdag; endog i en lederartikel. Dette på trods af at præsident Biden allerede tirsdag aften, naturligvis grundet tidsforskellen, havde sagt meget klart, at der ikke var noget bevis for, at der var tale om et russisk missil, men at mistanken var, at det var et ukrainsk luftforsvarsmissil, som på den ene eller den anden måde var endt i Polen.

Så på trods af at USA's præsident og efterfølgende Pentagon benægtede, at det var et russisk missil, bragte medierne stadig overskrifter, endog om morgenen onsdag, hvor der blev rapporteret om sagen. Zelenskyj og Kuleba insisterede naturligvis hele dagen på, at det uden tvivl var et russisk missil, og da det blev tydeligt fastslået, at det ikke drejede sig om et russisk missil, sagde Kuleba, at det var en "konspirationsteori" at påstå dette.

Det er utroligt, men det er på en måde forståeligt – Ukraine er én ting. Men så fremturede nogle vestlige politikere, f.eks. fra det tyske liberale parti, FDP, [Marie Agnes] Strack-Zimmermann, formanden for forsvarsudvalget, og Lamsdorff, de påpegede alle sammen, at der ikke var nogen tvivl om, at det var et russisk missil. Så det som disse mennesker talte om, var muligheden for en militær konfrontation mellem NATO og Rusland i denne ekstremt anspændte situation. Det viser, at de ikke spekulerede på, om vi havde beviser, om de var blevet verificeret. Ved vi det?" De anmodede ikke om en undersøgelse, men de hoppede blot til konklusionen og gav Rusland skylden.

Jeg mener dette må analyseres, for det viser simpelthen, at i tider med utilsigtede hændelser eller forhold, kan det gå galt, hvis vi ikke bevæger os i en anden retning og udvikler en sikkerhedsarkitektur, hvor en sådan potentiel udslettelse af menneskeheden kan forhindres; Dette bør virkelig udgøre et varselssignal for alle, der ikke er fuldstændige idioter, om

at vi helt klart skal gå i den retning, som Schiller Instituttet har påpeget siden april i år, nemlig at vi har brug for en ny international sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur, som tager hensyn til alle verdens landes interesser, baseret på principperne i den Westfalske Fred.

Der er i kølvandet på sagen naturligvis krav om en grundig undersøgelse. Nu er der ligefrem røster, der taler om, at det måske var en provokation. Der er endda politikere i Polen, som udtaler, at Warszawa er nødt til fuldstændigt at genoverveje sin strategi i forhold til Ukraine. Så jeg er ikke i stand til at besvare disse spørgsmål nu, for det er naturligvis af største vigtighed, og man skal være ekstremt grundig for at finde ud af præcis, hvad der skete.

Nu var det sandsynligvis, som alle tegn vidner om, et sovjetisk produceret russisk missil, som Ukraine bruger, men hvem der affyrede dette missil, og var det et uheld, eller var det en provokation, det er endnu uvist. Jeg finder politikernes opførsel absolut skandaløs, og de medier der løj, på trods af at det fra USA's præsident allerede var blevet afkræftet; jeg synes, at folk egentlig burde smide disse aviser væk og i virkeligheden indse, hvor farlige de er som et redskab til geopolitisk krigsførelse.

SCHLANGER: Da det først blev klart, at det ikke var et russisk affyret missil, er det interessant, hvordan diskussionen fortsatte: Stoltenberg sagde, at det fortsat er Ruslands skyld. Der var denne skøre Anne Applebaum fra Atlantic Council, der sagde, at det er ligegyldigt, hvad der skete: Det er Ruslands skyld. Der fulgte et yderligere skift til dette argument om, at vi nu er nødt til at spendere flere penge på Ukraine, de har brug for et bedre luftforsvarssystem. Helga, du har en Schiller Institut-konference på vej den 22. november, som virkelig får større betydning nu som følge af denne hændelse, ikke sandt? ["Stop faren for atomkrig": https://schillerinstitute.nationbuilder.com/conference_20221122]

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Jo, for det viser ganske enkelt, at vi, som vi drøftede på den sidste Schiller-konference den 5. november, hvor denne ekstremt vigtige korte video blev fremvist, virkelig er ved at finde ud af, hvad der rent faktisk ville ske under atomare krigsforhold: Når denne tingest først er udløst, har man højst 10 minutter, eller absolut maksimalt 10 til 15 minutter, før et angreb meddeles, og i bund og grund er atomvåbenarsenalet ramt; 2 minutter til at identificere det, 30 sekunder til at den amerikanske præsident kan beslutte, hvad han skal gøre – nogle få minutter – hvis vi kommer ind i denne form for dynamik, så burde folk have søvnløse nætter, indtil vi har afklaret sagen.

Næste tirsdag, den 22. november, afholder vi den tredje Schiller-konference, som er et resultat af initiativet fra latinamerikanske kongresmedlemmer. Det startede i oktober, og derefter havde vi meget hurtigt endnu en konference, og nu har vi den tredje, men i mellemtiden har disse kongresmedlemmer, især to fra Mexico, udsendt en international opfordring til alle valgte embedsmænd på internationalt plan og deres vælgere om at etablere en ny fredsbevægelse af verdensborgere. ["Hastesag: Stop faren for atomkrig!" <https://schillerinstitute.com/blog/2022/11/16/letter-to-current-and-former-legislators-of-the-world/>] Det faktum, at hvis man udkæmper en atomkrig, er det et anliggende for hele menneskeheden, fordi det kan føre til den fuldstændige ødelæggelse af hele civilisationen, og det gør automatisk enhver borger til en verdensborger, der har ret til at rejse sig og erklære, at "dette må stoppe, så vi har brug for en anden politik".

Således vil vi have adskillige parlamentarikere fra Mexico, Peru, Argentina, Brasilien og også nogle folk fra Europa med; også nogle af de mennesker, der lige nu demonstrerer for en afslutning på denne krig og indledende fredsforhandlinger. Det bliver virkelig et meget betydningsfuldt møde med to paneler, for det udvikler sig meget hurtigt, og vi er nødsaget til at

have to paneler. Jeg vil virkelig opfordre alle jer, der er bekymrede over faren for atomkrig, til at deltage i denne konference, for vi er nødt til at lægge et meget virkningsfuldt alternativ på bordet, hvilket er præcis hvad jeg tidligere omtalte: Vi er nødt til at tvinge verdens regeringer til at udarbejde en ny international sikkerhedsarkitektur, som ikke udelukker noget land. For hvis man udelukker nogen, selv om det er en såkaldt autokratisk stat (hvilket man også kan sige meget om), skal der tages hensyn til alle, ellers fungerer det ikke!

Det er den store lære fra den Westfalske Fred, hvor folk erkendte, at man er nødt til at tage hensyn til alle landes interesser, hvis en fred skal være varig. Når man ikke gør det, som det skete med Versailles-traktaten, fører det til den næste krig: Det var den store forskel mellem den Westfalske Fred og Versailles-traktaten, at den ene fred etablerede international ret som et fungerende organ af lovmæssighed, mens Versailles-traktaten netop var kimen til den næste store verdenskrig, der skulle opstå.

Vi vil diskutere dette, og vi vil også præsentere brugbare foranstaltninger, der kan iværksættes for at afholde en sådan traktatkonference. Så I burde virkelig deltage.

SCHLANGER: Man kan tilmelde sig på Schiller Instituttets hjemmeside

(https://schillerinstitute.nationbuilder.com/conference_20221122); der er en boks og en tilmeldingsformular, som I kan udfylde.

Resten er på engelsk:

Now, you were mentioning the importance of the motion from Ibero-America, from especially the Global South: It's interesting that this incident in Poland occurred during the G20 conference, where there were clearly tensions between the Global South and these so-called G7 nations. What's your sense

of what came from there, because there were a number of meetings between leaders—Xi Jinping was very active. How do you think that conference went overall?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think it showed several things. First of all, the developing countries, but especially the host country Indonesia, they were very concerned that the so-called Western countries would not just come and complain, and harass and attack. But they wanted to have a constructive approach, focussing on the real challenges which are a threat to humanity, which is naturally, the world food crisis. Beasley, from the World Food Program, said this is the worst humanitarian crisis since World War II, what we're experiencing right now. So they succeeded to a very large extent.

There was still an effort to condemn Russia and so forth, but it did not really function, because I think it has dawned on at least the more intelligent people, that there is no way how you can go back to the unipolar world. The multipolarity has become a reality; the Global South is playing a much bigger role, they want to overcome colonialism in its new form. And I think that that is a completely new dynamic. That does not mean that everybody in the Western establishment immediately will adapt to that, because they're arrogant, and if you listen to [EU foreign policy chief] Josep Borrell, who thinks only Europe is a "garden" and the rest is a "jungle," naturally your ears are so full of flowers and whatever your garden is growing that you can't hear what people are saying!

But the reality is that there is a new reality, a new realignment, where 130, 140 countries have allied with the Belt and Road Initiative. They're forming new systems with the BRICS countries, many more countries are applying to become members of the BRICS—Argentina, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Turkey—so there is a lot of motion to actually build a completely new system based on sovereignty, the five principles of coexistence, the tradition of the Non-Aligned Movement, and

that is really the new dynamic.

Other than that, I think quite important was the first physical meeting between President Biden and President Xi Jinping, at least since Biden has been President, and according to Foreign Minister Wang Yi, this meeting was a breakthrough. We have to see; I'm always of the opinion, let the deeds follow the words. But I think the fact that these two people met for more than three hours is very important, and one can only hope that this will constitute a lasting shift toward cooperation and an ending to this extreme confrontation which was going on.

Xi Jinping also met with about a dozen or more leaders, with Macron, with Albanese from Australia, with Rutte from Holland, and many others. And especially the meeting between Xi Jinping and Macron reestablished the intention that the two countries should work together. Then you had the Scholz visit to China earlier.

So there are clear motions that there is a recognition that you don't get around China, because China is the locomotive of the world economy. And all the other Asian countries, as well! The only place where there is growth is Asia—it's not Europe, it's not the United States.

It was quite interesting that the Indonesian President Joko Widodo proudly announced the opening of the Jakarta-Bandung High-Speed Railway at the occasion of Indonesia being the host country of the G20. I think this is important, because the developing countries look for cooperation with those countries that bring them real development. They don't want to have just "democracy" and Sunday sermons, they want to have development, and they go to the countries that bring them that.

In that sense, it would be the best, and that is the whole aim of the Schiller Institute, we want the United States and European nations to cooperate with the Global South. There has

to be an equal footing, and the demands from the developing sector that they want to overcome their poverty, that's legitimate! And if Germany and France and Japan, and other so-called "industrial" countries, that are almost formerly industrialized countries by now, they have to listen and they have to come down from their high horse, and they should not think they are so superior to everybody else—and that, in any case, will not be accepted any longer.

So, I think with all caution, and the Polish missile event shows you that caution is adequate, nevertheless, I think this G20 meeting did reflect a change in the realities of the world, and that's a little step in the right direction.

SCHLANGER: The final communiqué, in which the G7 nations wanted it to be a condemnation of Russia, and it was obviously a compromise. The final communiqué said, "Most members strongly condemned the war in Ukraine..." not even condemning Russia. And it mentioned that "There were other views and different assessments of the situation and sanctions." [<http://static.kremlin.ru/media/events/files/en/-u82esHnvQFdH0jV25AJg73rnLGEe8cK6.pdf>] So, clearly if there was an attempt behind the scenes to bully, it didn't work.

Helga, going into this conference, you had a role to play: You were able to bring to full consciousness the whole question of the Non-Aligned Movement, the anti-colonial movement. Why don't you give us a little sense of what you did?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I participated in a very interesting conference celebrating the 66 year commemoration of the Bandung-Belgrade-Havana conferences, and celebrating a revival of the Spirit of Bandung. This was a very interesting week-long conference: It started in Jakarta; it went to Bandung, it went to Surabaya, and then from there to Bali. I unfortunately only participated online, but nevertheless, it was really expressing the absolute desire of the developing countries to end colonialism, and that spirit was very, very strong.

Now, some people also expressed that they think the West is hopeless, that you have to have a unilateral agreement, just don't bother about the West any more. Now, I have argued many times that I don't think that is realistic, because if you do not integrate at least the United States and hopefully many European countries, at least the continental European countries, it will not work! First of all, I don't think the West would collapse as peacefully as the Soviet Union disintegrated in 1991. And we can't have a bloc-building either: You can't have a Global South plus Russia and China, and a West, which decouples—I don't think that that will work. And I find it quite interesting, I just read an article by Andrey Kortunov from the Russian International Affairs Council (RIAC), who basically said the same thing. He thinks that to construct any kind of world order without the United States will not function, and unfortunately, that's what it is—or not “unfortunately.” [<https://www.rt.com/news/-566635-andrey-kortunov-american-attempts/>]

But we have to getting the United States, despite what Ray McGovern calls the MICIMATT, Wall Street, the big banks, BlackRock, the whole conglomerate of economic-financial interests and the military-industrial complex conglomerate, that is one reality, but that is not the entire United States: We have farmers, we have people who are the real people and they have obviously had a voice in the recent period, in the campaign for Senate of Diane Sare in New York.

But I think just the last word on the G20, the Non-Aligned Movement, I think the momentum is in Asia. I was also able to give several interviews, Chinese TV, commenting on all these things. So my overall impression of all of that is, the Westerners, so-called, would be really advised to stop being so arrogant and just start to cooperate with the countries that clearly have the historic momentum. If they don't it will be at their own expense, and in the worst case, Europe will go to the sidelines of history and become a relic of one of these

civilizations that didn't make it.

That's not what we should aim for, so I'm more for a revival of the spirit of Leibniz, that Europe and China should work together, and develop all the countries in between: So that's my view.

SCHLANGER: Things are not so good in Josep Borrell's "garden." The latest report from the European Central Bank shows that there is an extreme period of crisis coming with the economy. The idiocy of the Green partners in the German coalition government, Baerbock and Habeck, are pointing toward accelerated deindustrialization. What does it look like in Europe right now?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: We are going into a real hard fall and winter: The prices of food and energy are already skyrocketing. Fuest, who is the head of the Ifo economic institute in Munich just said that in the medium term this is risking Germany as an industrial location; the Mittelstand will be wiped out if the policies of these Green ideologues, these absolutely anti-human, anti-growth people, [Foreign Minister] Baerbock and [Economic Minister] Habeck, if that is not quickly replaced, Germany will cease to be an industrial nation.

And the ECB just put out a report saying that they're between a rock and a hard place, between quantitative tightening, threatening collapses and bankruptcies; and quantitative easing, which threatens hyperinflation. There is no solution within that system. This is why we are saying, we absolutely need to have a new credit system, Glass-Steagall, national bank, going back to the principles as the Bretton Woods system was intended by Franklin D. Roosevelt, and unfortunately never implemented because when FDR died, Truman and Churchill who then finally designed the Bretton Woods. This is why many developing countries don't even like the word "Bretton Woods."

But as Roosevelt intended it, to overcome the poverty and

increase the living standard of the entire world population, that has to be put on the agenda, but naturally, I don't think it will function with this present leadership of the EU, because von der Leyen and ECB President Lagarde, and these people, they are really the hard-core neoliberal—they're like the Honeckers of the neoliberal system. So, with them it will not function. We need some other motion.

SCHLANGER: Especially given the context of the war danger, as well as the hunger crisis that David Beasley talked about, maybe you want to say something more about that; but clearly, the question of a failing architecture, which as you say, is not going to fail peacefully, but could drag the world into war, does raise the question of what your husband, Lyndon LaRouche, dedicated the last 50 years of his life to, which is the creation of a new paradigm. And I think it'd be worthwhile just discussing finally how this would work to further the so-called "advanced sector": the bankruptcy reorganization, the credit system—this is something that's not even discussed. We just had an election in the United States, and *none* of this was discussed!

Maybe you want to say something about the lack of a "red wave" in the United States, in this context?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think the expectation that the Republicans would take over with a sweeping victory did not come true. Then Trump's candidates didn't win in many places. Now the big talk is about Florida Governor DeSantis, who is really linked to the neoliberal Austrian school of economics.

Right now, I think the United States, it really shows that what my late husband had said about the party system, that it does not function—he actually called it the "potty system." And, of course, George Washington at the end of his term, warned against the parties, saying they tend not to be in the interest of the nation, but in the lobby interests, the specialist groups. There is really no fundamental difference,

because if you now look at what Bannon as an adviser to Trump is now doing in Mexico, lining up with the extreme rightwing forces of Latin American continent.

I think we need, really, a revival of the American tradition, and the only thing one could see in this recent election campaign was the fantastic campaign of Diane Sare, who, however, was completely defrauded of her vote! That should also be noted: There's this big story, you can't say there was vote fraud in 2020. Well, there was vote fraud for sure against Diane Sare. We have screen shots where she had at a certain point over 50,000 votes, and then a few hours later, the screen shot shows she had only 29,000 votes. She had collected more than 66,000 signatures to even *be* on the ballot! So they didn't even give her a third of those votes, which is completely hilarious! She had all these groups that were supporting her.

In any case, what that signifies is that there is a huge divide between the population and the governments, and that is becoming very clear in Europe as well, where you have more and more large demonstrations: People taking to the streets because they don't feel represented by the government, or the parties like the Free Democratic Party, which really showed its colors in the missile crisis. Who wants to be in the hands of people like this German MP Strack-Zimmermann? This is a Halloween kind of an idea.

What is really required is a completely different system, whereby the common good is again on the agenda, and more and more people from the so-called "normal people" have to take responsibility and qualify themselves to know what should be the economic policy, the foreign policy, the security policy, education. And that requires exactly what we are trying to do to create a movement of world citizens who basically say: We will not allow our fate to be ruined by those few billionaires who are controlling all the corporations; you know, BlackRock is just one example, Vanguard, these things are like vultures

that are trying to suck the juice out of the economy, at the expense of the people. That has come to a breaking point, and we need, really, a mass movement of true state citizens. And one occasion where that will be discussed is this coming week at the next Schiller conference. So again, I invite you to participate.

SCHLANGER: Those people who want to know how there's no contradiction between being a patriot of your nation and a world citizen, should register for the conference. It's Nov. 22, and registration is available at the Schiller Institute website: https://schillerinstitute.-nationbuilder.com/conference_20221122

Helga we've run out of time, so thank you very much for joining us today, and we'll see you hopefully again next week.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes, till next week.

Et potentielt tredje verdenskrigs-missil rammer Polen

Den 15. november 2022 (EIRNS) – Som et eksempel på den type af hændelser, der utilsigtet kan føre til en optrapning imod global atomar udslettelse, ramte et missil en korntørrer i den polske by Przewodów, ikke langt fra grænsen til Ukraine. Hændelsen, som angiveligt har kostet to mennesker livet, fandt sted den 15. november i forbindelse med Ruslands omfattende missilangreb på Ukraine. De første medierapporter, bl.a. fra AP, oplyste, at eksplosionen var forårsaget af et russisk "vildfarende missil".

Disse rapporter var ikke blevet bekræftet af den polske regering, som forinden havde indkaldt til et hastemøde for at drøfte hændelsen. Regeringens talsmand, Piotr Mueller, opfordrede ifølge RT medierne og offentligheden til "ikke at offentliggøre ubekræftede oplysninger".

Som modtræk til rapportererne om, at det var et russisk vildfarent missil, der ramte korntørreriet i Polen, offentliggjorde Telegram-siden "Mash" billeder taget af den polske regering, og hævdede at fragmenterne stammer fra S-300 luftforsvarssystemer fra sovjettiden, som i øjeblikket er i drift af Ukraine. Ukraines udenrigsminister Dmytro Kuleba reagerede med et tweet ved at kalde påstanden for en "konspirationsteori". Det polske udenrigsministerium meddelte herefter, at det havde bekræftet, at missilet var fremstillet i Rusland (i Sovjettiden?) og indkaldte den russiske ambassadør "med krav om en øjeblikkelig detaljeret redegørelse", fremgår det af en erklæring.

I mellemtiden forsøgte Ukraines præsident Volodymyr Zelenskyj at optrappe situationen med sin uovertrufne dramatiske facon ved at påstå, at "dette er et russisk missilangreb på den kollektive sikkerhed", og at "NATO er nødt til at handle", hvilket gav anledning til et væld af diskussioner på de sociale medier om, hvorvidt NATO's artikel 5 ville blive påberåbt. Formanden for Senatets udenrigsudvalg i USA, Bob Menendez (D-NJ), gav sig derefter i kast med forestillingen og udtalte i et interview, at hvis Moskva forsætligt ramte territorium i Polen, kunne det føre til, at artikel 5 blev påberåbt.

Ruslands udenrigsministerium reagerede på striden ved at tweete: "Russisk udstyr udførte INTET angreb i området". Og flere røster stemte i til fordel for nedtrapning. "Vi kan for nuværende ikke bekræfte rapportererne eller nogen af detaljerne. Vi vil fastslå, hvad der er sket, og hvad de passende efterfølgende foranstaltninger vil være," sagde talskvinde for USA's nationale sikkerhedsråd, Adrienne Watson, i en

erklæring.

Hændelsen blev derefter bragt på bane ved et pressemøde i Pentagon, hvor Pentagons talsmand, Air Force Brig. Gen. Patrick Ryder, forklarede journalisterne, at forsvarsministeriet ikke havde beviser, der kunne bekræfte russisk ansvar. Da journalisterne pressede Ryder på en tidligere AP-rapport, der citerede en unavngiven amerikansk embedsmand i efterretningstjenesten for at hævde, at det var russiske missiler, der havde ramt Polen, insisterede Ryder endnu en gang på, at Pentagon ikke har "nogen oplysninger, der kan bekræfte" sådanne rapporter, men at man "undersøger sagen".

Selv den polske præsident Andrzej Duda sagde: "Vi har på nuværende tidspunkt ikke afgørende beviser for, hvem der affyrede missilet" – med det forbehold, at missilet "sandsynligvis" blev fremstillet i Rusland. Ikke desto mindre overvejer Polen angiveligt at påberåbe sig NATO's diskussions- og undersøgelsesproces i henhold til den mildere artikel 4, men har i skrivende stund ikke truffet nogen beslutning.

Og endelig har endog Joe Biden fra et sted på Bali, ifølge et udskrift fra Det Hvide Hus, blandet sig i beskyldningerne om, at det var et russisk missil: Der er foreløbige oplysninger, som bestrider dette. Jeg vil ikke sige det, før vi har undersøgt det fuldstændigt. Men ... det er usandsynligt, i betragtning af banen, at det blev affyret fra Rusland. Men vi får se."

Centrale spørgsmål er stadig tilbage, herunder hvad hedder den "højtstående amerikanske embedsmand i efterretningstjenesten", der forsøger at udløse tredje verdenskrig?

Hvis Polen ikke var medlem af NATO, ville konsekvenserne af en sådan hændelse ikke nødvendigvis udløse en diskussion om Harmagedon, Ragnarok. Hvis Polen imidlertid ikke var blevet medlem af alliancen, da den udvidede sig til Ruslands grænse,

og hvis NATO ikke havde overvejet Ukraines medlemskab af alliancen, ville der sandsynligvis ikke være nogen missiler, som flyver nogen steder i Europa.

Følgende er fra dr.dk:

Ubekræftet: Missilet kan være fra ukrainsk forsvar

Amerikanske embedsmænd antyder, at det missil, der i går ramte Polen, kan komme fra det ukrainske forsvar. Det skriver journalist Seung Min Kim fra nyhedsbureauet AP, skriver Ritzau.

Ifølge hendes kilder tyder de indledende undersøgelser på, at det muligvis blev affyret fra de ukrainske styrker mod et indgående russisk missil.

Foto: Alexander Ermakov , Pexels

Schiller Instituttet i Danmark intervenserer på seminar i tænketank om NATO's nye strategiske koncept

København – Dansk Institut for Internationale Studier (DIIS), den førende tænketank med tilknytning til udenrigsministeriet, afholdt et fysisk seminar såvel som et online-seminar om "NATO's nye strategiske koncept i praksis". NATO's nye strategiske koncept blev vedtaget på NATO-topmødet i Madrid i juni på baggrund af krigen i Ukraine. Der var fire akademiske forsvarseksperter som indlægsholdere.

Nogle af hovedpunkterne: Det sidste strategiske koncept var fra 2010, hvor Rusland blev betegnet som en strategisk partner, og hvor Kina ikke blev nævnt. Denne gang må NATO være forberedt på en tofrontskrig imod Rusland og Kina. Forsvar og afspænding er ændret til forsvar og afskrækkelse. NATO skal bejle diplomatisk til det Globale Syd, som ikke er indforstået med det vestlige verdensbillede.

Schiller Instituttets organisator fik mulighed for at stille et af de tre spørgsmål: Den vigtigste strategiske trussel er atomkrig. Formanden for Schiller Instituttet har sammenlignet det med to atomtog, der kører mod hinanden. Hvad skal der til for skridt for skridt at undgå den optrapning, som vi har set fortsætte, og som kan medføre en atomkrig? Hvad skal der til for at overgå til forhandlinger for at stoppe krigen i Ukraine? Derefter annoncerede hun konferencen "Stop atomkrig" den 22. november.

Prof. Jamie Shea, formand for "Centre for War Studies" ved Syddansk Universitet og med 40 års erfaring fra NATO's internationale stab, svarede: "Jeg er helt enig. Jeg mener, at dette udgør en reel bekymring." Han henviste til Jake Sullivan, der ringede til sine russiske modparter, og at der er signaler bag kulisserne, som vi ikke er bekendt med. Vesten har en strategi, hvis Rusland bruger et atomvåben. NATO har også gennemført atomøvelser. Han nævnte, at Rusland kunne bruge en beskidt bombe ved at bombe et atomkraftværk.

Prof. WSR Olivier Schmitt fra samme universitet svarede, at en hindring af en atomar optrapning er noget andet end at standse krigen i Ukraine. Med hensyn til det første, er det et problem, at den tekniske ekspertise vedrørende afskrækkelse er blevet undermineret. Folk forstår ikke signalering af atomvåben, men vi har været der før og bør genoplive ekspertisen vedrørende afskrækkelse. Hvad angår det andet punkt, vil kampene ikke stoppe, så længe begge parter ser sandsynlige veje til sejr. Putin forventer, at de vestlige lande holder op med at støtte Ukraine, og Ukraine ser sin

militære kapacitet stige.

Organisatoren havde talrige drøftelser med talere og deltagere før og efter seminaret, og samtlige deltagere fik en invitation til konferencen den 22. november. Et par af deltagerne, herunder en militæranalytiker, udtalte, da de blev konfronteret med, at NATO er ansvarlig for krigen i Ukraine: "Der skal to til at danse tango". En svensk professor var bekymret for, hvad Sveriges NATO-medlemskab kunne medføre. Der blev oprettet kontakter.

Den danske Rusland/Ukraine-ekspert Jens Jørgen Nielsen afskediget som underviser af politiske årsager

Jens Jørgen Nielsen er netop blevet fyret som underviser på Folkeuniversitetet i København, angiveligt af politiske årsager. Jens Jørgen Nielsen talte på det dansk/svenske Schiller Instituts konference om en ny sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur den 25. maj, og blev efterfølgende sat på Ukraines sortliste som nummer 3.

For nylig fratrådte tre andre undervisere, fordi de nægtede at undervise, hvis han fortsatte, og det blev omtalt i pressen. Kristeligt Dagblad skrev i sin dækning af kontroversen, at Jens Jørgen Nielsen var blevet sat på den ukrainske sortliste.

For tre dage siden besluttede den nye bestyrelse på Folkeuniversitetet, at Jens Jørgens kontrakt ikke skal forlænges næste år, fordi enkelte har kritiseret ham for "at

politisere i undervisningen til fordel for den russiske forståelse af krigen i Ukraine". Han underviser i øjeblikket på et kursus om Krims historie, som han får lov til at afslutte, men næste års kurser om "Russisk konservatisme" og "Ukraines historie" er blevet aflyst.

Hverken bestyrelsen eller andre af hans akademiske kritikere har nogensinde overværet et af hans kurser, og bestyrelsen har ikke engang talt med ham eller nogen af de deltagende om sagen, før de fyrede ham. Bestyrelsen har blot lyttet til nogle af hans kritikere og læst en af hans debatbøger, "Ukraine i spændingsfeltet". Bestyrelsen kritiserede ham bl.a. for at skrive i bogen, at Krim ikke blev "annekteret" af Rusland, hvilket ville have krævet et militært angreb, men at det var en beslutning truffet af parlamentet på Krim.

I et radiointerview efter bortvisningen understregede Jens Jørgen Nielsen, at han holder sine personlige politiske holdninger, som han giver offentligt udtryk for i danske og internationale medier, ude af undervisningen og udelukkende præsenterer forskellige synspunkter om de historiske emner i sin undervisning, så eleverne kan reflektere over dem. Samtlige elevvurderinger, der er foretaget i de 8 år, han har undervist, har været overvejende positive, og ingen har kritiseret ham for at politisere.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen har sagt, at han ikke har politiseret til fordel for Ruslands militære angreb på Ukraine i undervisningen. Selv i medierne har han ikke legitimeret Ruslands handlinger, og sagt at det var en fejltagelse, men han har derimod sagt, at det er vigtigt at finde ud af, hvordan vi er havnet her, og dernæst hvordan vi kan nå frem til en fredelig løsning. Burde det ikke være tilladt, spørger han? Han siger, at han skrev bogen om Ukraine på grund af den ensidige mediedækning.

En af de undervisere, der sagde op, angreb ham i radioprogrammet for at være blevet interviewet på russisk

stats-tv, men læreren vidste imidlertid intet om indholdet af interviewet.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen konkluderer, at Folkeuniversitetet har valgt den nemme, men også principløse løsning på det pres, de blev påført af den furore, der opstod, da de andre lærere sagde op. Det vides ikke, hvilken rolle Jens Jørgen Nielsens optræden på Ukraine-listen har spillet, da den blev omtalt bredt i pressen.

“Underviseren, der blev fyret [af Folkeuniversitetet] for sit syn på Rusland”.

Interview med Jens Jørgen Nielsen m.fl. på Radio 24/syv

Lyt til programmet her på Radio 24/syvs hjemmeside.

“Beskrivelse af Radio 24/syv:

“Den kontroversielle historiker og Rusland-debattør Jens Jørgen Nielsen er blevet fyret som underviser af Folkeuniversitetets bestyrelse. Fyringen kommer, efter flere undervisere på Folkeuniversitetet har sagt op i protest mod Jens Jørgen Nielsen, og at kritikere har beskyldt ham for at være for “forstående” over for Putins styre i Rusland.

“Ifølge Jens Jørgen Nielsen er der tale om en fuldstændig uberettiget fyreseddel.

“Reporterne undersøger, hvad der er op og ned i sagen. For må

man mene, hvad man vil i privaten, og kan man samtidig bedrive saglig undervisning?

“Gæster:

Jens Jørgen Nielsen, historiker og Rusland-debattør

Anders Lundt Hansen, middelalderhistoriker

Jakob Skovgaard-Petersen, formand for Folkeuniversitetet

Uffe Gardel, journalist

Vært: Alexander Wils Lorenzen”

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

Han er på Ukraines sortliste efter at have talt på Schiller Instituttets seminar i Danmark den 25. maj 2022 om en ny international sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur.

Her er et interview Schiller Instituttet lavede med Jens Jørgen Nielsen den 3. oktober 2022:

Interviewet omfatter:

- Truslen om atomkrig;
- Situationen er mere alvorlig end Cuba-krisen;
- Behovet for forhandlinger eventuelt med Tyrkiet eller Indien som mæglere;
- Den vestlige strategi om at fortsætte krigen, indtil Rusland er besejret, vil ikke fungere og indebærer risiko for atomkrig;
- Hvordan vi er kommet til dette punkt, startende med USA’s tidligere nationale sikkerhedsrådgiver (1977 til 1981) Zbigniew Brzezinskis plan om at bruge Ukraine til at splitte Rusland;
- North Stream-sabotagen blev efter al sandsynlighed ikke

udført af Rusland.

Vælg at ændre verdens nedsynken i krig

Den 8. november 2022 (EIRNS) – De i USA, der i dag har det privilegium og mulighed for at stemme på de uafhængige kandidater Diane Sare (USA's Senat i New York) og Joel De Jean (U.S. Congress 38th CD, Texas), eller på dem, der har arbejdet sammen med dem på trods af politiske forskelle, såsom Geoff Young (6th CD, Kentucky), genopliver det, som mange amerikanere ikke engang er klar over er blevet stjålet – ikke “amerikanske valg”, men selve den amerikanske valgproces. Dagens valgproces er kun vigtig, fordi den indgår i den globale kamp for at føre verden tilbage fra randen af en atomkrig og til en holdbar ny strategisk og økonomisk arkitektur baseret på en tilbagevenden til det nyligt forsømte ideal og den praksis, som den Westfalske Fred i 1648 indebar.

Det princip, der ligger til grund for denne fredstraktat, er, at hver part i en konflikt skal forhandle om fred ud fra et synspunkt om at prioritere “den andens fordel” frem for sine egne misforhold eller fordele. Den Westfalske Fred, også kendt som Münster-traktaten, som Tysklands grønne udenrigsminister Annalena Baerbock, en “dum og dummere” udgave af Tony Blair, har angrebet (samt angrebet sin egen kansler Olaf Scholz for hans rejse til Kina), foranledigede hende til i mødesalen i Münster, hvor traktaten blev underskrevet, og hvor G7-udenrigsministtermødet fandt sted, tilsyneladende endog at få fjernet det kristne kors, der hænger der....

I dag henleder vi opmærksomheden på to anliggender, som måske

ikke ville få den rette opmærksomhed, hvis de blev beskrevet fra andre kilder. For det første havde Dmitry Polyanskij, Ruslands første stedfortrædende faste repræsentant ved De Forenede Nationer, et budskab til amerikanerne, som han formidlede torsdag aften, den 3. november, i Terra Reades "Politics of Survival"-show. Han erklærede bl.a., at "ingen i Rusland ønsker en atomkrig, uanset om det er en "begrænset" atomkrig eller en "ikke-begrænset" atomkrig. Vi forstår, hvor det kan føre hen. Vi har ingen illusioner med hensyn til, at det ville være ødelæggende for alle. Så hvis nogen starter det, vil det ikke være Rusland. Men hvis nogen starter en sådan krig mod Rusland, vil vi naturligvis i henhold til vores atomdoktrin være nødt til at gengælde... Men igen, hvad er der på spil? Jeg mener, at det er vores fælles fremtid, der står på spil. USA's fremtid er også på spil. Ingen ønsker, at USA skal smuldre, ingen ønsker, at USA skal forsvinde..."

For det andet er der gennembruddet med beretninger i den brede tyske presse om eksistensen af det ukrainske Center for bekæmpelse af Desinformations "kill list", herunder navnet på en allieret af den tyske kansler Olaf Scholz, Rolf Mützenich, formand for de tyske socialdemokraters (SPD) parlamentsgruppe. Selv om man har vidst, at dræberlisten har eksisteret siden juli, blev den ikke omtalt, bl.a. fordi den indeholdt navnet på Schiller Instituttets grundlægger og leder, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, et navn som NATO-styrker har forbudt at udtale uden bagvaskelse i langt over 40 år i Tyskland. Den tyske hjemmeside NachDenkSeiten tog dette skridt i august og dækkede senere Executive Intelligence Reviews pressekonference, der afslørede drabslisten i september.

Det tyske gennembrud kommer på et tidspunkt, hvor nogle, bl.a. i USA og London, truer med at føre krig mod Tyskland, hvis det skulle overveje at trække sig bare et skridt tilbage fra det selvmord, der er planlagt for landet i form af dets forestående afindustrialisering, som Morgenthau og andre engang ønskede. Det vil nu blive gennemført under påskud af

den store grønne omstilling. De tyske industrifolk, landmænd og dem der mener, at de er frie borgere, som ikke er underlagt den angloamerikanske besættelse, er uenige.

Helga Zepp-LaRouches bemærkninger i en China Plus "World Today"-podcast, fredag den 4. november – at man ikke behøver at se Kina som en systemisk rival; at 150 lande ikke ser det på den måde, men snarere ser Kina som en partner til at overvinde kolonialismen; og at hvis de tyske medier ville rapportere om de faktiske enorme fremskridt, der er sket i Kina, ville folk have et helt andet syn på landet – afspejler det løsningskoncept, som Schiller Instituttet atter vil præsentere på den kommende konference, "Stop faren for atomkrig nu". Konferencen finder sted tirsdag den 22. november, som er 59-årsdagen for mordet på præsident John F. Kennedy.

Som i USA's aktuelle historie er mord blevet brugt i Tyskland til at hjælpe med at gennemføre den politik, som NATO's første generalsekretær (1952), Lord Hastings Lionel Ismay, Winston Churchills øverste militære assistent, engang udtrykte som NATO's formål – "at holde russerne ude, amerikanerne inde og tyskerne nede". Der var mordene på Jürgen Ponto og Hanns Martin Schleyer i 1977. (Lyndon LaRouche var nr. 2 på den samme "drabsliste".) Der var mordene på Alfred Herrhausen (november 1989) og Detlev Rohwedder (april 1991) efter Berlinmurens fald. Og man må ikke glemme virkningen af mordet på den tyske udenrigsminister Walter Rathenau for 100 år siden i 1922 i kølvandet på underskrivelsen af Rapallo-traktaten med Sovjetunionen, et mord, hvis egentlige planlæggere og gerningsmænd fik Tyskland til at tage en anden retning, som manifesterede sig i en ølhal i München et år senere.

Men denne anglofile imperialistiske ordens dage er hastigt ved at være forbi. I går sagde Zhao Lijian, talsmand for det kinesiske udenrigsministerium: "Vi opfordrer G7-landene til at opgive koldkrigsmentaliteten og ideologiske fordomme, ophøre med at blande sig i andre landes indenrigspolitik, gentage

usandheder og fremprovokere regionale konflikter.” Det er trods alt i Tysklands og dets befolknings interesse, især dets kvalificerede arbejdsstyrke, at forsikre Kina om, at Tyskland ikke blot vil overholde stående kontrakter, men at det fortsat vil fortsætte med at forfølge og forbedre et forhold til Kina, selv om det er blevet helt klart, at anglosfæren er i færd med at erklære krig mod Kina, uanset hvad det vil koste dets egen befolkning. Tyske industrifolk og kansleren rejste til Kina mod anglosfærens ønske.

Dette er i strid med den uskrevne “Rule of Law”, som allerede har besluttet sig for krig mod Kina, og som vil skabe et påskud for at retfærdiggøre denne krig, hvilket analytikeren Ray McGovern antydede i sine bemærkninger på EIR’s pressemøde i lørdags.

Søndag den 6. november udfordrede arrangørerne for Diane Sares kampagne til det amerikanske senat præsident Joe Biden til at reagere på Ruslands nylige gentagelse af deres “no first use”-politik for atomvåben. Dette skete på en valgforsamling på Sarah Lawrence College. (Præsident Biden reagerede ikke.) Arrangørerne henviste til pavens forslag om, at Vatikanet kunne være mødested for øjeblikkelige fredsforhandlinger for at få krigen i Ukraine bragt til ophør. Pave Frans havde rammende sammenlignet den nuværende krig med krigene i 1914-1918 og 1939-1945, idet han sagde, at den nuværende krig, ligesom disse krige, er en verdenskrig. (<https://twitter.com/JosBtrigga/status/1589488558716616704>)

Paven har ret; dette er allerede en verdenskrig. Der hersker et vanvid blandt nogle af de nuværende misdædere i den transatlantiske verden, der insisterer på, at dette ikke er tilfældet. Andre sammenligner USA’s placering af “trænere” og “inspektører” i Ukraine, der måske er tusind eller flere, med den måde hvorpå USA “pludselig blev inddraget” i et dødsdømt regime i Sydvietnam, et regime, hvis ledere den anglo-amerikanske efterretningstjeneste også myrdede, da det blev belejligt...

Den samme tåbelighed er undervejs i dag... [som] Prompt Global Strikes "vi kan vinde en atomkrig"-galskab, der så effektivt blev modbevist af Steven Starr og Scott Ritter på konferencen i lørdags: "A Nuclear War Cannot Be Won and Must Never Be Fought" (En atomkrig kan ikke vindes og må aldrig udkæmpes). (<https://schillerinstitute.com/blog/2022/11/03/press-conference-a-nuclear-war-cannot-be-won-and-must-never-be-fought/>) ...

De kulturelle aksiomer, de gamle, onde drømme om kolonialisme, som i realiteten ligger til grund for den "New Malthusian" "Save The Planet, Kill The People"-globalistiske bevægelse, vil flyve ind i Sharm el-Sheikh af egen kraft, sandsynligvis uden brug af fly. Måske vil Bandungs ånd, som i Francisco Goyas berømte tavler 79 og 80, der afslutter hans serie Krigens katastrofer – Sandheden er død/ Vil hun leve igen – være der for at konfrontere dem. Hvem der vinder denne kamp, vil blive afgjort af, hvad vi og dem vi rekrutterer, trods forskelligheder, gør i den nærmeste fremtid. (<https://www.museodelprado.es/en/the-collection/art-work/truth-has-died/8c3b0257-606f-4d0b-af9e-73f05de59697> ; <https://www.museodelprado.es/en/the-collection/art-work/disaster-80-will-she-live-again/b6ce7420-7ce6-4f74-a199-9d024bf19083?searchid=8f7e6842-90a1-adf6-ebb0-7516135050e9>)

Foto: Ben Mack, Pexels

**Folketingskandidat
Gillesberg:**

Tom

Resumé af interviewet på Den Uafhængige radiostation

Her er et resumé af Den Uafhængig radiostations interview med Tom Gillesberg den 2. november, dagen efter valget. Værten var Oliver Breum.

København den 9 november, 2022

Først angreb Tom Gillesberg mediernes mørklægning af hans kampagne, bortset fra Den Uafhængige radiostation. Derefter sagde han, at han stillede op, fordi han ikke ønsker atomkrig. At vi ikke skal fortsætte optrapningen fra Vestens side, med aktiv dansk støtte, som fører til en atomkrig med Rusland. De andre partier siger ikke, at når vi blindt følger NATO's optrapning i Ukraine ved fortsat at sende våben, så kommer vi for hver dag tættere på en direkte konfrontation og potentiel atomkrig med Rusland. Eller stiller spørgsmålstejn ved, at statsministeren siger, at energi- og inflationskrisen skyldes Ruslands krig, og at krigen var uprovokeret. Der har været krig i Ukraine i otte år, og vi i Vesten, herunder Danmark, har ikke gjort det, der skulle gøres for at finde en løsning. Tværtimod sagde Vesten i marts til Ukraine, at I ikke skal forhandle fred med Rusland, men i stedet kæmpe til den sidste ukrainer, og vi vil fortsat sende våben til jer.

Jeg stillede op, fordi der må være nogen, som har ryggrad til at sige sandheden om dette, selv om man er upopulær, selv om man kan blive sat på ukrainske hitlister, som mange af mine venner. Der skal være nogen, der rejser de kritiske spørgsmål. For i løbet af de næste par måneder vil det stå klart, at det, som folk har fået at vide, ikke er sandt – at Ukraine vil vinde krigen, og at Rusland vil blive knust. Hvad sker der, når Rusland vinder krigen? Vil vi fortsætte med at eskalere, vel vidende, at det vil føre til atomkrig?

Det er ligesom i 2007, hvor jeg stillede op med sloganet: "Efter finanskuppet: Magnettog over Kattegat". Alle sagde: "Hvilket finanskup?" Kort efter kom finanskuppet, og alle sagde: "Hvordan kunne nogen vide det? I de næste par måneder, når illusionen om den verdensorden vi lever i brister, og vi står i en meget værre strategisk og økonomisk situation, er det vigtigt, at der var nogen, der sagde, hvad der ville ske, og hvad man kunne gøre ved det. Og når sandhedens time kommer, kan folk gå tilbage og sige: "Hvad var det, Tom Gillesberg sagde?"

EIR-pressemøde: "En atomkrig kan ikke vindes og må aldrig udkæmpes"

Den 5. november 2022 (EIRNS) – Den 5. november indkaldte Executive Intelligence Review (EIR) til en ekstraordinær tre timers pressekonference, der samlede en international gruppe af talere med videnskabelig, militær, efterretningsmæssig og politisk baggrund, alle pligttro til det princip, som præsident Ronald Reagan fastslog i sin Tale om unionens Tilstand i 1984, nemlig at "en atomkrig ikke kan vindes og aldrig må udkæmpes". I sin tale til både USA's og Sovjetunionens befolkning tilføjede præsident Reagan: "Den eneste værdi i at vores to nationer besidder atomvåben består i at sikre, at de aldrig vil blive anvendt. Men ville det så ikke være bedre at afskaffe dem helt og holdent?" Naturligvis ville det være bedre. Men 38 år efter denne betydningsfulde udtalelse er Vestens "regeringsskib" blevet kapret af geopolitiske galninge, som hensynsløst styrer os mod en atomkrig, der vil forårsage menneskehedens udslettelse. Kan

denne vanvittige proces vendes?

Formålet med denne pressekonference og med tidligere og fremtidige konferencer, som EIR og Schiller Instituttet er værter for, består i at overbevise verden om, at der eksisterer en bevægelse af fornuftige mennesker i Vesten, som ikke blot er imod udryddelseskrig, men som også foreslår positive ideer til at skabe en velstående og harmonisk fremtid for nuværende og kommende generationer. Vil denne bevægelse lykkes? Som mange af talerne gjorde det klart, vil det afhænge af almindelige borgeres vilje til at opgive tilskurolleren på sidelinjen og deltage i kampen. Nedenfor følger et kort resumé af de indledende betragtninger fra hver enkelt af de talere, der deltog i pressekonferencen.

Her er et fremhævet resumé:

Steven Starr, pensioneret direktør for University of Missouri's Clinical Laboratory Science Program og ekspert i atomkrig, gav en skræmmende præsentation, som omfattede et overbevisende lysbilledeshow, hvori han klart påviste, at en atomkrig ville forårsage menneskets og de fleste dyrs udslettelse på planeten Jorden. Han forklarede, at den destruktive kraft, som nutidens atomvåben rummer, langt overgår den effekt, som blev brugt mod Japan under Anden Verdenskrig. Et sprænghoved, der detoneres over New York City, ville skabe en ildstorm, der ville brænde alt til aske i en radius på 150 kvadratkilometer. Hvis et missilangreb mod USA blev opdaget, ville præsidenten få en briefing på 30 sekunder om angrebets art og derefter maksimalt have 2-3 minutter til at beslutte, hvordan der skulle reageres! Hvis der blev beordret et modangreb, ville missilerne være i luften i løbet af to minutter uden mulighed for at trække dem tilbage, hvis advarslen skulle vise sig at være falsk. Følgerne af en atomkrig ville være en atomvinter, hvor 70 % af sollyset ville blive blokeret på den nordlige halvkugle og 35 % på den sydlige halvkugle i en periode på mindst ti år, hvilket ville gøre det umuligt at dyrke afgrøder. Dette ville medføre massiv hungersnød og mulig

udryddelse af mennesker og dyr.

Resten er på engelsk

Former U.S. Marine Corps intelligence officer and chief UN weapons inspector Scott Ritter followed with a presentation aimed at shaking people out of their complacency regarding the dangers of nuclear war. He began with the assertion that the majority of American people are ignorant of the reality of nuclear conflict. The son of an Air Force officer stationed in Germany during the Cold War, whose responsibilities included nuclear weapons delivery, Ritter grew up acutely aware that nuclear annihilation could happen at any time. After joining the Marine Corps, he was assigned to a nuclear artillery unit which constantly trained to carry out attacks. He then went on to become a weapons inspector during the 1980s at the height of the dangerous very period where Soviet SS-20 and U.S. Pershing II intermediate missiles could reach targets within seven minutes eliminating any chance for reasoned deliberation on how to respond to an attack. In Ritter's words, "The 1980's was all about dodging nuclear Armageddon." He believes one of the most underappreciated moments in history is when President Reagan signed the INF Treaty with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev because this event saved the world from nuclear suicide. However, with the collapse of the Soviet Union we no longer respect Russia and are now reconstituting intermediate nuclear weapons. Ritter ended his presentation as a warning to those in the West who believe a nuclear war against Russia is winnable by describing the Russian system called the "dead hand." Were a successful decapitation strike carried out against Moscow, the "dead hand" system would automatically launch communications rockets which would travel across the territory of Russia activating a retaliatory second strike which would mean the end of the world.

French Col. Alain Corvez (ret.), former advisor to the General-in-Commander of the UNIFIL in Lebanon and former international relations advisor to the French Foreign

Ministry, began his remarks by expressing gratitude for participating in an event where speakers know what they're talking about. The problem in his opinion is that leaders in the West know nothing about nuclear war. He recounted Charles de Gaulle's intention to constitute a nuclear force ("force de frappe") under the sole control of France strictly for the purpose of nuclear deterrence. De Gaulle was well aware that a nuclear war would result in the deaths of hundreds of millions of people. He questioned whether today's leaders have any understanding of the fact that a nuclear war cannot be won and that as a consequence the nature of war has been fundamentally changed. Even a war with a small nuclear armed power like North Korea would have unimaginable consequences.

Colonel Richard Black (ret.), U.S. Marine Corps combat veteran, former chief of the Army Criminal Law Division at the Pentagon and former Virginia State Senator, began by stating that we are in a footrace with the globalist demons intent on starting World War III. According to Black, given that there may be a shift away from support for the Ukrainian regime were the outcome of the midterm elections to favor the Republicans, as is highly likely, there is an effort by NATO to accelerate the war. As empirical evidence of this accelerated war drive, Black cites events such as the Sept. 26 Nord Stream pipeline sabotage (including British Prime Minister Liz Truss's "It is done" text message to Secretary of State Tony Blinken), the Oct. 8 attempt at blowing up of the Crimean Bridge across the Kerch Strait and the foiling by Russian security forces of sabotage attempts deep within Russian territory. Black believes the intention is to "trip up" the Russian leadership causing an overreaction which creates the pretext for a counterattack by NATO. He also pointed to the recent highly unusual surfacing of two U.S. nuclear armed attack submarines as an intended signal to Moscow that NATO has the capability to launch a nuclear 'Pearl Harbor' at any time. He stated that President Biden has the capability of ending the war at anytime but right now is not listening to the American people

but only to the globalists. Black ended his remarks by voicing his opinion that the Schiller Institute is the preeminent voice for peace in the world today and thanked the young “gutsy” Schiller Institute activists for their interventions confronting the warmongers.

The next speaker, Jacques Cheminade, is a three-time candidate for the French presidency and leader of the Solidarité et Progrès party as well as a leader of the Schiller Institute. Cheminade’s remarks were very brief, expressing his full support for Diane Sare’s Senate campaign in the Nov. 8 U.S. election. What she expresses as her political objectives echoes the voice of people he has met in France who are suffering the same hardships as the American people. She is the only candidate campaigning for peace, stability and cooperation for the entire world. Cheminade advised all New Yorkers to vote for Sare to help bring about peace and the best of all possible worlds.

Dr. Cliff Kiracofe, former senior advisor to the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee and president of the Washington Institute for Peace and Development, began by stating his opinion that a diplomatic process is the only way to end the war in Ukraine and the sooner this diplomatic process takes place the better. Russia, having a policy of what Kiracofe characterized as “old school” diplomacy, is open to negotiations. However, the Ukrainian government at this point is refusing to negotiate, and without negotiations diplomacy is impossible. France and Germany failed to advance the Minsk II process which was endorsed by the UN Security Council in 2015. As a consequence Ukraine has lost the Donbass territory (formerly known as Novorossiia) which has been incorporated into Russia. The question now is will Russia launch a winter offensive to absorb more territory and would this lead to a general European war or even nuclear war? Kiracofe ended by stating his belief that as peace advocates we must insist on a diplomatic process now.

General Dominique Delawarde (ret.), former French liaison officer to the U.S. Army's Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, began by thanking Scott Ritter for his exemplary work which is followed very closely by his colleagues in France. He also stated that as a citizen of the world he endorses Diane Sare's Senate campaign; that she is a rare candidate who understands that Russia cannot afford to lose the war with Ukraine and that miscalculations would have potential catastrophic consequences. He expressed his fear that the globalists in the West directing foreign policy unless stopped are leading us to war. He ended his remarks by noting that Sare deserves to be Senator as she represents a powerful voice for peace and, as in 1962 during the Cuban Missile Crisis, we must be willing to compromise.

Retired CIA analyst Ray McGovern started by recounting his experience as a 2nd Lieutenant in the U.S. Army during the Cuban Missile Crisis at which time he was stationed near Key West, Florida. He then amplified remarks made earlier by Scott Ritter regarding how close we came to nuclear war with the Soviet Union, a nation President Reagan had labeled "the evil empire," in 1983. In particular, McGovern singled out a NATO exercise in 1983 called Able Archer which simulated a nuclear attack against the Soviet Union. At the time serving as a CIA intelligence officer, a colleague named Mel Goodman sounded the alarm bells to his superiors that the Soviets saw this exercise as a serious threat and if we didn't "tone it down" it could trigger a nuclear war. Whereas Bob Gates refused to heed his warnings, he went over Gates's head to William Casey, who did listen to him seriously, to our great fortune. The problem now in the current political climate is that very few people know what's really going on. That means those who do know have to "get off their butts and do something." McGovern then explained what he calls the Noah principle: "No awards for predicting rain, awards only for building arcs." This means each person has to get off their derriere and do their part in helping to building the arc (i.e. do something!). And

although we can't expect immediate success, by being faithful and telling the truth we set an example for future generations. McGovern ended his remarks by calling out the older generation with a "little bit of gray" in their hair. According to McGovern these people have an advantage because while the actions of younger people may be dismissed by the general population when they get arrested or beaten up, most people don't like to see old people getting beaten up. Under today's circumstances it's important for older people to put this advantage to good use and get out there and do something!

The final speaker was Helga Zepp-LaRouche, founder and chairwoman of the Schiller Institute. Echoing several of the prior speakers, she started by saying that we are in the most dangerous moment in history and most people know nothing. During the 1980s, during the Pershing Missile crisis, hundreds of thousands of people were in the streets protesting. Today very little is happening. Her late husband, Lyndon LaRouche, created the basis for a new security architecture during that period based on a policy that became known as the Strategic Defense Initiative which was formally adopted by President Reagan on March 23, 1983. With the ongoing collapse of the trans-Atlantic financial system, to prevent World War III we need a new security architecture which takes into consideration the needs of all nations. To succeed, the West must be a part of this new security architecture. She expressed her belief that the reason she is on the Ukraine government's Center for Countering Disinformation "hit list" is precisely because of the role the Schiller Instituting is playing in this process. Zepp-LaRouche ended her remarks by wholeheartedly wishing Diane Sare success in her Senate campaign.