

Video: Samarbej med Kina. Det er ikke fjenden.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)

INTERVIEW

Professor Li Xing

Cooperate with China – It Is Not the Enemy

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

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

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

Prof. Li Xing: Thank you too.

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

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

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

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

Advice to President Biden

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

But still, I would also say to the President:

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

Attitude of the U.S. Toward China

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Belt and Road Concept

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

'Debt Trap' Diplomacy

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

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

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

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

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

Infrastructure Means Development

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

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

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

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

Europe-China Relations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A 'Differentiated' Europe

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Prof. Li Xing: No, no.

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

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

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

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

Prof. Li Xing: Yes, totally.

Reordering the World Order

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

influence.

The Monroe Doctrine

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

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

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

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

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

Prof. Li Xing: Exactly.

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

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

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

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

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

Prof. Li Xing: Yes.

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

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

wall!

Michelle Rasmussen: Exactly, exactly.

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

Operation Ibn Sina

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Xinjiang

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SWIFT System

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Schiller Institute

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

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

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

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

Michelle Rasmussen: I think 8%.

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

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

Michelle Rasmussen: Thank you so much, Li Xing.

Den sidste krig eller varig fred

Den 24. januar (EIRNS) – Fra det øjeblik sidste fredag, hvor den russiske udenrigsminister Sergey Lavrov og USA's udenrigsminister Tony Blinken meddelte, at de havde mødtes, og var blevet enige om, at USA ville give et skriftligt svar på Ruslands presserende sikkerhedsproblemer, har briterne været på overarbejde for at sikre, at intet af den slags nogensinde sker – eller i det mindste at det skriftlige svar, som Blinken giver, vil være en yderligere antirussisk provokation.

For det første er der de intensiverede direkte militære deployeringer: endnu et amerikansk fly med sofistikerede våben til en Kiev-regering med pro-nazistiske elementer; overførslen af ukrainske raketkastere og andre tunge våben til konfliktzonen ved Donbas; og Pentagon bekræftede, at præsident Biden havde instrueret dem om, at sætte 8.500 amerikanske tropper i forhøjet beredskab, med henblik på en potentiel udstationering i Europa, baseret på en briefing om »militære muligheder«, som forsvarsminister Austin og chefen for de fælles stabschefer, general Milley, havde præsenteret ham for. Disse muligheder omfattede at sende op til 50.000 amerikanske tropper til Østeuropa – tiltag, som russerne vil opfatte som en direkte militær trussel.

Så er der de britiske psy-ops: En anonym diplomat i Beijing rapporterede, at den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping havde bedt Putin om at vente med at invadere Ukraine til efter de olympiske vinterlege (hvilket afvises af den kinesiske og russiske regering); og endnu en omgang antirussiske floskler fra Blinken (det vil medføre »massive konsekvenser« for Rusland, hvis en »eneste yderligere russisk enhed« trænger ind i Ukraine) og fra Karen Pierce, den britiske ambassadør i USA (»man vil altid finde Storbritannien i den forreste ende af feltet«, når det gælder om at gå efter Rusland).

»Hvad der står klart,« rapporterede Helga Zepp-LaRouche i dag, »er, at vi befinder os i en ekstremt farlig situation, og i betragtning af antallet af forrykte personer i ledende stillinger, og også den absolutte sikkerhed for fejlregninger, baseret på forkerte erkendelsesmæssige holdninger, tror jeg, at den eneste konklusion, vi kan drage af den nuværende situation, er, at vi må gå ind i en total mobilisering mod krig, og vække især den amerikanske offentlighed, fordi de er den vigtigste faktor, som ikke er informeret om, hvad faren ved situationen er.«

Rusland forventer et svar i denne uge, fortsatte hun, og det svar kan ikke undgå at tage fat på deres eksistentielle

sikkerhedsproblemer, ved at nedfælde skriftlige garantier for, at NATO vil ophøre med sin ekspansion mod øst op til Ruslands grænser. Men på nuværende tidspunkt tyder alt på, at USA ikke vil gøre noget sådant.

Hvis det er tilfældet, advarede Zepp-LaRouche, så befinder vi os i et opgør om en nedtælling til Ruslands aktivering af deres egne »militærtekniske foranstaltninger« – som kunne omfatte opstilling af hypersoniske Zircon-missiler på ubåde inden for fem minutters flyvetid fra begge amerikanske kyster.

For at en antikrigsmobilisering kan blive en succes, må den imidlertid ikke blot udstede udtalelser mod krig, men den skal tage fat på to centrale politiske punkter: 1) identificere, hvem der står bag drivkraften til krig, og hvorfor (det kollapsende transatlantiske finansimperium); og 2) præsentere et program til opbygning af en varig fred – baseret på den politik for global økonomisk genopbygning, der er beskrevet i LaRouches fire love.

Som den daværende præsidentkandidat Lyndon LaRouche beskrev problematikkerne for næsten 40 år siden, i den indledende sætning i et »Udkast til aftalememorandum mellem USA og Sovjetunionen« fra den 30. marts 1984: »Artikel 1: Generelle betingelser for fred. Det politiske grundlag for varig fred skal være: a) Den ubetingede suverænitet for hver eneste nationalstat og b) samarbejde mellem suveræne nationalstater om at fremme ubegrænsede muligheder for at deltage i fordelene ved teknologiske fremskridt til gensidig fordel for hver eneste nation.«

(www.larouchepub.com/eiw/public/1991/eirv18n02-19910111/eirv18n02-19910111_026-the_larouche_doctrine_draft_memo-lar.pdf)

Udvalgt billede: Pexels

Afsløring: Dette er et britisk fremstød for krig mod Rusland

Den 23. januar (EIRNS) – Med den britiske udenrigsminister Liz Truss' lokketoner den 22. januar, om et "russisk kup på vej i Ukraine" – for at fremme det britiske krav om at ramme Rusland {nu}med de finansielle supersanktioner, som skulle true med at afskrække fra krig – er det blevet klart, at der ikke er nogen "enighed blandt NATO-allierede og partnere" om at håndtere Rusland i Ukraine-missilkrisen.

Det er snarere et britisk fremstød for at tvinge Rusland til at invadere Ukraine eller kapitulere; en trængt, men klar tysk modstand mod den britiske krigskampagne; en fransk præsident, der ønsker at forhandle, men som forsøger at fremstå nydelig og blive genvalgt; og en svag amerikansk præsident, som helst vil undgå krig.

Hvis der udbryder krig, ja, endog verdenskrig, vil det være en krig, som City of London og Storbritannien påtvinger det svækkede amerikanske præsidentskab. Ikke en ny Krim-krig, men en krig for at hævne sig på Rusland og Kina, for at have ydet modstand og spoleret det store globale klimatopmøde i Glasgow i november, hvilket efterlod de britiske ministre, der ledede topmødet, med vredens tårer, da det endte som en fiasko. Det gjaldt også premierminister Boris Johnson, "BoJo", den slemme klovn, som er miskrediteret og er meget tæt på en mistillidsafstemning fra sit eget konservative partis parlamentsmedlemmer. "Hans holdninger er blevet strengere" over for Rusland, meddelte hans talsmand den 22. januar. I {New York Times'} dækning af det "nye fake" var overskriften: "Storbritannien efterstræber en mere muskuløs rolle i opgøret med Rusland om Ukraine", selv om det altid er amerikanske muskler, som Storbritannien anvender.

(<https://www.nytimes.com/2022/01/23/world/europe/uk-russia-ukraine.html>)

Selv den nervøst hyper-aggressive, amerikanske udenrigsminister, Antony Blinken, reagerede ikke på den nyeste britiske krigsfabel, ud over "Vi tager det alvorligt", da det blev slynget efter ham i dag af "Face the Nations" ordstyrer, Margaret Brennan, der rablede, som om hun havde taget noget britisk meth-amfetamin i sin kaffe før programmet. Over for London-Kiev-kravet om, at de såkaldte finansielle "supersanktioner" skal indføres over for Rusland i morgen, bemærkede Blinken det indlysende: "Vi bruger dem som afskrækkelse. De ville miste deres afskrækkende virkning". Han nævnte ikke det lige så indlysende: "og skubbe Rusland mod krig" – den britiske hensigt. Blinken understregede gentagne gange to punkter: "Vi har i de seneste dage, samlet allierede og partnere på en meget intens måde i hele Europa"; og "vi reagerer også på nogle af Ruslands bekymringer med yderligere samtaler, og vi forventer, at de reagerer på vores bekymringer."

Den russiske ambassade i London understregede i dag, at briterne stod uden for forhandlingsprocessen med Rusland: "Det britiske udenrigsministerium fortsætter med en række provokerende udtalelser om situationen omkring Ukraine... Disse opråb kommer på baggrund af en åbenlys svækkelse af den britiske ekspertise om Rusland og Ukraine. ...Udenrigsminister Elizabeth Truss' udsagn om, at Ukraine har lidt under forskellige invasioner, 'fra mongolerne til tatarerne', er et eksempel herpå. Efterfølgende kom 'nyheden' om, at Rusland har til hensigt at etablere et marionetregime i Kiev, under ledelse af et tidligere ukrainsk parlamentsmedlem – en person, der tilfældigvis er under russiske sanktioner for at være en trussel mod den nationale sikkerhed", med henvisning til Jevhenij Murajev. (<https://www.rusemb.org.uk/fnapr/7059>)

Tyskland ønsker ikke at lade den britiske krigsførelse lykkes. Dets flådechef, viceadmiral Kay-Achim Schönbach, blev tvunget

til at træde tilbage på grund af angreb fra medierne, da han udtalte, at det Putin "ønsker er respekt". Og min Gud, at give nogen respekt er en lav pris... Det er let at give ham den respekt, som han reelt kræver – og sandsynligvis også fortjener". Det forlyder nu bredt, at kansler Olaf Scholz blev bedt om at tage til Washington til konsultationer med præsident Biden, men afviste at tage af sted til et senere tidspunkt. Tyskland vil ikke tillade, at de baltiske lande, som det har solgt tyske våben til, giver dem videre til Ukraine, og de hektiske britiske leverancer af dødbringende våben, flyves over dansk luftrum, fordi Storbritannien ikke tør bede Tyskland om tilladelse til overflyvning.

Biden-administrationen er i færd med at svare skriftligt, på den russiske præsident Putins foreslåede aftaler om at holde NATO's missiler og krigsforberedelser ude af Ukraine og fra Ruslands grænse – "og at give udtryk for vores bekymring" over Rusland, sagde Blinken i dag. USA har besluttet, at det ønsker at Rusland skal acceptere at undlade offentliggørelse af disse svar, højst sandsynligt fordi en sådan offentliggørelse enten vil gøre krigsmagere omkring BoJos regering og inde i City of London rasende, eller skabe mere tvivl i Tyskland, Frankrig og måske hos andre "allierede og partnere".

Det vigtigste spørgsmål er nu, hvad de amerikanske borgere vil gøre for at lede deres vaklende regering i retning af at løse de vigtigste problemer, som menneskeheden står over for? Det kræver samarbejde med i det mindste Rusland og Kina, som et middel til at vende den amerikanske industriøkonomis forfald hen imod "grønt" selvmord, og inddrage USA i opbygningen af nye offentlige sundhedssystemer og programmer for udvikling af infrastruktur overalt i verden. Londons malthusianske politik med afindustrialisering ved hjælp af krig kan ikke tolereres.

Udvalgt billede: Julius Silver

Schiller Instituttets dialog med Rusland

Den 22 januar (EIRNS) – Schiller Instituttet afholdt i dag et kritisk debatemøde under titlen: “En forskel i lederskab: Kan krig mod Rusland stadig undgås?” I en tale fra den russiske repræsentation ved FN, redegjorde ambassadør Dmitry Polyanskij, 1. permanente vicerrepræsentant for Den Russiske Føderations faste mission ved FN, for den barske virkelighed i forbindelse med de vestlige lederes igangværende stormløb mod krig. “Det ser ud til,” sagde han, “at vores vestlige kolleger er forblændet af den såkaldte ‘sejr’ i Den kolde Krig, og fortsætter med at leve i disse minder og forsøger at tale ud fra en overlegen position og påtvungen dobbeltmoral. De bebrejder os for vores troppers tilstedeværelse og bevægelser på eget suveræne territorium, mens de hævder, at alt, hvad de gør på NATO’s territorium, ikke angår andre. Dette vil ikke længere kunne fungere.”

Helga Zepp-LaRouche fremlagde en tilgang til krisen ud fra et overordnet perspektiv: “Jeg insisterer meget indtrængende på, at vi har brug for en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur, som skal tage hensyn til de grundlæggende erfaringer fra historien. Man må undersøge de traktater, der førte til fred, og dem, der mislykkedes. Et godt eksempel på det første, er den Westfalske Fred, hvor folk efter 150 års religionskrig, især Trediveårskrigen, indså, at ingen ville være sejrherre ved en fortsættelse af krigen. Så de blev enige om de berømte principper i den Westfalske fred, hvoraf det vigtigste er, at man skal tage hensyn til den andens interesser, hvis man vil have fred. Hver gang det bliver praktiseret – og denne Westfalske Fred var i øvrigt begyndelsen til folkeretten og det, der udgør FN-Pagten i dag – fører det til fred. Det andet

eksempel er Versailles-traktaten, som proklamerede, at Tyskland var den eneste skyldige part i Første Verdenskrig, hvilket ikke var sandt. Den var bestemt ikke retfærdig. Den lagde byrder på Tyskland, som ikke kun skulle betale krigens udgifter, men også erstatninger, hvilket overbelastede den tyske økonomi fuldstændigt. Så Rigsbanken begyndte at trykke penge, hvilket førte til hyperinflation, og det bidrog til depressionen. Efterfølgende førte den dybe følelse af uretfærdighed, som folk, der kom ud for dette, havde, til nazisternes fremkomst og nationalsocialisternes omvæltende regeringsovertagelse, som førte til Anden Verdenskrig.”

Harley Schlanger, talsmand for LaRouche-organisationen, gennemgik arrogancen hos de neokonservative og neoliberale, som mente, at Vesten havde “vundet” Den kolde Krig, og at dette gav dem tilladelse til at påtvinge alle nationer, deres indbildte overlegne system af “demokrati og frie markedsøkonomier”, om nødvendigt med militære midler. Han fremlagde en oversigt over de ulovlige og folkemorderiske krige, der blev ført mod nationer – Afghanistan, Irak, Jugoslavien, Libyen, Syrien og dernæst kuppet mod Ukraine i 2014 – mod nationer, der ikke udgjorde nogen trussel mod nogen, krige baseret på falske anklager, som nu erkendes at være blevet fremstillet for at retfærdiggøre krigene. Dette omfattede den “chokterapi”, som blev pålagt selve Rusland, i et forsøg på at reducere en betydningsfuld videnskabelig og industriel nation til en “råstofeksportør” med en forarmet og svækket befolkning. Da Vladimir Putin omgjorde denne ødelæggelse, blev han stemplet som “autokrat”, mens begge partier i USA stod sammen om krigspolitikken. Tiden med unilateralisme og en unipolær verden er nu afsluttet, hævdede Schlanger, da det kinesisk-russiske samarbejde om national opbygning, for dem selv og de 140 nationer, der har tilsluttet sig Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet, ikke længere tager imod ordrer og ikke længere vil tillade farverevolutioner eller neokoloniaale krige og undertrykkelse.

Paul Gallagher, EIR's økonomiredaktør, gennemgik derefter nedbrydningen af det "Amerikanske System", som var blevet genoprettet af Franklin Roosevelt gennem Glass/Steagall-bankregulering og efterkrigstidens Bretton Woods-system. Ødelæggelsen begyndte med Nixon-regeringens afkobling af dollaren fra guldet i 1971, hvilket omdannede banksystemet til et system baseret på spekulation i stedet for produktion. Med spekulationsboblens kollaps i 2008 blev Lyndon LaRouches forslag om at genindføre det amerikanske systems principper afvist til fordel for massiv pengeskabelse, for at redde bankerne, hvilket medførte den største "alting-boble" i historien. Bestræbelserne på at opretholde boblen på 275 billioner dollars gennem den grønne "New Deal", der forvaltes af de samme bankfolk, som er ansvarlige for selve boblen, ved at afvikle fossile brændstoffer, mange industrier og landbrug, ville resultere i en massiv affolkning af verden, hvilket allerede er tydeligt globalt og selv i USA. Også her viser Ruslands, Kinas og Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet, at den unipolære verden, der ledes af City of London og Wall Street, ikke længere kan diktere denne destruktion over for resten af verden, med fare for at de vælger at starte en atomkrig, i stedet for at deltage som en ligeværdig partner i en ny verdensorden.

Richard Black, Schiller Instituttets repræsentant ved FN, fulgte op på ambassadør Polyanskijs opfordring, til at gøre op med den fremtvungne opdeling af verden i konfliktfyldte blokke, og søge de ting der forener os i stedet for at adskille os. Han gennemgik LaRouches arbejde med de videnskabelige kredse i Rusland, i traditionen fra denne nations store videnskabelige genier, og opfordrede borgerne i de vestlige nationer, til at inddrage deres politiske ledere og kandidater, for at tvinge deres regeringer til at opgive deres fobier og samarbejde om de store opgaver, som hele menneskeheden står over for.

Der fulgte en livlig diskussion med spørgsmål og svar. Du

opfordres til at se dette vigtige og produktive møde og til at handle på de idéer, der blev præsenteret: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o32znt4i_zE

Kan en krig mod Rusland stadig undgås?

Den 21. januar (EIRNS) – Dette spørgsmål: “Kan en krig mod Rusland stadig undgås?”, er titlen på Schiller Instituttets internationale dialog, lørdag den 22. januar kl. 20.00 dansk tid, med det formål at styrke bestræbelserne på at stoppe USA's, det britiske imperiums og NATO's farlige krigsførelse mod Rusland og Kina og gøre plads til et fuldstændigt skift mod et globalt sikkerhedssystem, baseret på princippet om gensidig fordel for alle, og helt afgørende, den økonomiske fordel for alle.

Resultaterne af dagens vigtige møde i Genève, mellem USA's udenrigsminister Antony Blinken og den russiske udenrigsminister Sergej Lavrov, ændrer ikke dette fokus, men skærper det snarere. Mødet varede 90 minutter med bemærkninger før og efter fra repræsentanterne. Der forventes en opfølgning af drøftelserne – med en omtrentlig tidsplan for den næste uge til 10 dage; men man kan til enhver tid forvente sabotage fra fjender af denne forhandlingsproces.

I korte træk fortalte Blinken, at præsident Biden havde bedt ham om at mødes med Lavrov, og at han efter dagens samtaler vil henvende sig til NATO og allierede samt Kongressen, og “vi vil være i stand til at dele vores bekymringer og idéer med Rusland mere detaljeret og skriftligt i næste uge, og vi er

blevet enige om yderligere drøftelser derefter". TASS rapporterede, at Blinken sagde, at USA og Rusland vil mødes igen, efter at Moskva har gennemgået Washingtons forslag til sikkerhedspolitiske foranstaltninger i næste uge. Udenrigsministeriet kastede imidlertid koldt vand på denne rapport og erklærede, at der ikke er planer om et møde, før Rusland modtager et "artikel for artikel"-svar, på sit krav om sikkerhedsgarantier. Ellers holdt Blinken sig til påstandene i sin opremsning af beskyldninger og krav, idet han formandede Rusland til at nedtrappe sin magtanvendelse, ikke invadere Ukraine osv.

Lavrov sagde om Blinkens bemærkning, at USA vil svare skriftligt på Ruslands "bekymringer", at: "Jeg tror, det vil være rigtigt at offentliggøre dette svar, og jeg vil spørge Antony Blinken, så de ikke har noget imod det." Han sagde, at der ikke var nogen aftale om endnu et møde mellem ham selv og Blinken. Blandt mange andre emner sagde Lavrov, at USA gentager sine anklager mod Rusland "som et mantra" og pegede på vestlig "hysteri", når det gjaldt Ukraine.

Særligt bemærkelsesværdigt var inddragelsen af Kina i det, der er på spil. Det russiske udenrigsministerium udsendte en erklæring i forbindelse med samtalerne, hvori det fremgår: "Det er på høje tid, at vores amerikanske kolleger forstår, at Washingtons dobbelte inddæmningspolitik over for Moskva og Beijing er fuldstændig utidssvarende og ikke indebærer nogle gunstige udsigter for USA. Amerikanerne ville gøre mere gavn for sig selv og hele verden, hvis de opgav deres arrogante krav om global dominans og gik ind i en ligeværdig og ærlig dialog med Rusland, Kina og andre vigtige aktører, for at søge afbalancerede løsninger på presserende globale sikkerheds- og udviklingsmæssige anliggender"...

Schiller Instituttets præsident, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, sagde i sin ugentlige strategiske webcast den 20. januar, at "jeg mener, at det er faren for krig, som folk bør være bekymrede over." Men hun erklærede endvidere, at bekymringen bør være

“ud fra dynamikkens synspunkt [hvis] orientering, går meget klart i retning af Bælte- og Vej-samarbejdet, fordi mange nationer ser det som en langt større fordel at samarbejde økonomisk i stedet for at føre geopolitiske spil.”

På denne måde er BRI-alliancer og -projekter antikrigspolitik....

Deltag i de bestræbelser, der forsøger at afværge en krig, ved at se og dele Schiller Instituttets internationale dialogkonference den 22. januar, “Kan en krig mod Rusland stadig undgås?”, og bliv aktiv i Schiller Instituttet. https://schillerinstitute.nationbuilder.com/20220117-conference_20220122

Sikkerhedseksperter advarer om optrapning af opgøret mellem USA og Rusland

Den 19. januar (EIRNS) – David T. Pyne offentliggjorde en artikel i det konservative National Interest i nummeret af 17. januar, under overskriften “Bidens mulighed for fred i Eurasien”. I den advarer Pyne om, at “de bilaterale forhandlinger mellem USA og Rusland brød sammen i denne uge, efter at den amerikanske delegation angiveligt nægtede at tilbyde Rusland nogen indrømmelser, eller anerkende nogen af dets legitime sikkerhedsbekymringer, vigtigst af alt i Ukraine”, og at krisen mellem de to lande som følge heraf er i fare for at ende i en spiral, der snurrer ud af kontrol, hen imod en termonuklear krig. (Den 18. januar talte USA’s

udenrigsminister Tony Blinken og Ruslands udenrigsminister Sergej Lavrov i telefon og aftalte et hastigt arrangeret møde mellem dem i Genève den 21. januar).

Pyne er tidligere officer i den amerikanske hærs kampenheder, stabsofficer i hovedkvarteret og har en kandidatgrad i nationale sikkerhedsstudier fra Georgetown University. Han er i øjeblikket vicedirektør for nationale operationer for EMP Task Force on National and Homeland Security, hvis hjemmeside beskriver Pyne som "en autoritet med hensyn til USA's, Ruslands og Kinas atomarsenaler, amerikanske og russiske missilforsvarssystemer og den stigende trussel fra elektromagnetiske pulsvåben (EMP)".

Vi citerer det indledende afsnit af Pynes artikel, som taler for sig selv:

"I slutningen af december 2021 truede den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin med, at en afvisning af Ruslands foreslåede sikkerhedsaftaler med Vesten, ville blive mødt med "passende militær-tekniske gengældelsesforanstaltninger". Gilbert Doctorow, en Bruxelles-baseret politisk analytiker, har oversat dette til at betyde, – opstilling af yderligere russisk militært udstyr, herunder atombevæbnede SS-26 Iskander-M-kortdistancemissiler til Hviderusland og Kaliningrad, for at true NATO's frontlinjestater og Østtyskland. Han har også spekuleret i, at det kan hentyde til en mulig udstationering af atombevæbnede, hypersoniske, ubådsbaserede Zircon krydsermissiler ud for Washington D.C., som Rusland tidligere har sagt kunne bruges til at ødelægge USA's hovedstad, før præsidenten kunne flygte med Air Force One.

"Når Ruslands andre masseødelæggelsesvåben lægges til, kunne det der står på spil for de bilaterale forhandlinger mellem USA og Rusland næppe være højere. Rusland har også truet med disse militær-tekniske gengældelsesforanstaltninger som svar på, at USA vedtager meget strengere økonomiske sanktioner mod

landet. Hvis USA og NATO skulle flytte deres tropper til den ukrainske grænse som svar på en russisk invasion af Ukraine, ville det naturligvis, næsten helt sikkert, fremprovokere et russisk angreb på NATO's frontlinjemedlemsstater, hvor disse tropper er stationeret, og potentielt starte en tredje verdenskrig. Det er således en russisk "rød linje", som ikke må overskrides. Desuden kunne en eventuel russisk invasion af Ukraine og/eller udbrud af krig mellem USA og Rusland i Europa kortvarigt blive efterfulgt af en kinesisk invasion af Taiwan og en nordkoreansk invasion af Sydkorea – alt sammen noget, der sikrer, at USA ikke vil være i stand til effektivt at imødegå nogle af disse aggressioner.

"Desværre brød de bilaterale forhandlinger mellem USA og Rusland sammen i denne uge, efter at den amerikanske delegation angiveligt nægtede at tilbyde Rusland nogle indrømmelser eller anerkende nogen af dens legitime sikkerhedsproblemer, vigtigst af alt i Ukraine. Som svar herpå har Rusland erklæret, at det ikke har nogen planer om at genoptage bilaterale drøftelser med USA for at afslutte krisen og fortsætter med at optrappe sine krigsforberedelser. På nuværende tidspunkt, vil den eneste måde at give Rusland en oprejsning i Ukraine-krisen være, at Biden-administrationen tilbyder en betydelig indrømmelse, såsom udsættelse af USA's militære bistand til Ukraine."

Pyne slutter sin artikel med at opfordre USA til at ændre politik og i stedet skabe "omfattende fredsaftaler med Rusland og Kina", og tilføjer, at de "ikke vil være uden udfordringer". De ville imidlertid, fastslår Pyne, "give Biden en hidtil uset mulighed for at sikre sit præsidentielle eftermæle som en forandringens fredspræsident og samtidig tjene til at beskytte USA's vitale nationale sikkerhedsinteresser".

Tidsskriftet bag artiklen i National Interest er bemærkelsesværdigt. Det blev grundlagt af den neokonservative Irving Kristol og repræsenterer den dag i dag et

“konservativt” synspunkt på udenrigspolitik.
(<https://nationalinterest.org/feature/biden%E2%80%99s-opportunity-peace-eurasia-199344>)

**Vi har nået et afgørende
øjeblik – “tiden er ved at
rinde ud”**

**Schiller Instituttets
ugentlige webcast med Helga
Zepp-LaRouche den 20. januar
2022**

I de sidste, og i de kommende dage, bliver der truffet beslutninger som vil afgøre, om menneskeheden har den moralske evne til at overleve. I sin ugentlige dialog præsenterede Helga Zepp-LaRouche en dramatisk tour d’horizon (gennemgang), idet hun flettede en analyse af topmøder, troppebevægelser og positive økonomiske udviklinger omkring Bælte-ogVej-Initiativet sammen, og formidlede både den enorme fare i nutiden og, hvad der er vigtigt, en vej ud af denne fare.

Hun understregede, at Blinkens trusler i Ukraine ikke er helt i tråd med Bidens udtalelser. Hun understregede desuden, at Putin har været klar over, hvorfor Rusland har brug for strategiske garantier, og at nogle i Vesten, såsom David Pyne, Gilbert Doctorow og general Kujat, åbent diskuterer dette. Vi

har en delegation bestående af syv tåbelige senatorer, der efter en tur til Kiev skrålede op og krævede, at Biden skulle stramme sig an, og en af dem – som hun omtalte som senator Wicked – sagde, at Putin skal have en blodtud. Samtidig var den iranske præsident i Moskva for at underskrive en 20-årig aftale, og kineserne og syrerne færdiggjorde et aftalememorandum om samarbejde i BVI.

Endelig talte hun bevægende om Schiller Instituttets konference den 15. januar om Afghanistan, hvor den nuværende trussel om millioner af sultende mennesker, blev sat i kontrast til Indiens banebrydende beslutning om at sende hvede til Afghanistan gennem Pakistan.

Embedsmand fra USA's udenrigsministerium truer Hviderusland med regimeskift

Den 19 januar (EIRNS) – En embedsmand fra det amerikanske udenrigsministerium truede den 18. januar på et orienteringsmøde for journalister med at vælte præsident Alexander Lukasjenkos regering i Hviderusland, hvis Hviderusland tillader russiske tropper på sit territorium og/eller deltager i en formodet russisk invasion af Ukraine. Den højtstående embedsmand sagde ikke direkte: “Vi vil vælte jer”, men han brugte alle de kodeord, der er forbundet med operationer i forbindelse med farverevolutioner/regimeskift, for at levere et utvetydigt budskab.

“Vi har set advarselstegn på, at dynamikken i Hviderusland gør

det muligt for Rusland at udnytte Lukasjenkas [sic] selvforskyldte sårbarhed yderligere. Rapporterne om russiske troppebevægelser mod Hviderusland, hvor disse bevægelser angiveligt sker i forbindelse med regelmæssigt planlagte fælles militærøvelser, er bekymrende. Timingen er bemærkelsesværdig og giver naturligvis anledning til bekymring for, at Rusland kunne have til hensigt at stationere tropper i Hviderusland under dække af fælles militærøvelser, med henblik på potentielt at angribe Ukraine fra nord", sagde han ifølge Udenrigsministeriets referat af briefinggen. "Jeg mener, at Hvideruslands medvirken til et sådant angreb, ville være fuldstændig uacceptabelt for hviderusserne og for mange inden for regimet samt for os og vores allierede og partnere. Og vi har bekendtgjort vores betænkeligheder til de hviderussiske myndigheder privat."

Senere i briefinggen udtrykte embedsmanden et dystert syn på Lukasjenkos fremtid, og gav skylden for hans formodede svagheder på hans forhold til Moskva. "Jeg tror det er vigtigt at se på, hvor han står efter halvandet år med at forsøge at ignorere, vende sig bort fra en politisk krise, som han stort set selv har skabt, ikke sandt," sagde embedsmanden. "Og så er det vigtigt at erkende, at Lukasjenka selv har skabt denne reelle skrøbelighed i sin embedsperiode, fordi han først og fremmest var uvillig til at have afvigende synspunkter, som en del af kampagnen, at han var uvillig til at acceptere kritik af spørgsmål fra COVID til en slags grundlæggende spørgsmål om regeringsførelse, ikke sandt, og så ser man på noget som den enormt bedrageriske, den komisk bedrageriske afvikling af valget og så den tragiske vold, der fulgte, dødsfaldene, ikke sandt?"

"Så det er vigtigt at erkende, at Lukasjenka har mistet troværdighed i den hviderussiske befolknings øjne i et ret dramatisk tempo siden dengang, og da han har forstået, hvor mere og mere isoleret han er, efterhånden som hans popularitet er blevet mindre, har han i stigende grad vendt sig hen imod

Moskva.”

(<https://www.state.gov/briefing-with-senior-state-department-official-on-belarus/>) [dns/cjo]

Billede: Belarus_in_Europe TUBS, CC BY SA 3.0 via Wikimedia Commons

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 20. januar 2022: Vil Vesten have krig eller fred med Rusland og Kina? Finanskollaps på vej. FE- skandaler m.m. Video, lyd og resumé.

med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/tg-20.1.22.mp3>

Resumé:

USA's og Ruslands udenrigsministre mødes i morgen. Er USA og NATO villige til at give Rusland de nødvendige sikkerhedsgarantier på skrift eller går man

konfrontationsvejen? Rusland bakker ikke ned. Man gør op med årtiers svigt fra Vesten, hvor Vesten har ført krig imod Rusland og dets interesser med farvede revolutioner m.m. Nu er Rusland militært og økonomisk stærk mens Vesten er svag. Rusland og Kina kan klare sig uden Vesten, men Europa kan ikke klare sig uden russisk gas og kinesiske varer.

Eksperter advarer at hvis USA og NATO overskrider Ruslands røde linjer kan Rusland angribe fra Hviderusland og Kaliningrad med SS-26 Skander kortdistance atommissiler i hele Østeuropa. USA kan trues med ubådsbaserede Zircon atommissiler, der flyver 5-10 gange lydens hastighed, som USA ikke kan forsvare sig imod. Hvis det bliver krig mellem Rusland og USA vil Kina indtage Taiwan og Nordkorea angribe Sydkorea uden at USA kan gøre noget. Få derfor langsigtede fredsaftaler med Rusland og Kina, som alle kan leve med i stedet for konfrontation og krig. Rusland deltager i militærøvelser i Hviderusland fra den 9. februar så tag snakken med Rusland, evt. med et topmøde mellem Biden og Putin, inden de Olympiske Vinterlege i Beijing fra den 4.-20. februar er afsluttet og scenen sat for eskalation og mulig krig.

USA's inflation på 7 % og USA's Federal Reserve bliver tvunget til at hæve renten. Resultatet vil være en nedsmeltning på de finansielle markeder. Nedflyvningen er startet så spænd sikkerhedsbælterne. Europa er ikke bedre stillet. Forbered implementering af LaRouches fire økonomiske love så realøkonomien og samfundet kan beskyttes imod konsekvenserne af nedsmeltningen.

COVID-19: Pga. den høje vacinetilslutning er Omikron-variantens indtog en gamechanger på trods af sin meget større smitbarhed. Største problem for sundhedsvæsenet er ikke Coronapatienter men hjemsendelse og karantæne for ikke-syge ansatte. Vi må reducere karantænetiden, men vente en uge eller to inden vi sætter fuld fart på genåbningen, til vi har set konsekvenserne af at der er 4 gange så mange daglige smittede

som for en måned siden.

FE-skandalen viser i lighed med mink-skandalen en stor villighed hos regeringen til at ville bestemme, men en dårlig evne til at sikre sig den fornødne rådgivning og ekspertise inden man træffer drastiske beslutninger med store og vidtrækkende konsekvenser. Efter hybris kommer nemesis. Det kan true regeringens fremtid. Det er ikke kun regeringens medlemmer der handler hurtigt og overilet, uden tanke på de langsigtede konsekvenser, men hele den nuværende regerende elite. Husk at hovmod står for fald.

Grib ind i historien. Vær med til at sikre et globalt sundhedssystem. Lad os samarbejde om at stoppe sultkatastrofen i Afghanistan og få opbygget hele verdens økonomiske sundhed. Gå med i Schiller Instituttets kampagne. Tænk som LaRouche.

Zepp-LaRouche: "Det er ved at være sidste øjeblik" med hensyn til faren for krig mellem USA og Rusland

Den 19. jan. (EIRNS) – USA's udenrigsminister Antony Blinken indledte onsdag den 19. jan., tre dage med kritiske møder i Europa, for at diskutere Ukraine-krisen og Ruslands ufravigelige insisteren på, at hvis sikkerhedsforhandlingerne med USA skal fortsætte, skal Rusland modtage skriftlige svar på hvert af de punkter, der er rejst i de to udkast til traktatforslag, som de præsenterede for verden den 17. december. I disse traktatforslag, det ene med USA og det andet med NATO, fastslås det, at Ruslands nationale sikkerhed er

alvorligt udfordret af den truende opstilling af NATO's avancerede våbensystemer på deres egen grænse og af den foreslåede optagelse af Ukraine i NATO-alliancen, og at Rusland derfor skal have skriftlige garantier for, at ingen af delene vil forekomme – ellers vil de selv træffe "militær-tekniske gengældelsesforanstaltninger".

Onsdag rejste Blinken til Kiev i Ukraine for at mødes med præsident Volodymyr Zelensky. Torsdag den 20. januar tager han til Berlin for at mødes med udenrigsministrene fra Tyskland, Frankrig og den krigsførende toneangivende britiske regering. Og fredag den 21. januar tager han til Genève for at mødes med den russiske udenrigsminister Sergej Lavrov.

Blinkens tur er ikke bare endnu en omgang diplomati: Krig eller fred mellem USA og Rusland er på vippen. Putin har gentagne gange advaret om, at Rusland egenrådigt bliver nødsaget til at vedtage "passende militær-tekniske gengældelsesforanstaltninger", hvilket Gilbert Doctorow, en politisk analytiker med base i Bruxelles, mener vil omfatte opstilling af atombevæbnede SS-26 Iskander-M kortdistancemissiler til Hviderusland og Kaliningrad, for at true NATO's frontlinjestater og det østlige Tyskland, samt muligvis placering af atombevæbnede Zircon hypersoniske krydsermissiler til søs ud for kysten af Washington, D.C., som, påpeger Doctorow videre, "Rusland tidligere har erklæret kunne bruges til at ødelægge USA's hovedstad, inden præsidenten kunne flygte med Air Force One."

I sine samtaler med Zelensky satte Blinken tonen for sin samtale med Lavrov den 21. januar, ved endnu en gang aggressivt, udelukkende at give Rusland skylden for krisen, og kræve at de "nedtrapper" ved at stoppe udstationeringen af tropper på deres eget territorium, nær grænsen til Ukraine, eller være forberedt på at blive ramt af den brændte jords økonomiske krigsførelse fra Vestens side.

Lavrov gentog for sit vedkommende, den russiske holdning efter

samtaler den 18. januar med den tyske udenrigsminister, Annalena Baerbock: "Vi afventer nu svar på disse forslag (de to traktatudkast), som lovet, for at fortsætte forhandlingerne."

"Krigsfaren er større end nogensinde før, og vi står på randen af Tredje Verdenskrig", advarede Helga Zepp-LaRouche i dag. "Det er ved at være sidste øjeblik, og tingene må udvikle sig på den ene eller den anden måde i de kommende dage." Selv om der er et voksende kor af stemmer, der kalder på fornuft i USA og Europa, er briterne og deres amerikanske krigspartiforbundsfællers kontrol over USA's politik ikke blevet brudt. Desuden, erklærede Zepp-LaRouche, drives nedturen til krig af det systemiske sammenbrud i det transatlantiske finanssystem, som nu er ved at komme ud af kontrol, som Lyndon LaRouche gentagne gange forklarede.

Men der er en anden dynamik i gang i verden, nemlig den fremvoksende omgruppering af nationer på alle kontinenter omkring Kina og Rusland og Bælte- og Vej-initiativet som et alternativ til den malthusianske affolkningspolitik, der fremmes af det døende transatlantiske system. Et tegn på dette er Irans præsident Ebrahim Raisis besøg i Moskva, hvor en 20-årig pakke af udviklingsaftaler er til drøftelse. Et andet er det kommende besøg af den argentinske præsident Alberto Fernández i Moskva og derefter i Beijing, hvor han planlægger at underskrive et aftalememorandum om Bælte- og Vej-initiativet.

Hvis USA fortsat er fjendtligt indstillet over for dette politiske alternativ og fortsætter med at forsvare City of London og Wall Streets bankerotte system, vil verden efter al sandsynlighed glide i retning af en termonuklear krig. Hvis USA tilslutter sig Bælte og Vej-initiativet, som Lyndon LaRouche anbefalede fra starten, er udsigterne for fred og udvikling fremragende.

Vi tilslutter os Helga Zepp-LaRouches opfordring til at gøre

2022 til Lyndon LaRouches år og til at vedtage hans politik.

Billede: public domain

En strategisk betydning af Kinas større vækst end USA's i 2021

Indsendt af Paul Gallagher januar 18, 2022

På et ugunstigt tidspunkt for det britiske og amerikanske krigsparti, der bestræber sig på at nedkæmpe Rusland og Kina i konfrontationer om Ukraine og Taiwan, har Kinas årlige offentliggørelse af økonomiske data vist, at landets økonomi igen voksede hurtigere end USA's økonomi i 2021. Og endnu vigtigere er det, at Kinas kreditkanal er fuldt åben både for den indenlandske industri og lån til Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet, mens de amerikanske bankers udlån ikke kan vokse, før de dominerende megabanker på Wall Street er opløst og omstruktureret.

Denne gang havde finansanalytikere og erhvervsøkonomer i New York og London i begyndelsen af 2021 vidt og bredt og med selvtillid forudsagt, at den amerikanske økonomis formodede "rødglødende opsving" efter det, der angiveligt blot var en pandemisk betinget recession, ville få den til at vokse mere end Kinas økonomi både i 2021 og 2022. Det viste sig, at de tog fejl. Kinas BNP voksede med 8,1 % i løbet af året, og South China Morning Post rapporterede, at den tidligere cheføkonom i Verdensbanken, Justin Yifu Lin, nu vurderer, at

Kinas økonomi kan blive verdens største målt på BNP i 2028 i stedet for 2030, som han tidligere havde forudset. Industriproduktionen voksede med 9,6 %, investeringerne i faste aktiver med 4,9 %, jobskabelsen var på 12,69 mio. og detailsalget øgedes med 12,5 %, ifølge offentliggørelsen fra det nationale statistiske kontor den 17. januar. Kinas disponible personlige realindkomst efter inflation steg med 8,1 % i 2021 – og for byområder med 7,1 % – mens amerikanernes gennemsnitlige reelle ugelønninger faldt med 2,3 % i løbet af året.

I en strategisk krise, hvor et effektivt partnerskab mellem Rusland og Kina har afværget et forsøg på en “farverevolution” i Kasakhstan og presser på for at forhindre Ukraine i at blive medlem af NATO, gør denne udvikling virkeligheden tydeligere for de amerikanske politikere. De frygtede sanktioner fra USA’s finansministerium, herunder toldsatser mod Kina, virker ikke mod disse to store økonomiske og videnskabelige magter, selvom de ødelægger modstandere blandt udviklingslandene og dræber eller forviser millioner af afghanere. Pludselig kulmangel, prisstigninger og endda strømafbrydelser i sensommeren, der blev udløst i Kina af Londons globale Green New Deal, blev hurtigt håndteret ved hjælp af lovgivningsmæssige foranstaltninger, mens Europa kæmper.

Disse økonomiske kendsgerninger vil også påvirke Federal Reserve, den amerikanske centralbank, og den dominerende dollar. Kinas Folkebank sænkede rent faktisk renten og reservekravet for bankerne, da 2021 sluttede. Centralbanken planlægger angiveligt flere renteforhøjelser for at “kontrollere inflationen”, som er ude af kontrol med 7 % for forbrugsvarer og næsten 10 % for produktionsvarer. Men data viser formentlig centralbankdirektørerne, at den amerikanske realøkonomi igen er ved at trække sig sammen, efter at det ikke engang lykkedes at genvinde aktivitetsniveauet fra før COVID i begyndelsen af 2020. En alvorlig forhøjelse af de kortfristede renter og virkningen på de langfristede renter

kunne ikke blot sprænge "alt-boblen" af gæld, men udløse endnu en dyb recession.

Den amerikanske industriproduktion faldt en smule, -0,1 % i december, og er lige akkurat på niveau med slutningen af 2019 og 3 % lavere end niveauet i midten af 2018. Industriproduktionen faldt med 0,3 % i december og ligger ca. 5 % under niveauet i midten af 2018; igen svarende til niveauet i slutningen af 2019. Bygge- og anlægsinvesteringer og beskæftigelsen er lavere end i 2018, især inden for "offentlige og statslige anlægsarbejder", selv om entreprenørerne forventer nye motorvejs- og brokontrakter som følge af den netop vedtagne infrastrukturlovgivning på 1.200 mia. dollar. Detailhandelssalget faldt også i december som en reaktion på inflationen af forbrugsgoder.

Men den mest dramatiske kontrast i økonomierne er den effektive kreditpolitik: De kinesiske bankers udestående lån, herunder udlån i udlandet, steg med 11,7 % i år, og selv om de store Wall Street-banker og regionale amerikanske banker er proppet med billioner af overskydende indskud som følge af Federal Reserves kvantitative lempelsesprogrammer, steg de amerikanske bankers udestående lån med mindre end 0,5 % i 2021.

Et initiativ til et nyt internationalt kredit- og monetært system, et "roosevelsk" Nyt Bretton Woods, kunne nu komme fra de eurasiske nationer i den "strategiske trekant" Kina, Rusland og Indien og foreslås USA som en løsning på strategiske kriser – i fællesskab søge fordel for tredjelande. Dette må begynde med moderne medicinske faciliteter og fødevarehjælp til Afghanistan og andre krigshærgede nationer, sådan som Helga Zepp-LaRouche og Schiller Instituttet foreslår.

Direkte appel fra FN til USA's Udenrigsministerium: Red Afghanistan fra massedød

Den 14. jan. (EIRNS) – På tidspunktet for denne udsendelse, afventer man besked fra et møde (virtuelt) i dag, der skal afholdes mellem USA's udenrigsminister Antony Blinken og topembedsmænd fra FN om Afghanistan, som blev annonceret i går af FN's generalsekretær Antonio Guterres, på grund af den forestående massedød. Guterres opfordrede ikke kun til at mobilisere omfattende bistand, men også til presserende genetablering af centralbanken, valuta likviditet og et finansielt system, ellers vil landet ophøre med at eksistere. Han sagde, at millioner af afghanere er på "dødens rand", og at "kolde temperaturer og indefrosne aktiver er en dødelig kombination". Regler og betingelser, der forhindrer penge i at blive brugt til at redde liv og økonomi, skal suspenderes i denne nødsituation", advarede han.

Guterres fremhævede USA og sagde, at USA har "en meget vigtig rolle at spille, fordi det meste af det finansielle system i verden opererer i dollars", og USA tilbageholder størstedelen af de indefrosne afghanske valutaeserver. Til mødet i dag med udenrigsminister Antony Blinken forventes, ud over Guterres selv, at Peter Maurer, formand for Den Internationale Røde Kors- Komité, og Martin Griffiths, FN's undersekretær for humanitære anliggender og nødhjælp, at være til stede.

Den 11. januar udsendte Griffiths på vegne af alle FN's humanitære organisationer og hjælpepartnere en international appel om finansiering på 4,4 milliarder dollars i år til Afghanistan, hvilket er den største appel af denne art til en

enkelt nation i FN's historie.

Blandt de nødvendige foranstaltninger, der nævnes i appellen, er ophævelse af sanktioner mod Afghanistan, som forhindrer vigtige kommercielle funktioner, samt nødhjælp og ophævelse af indefrysningen af de 9,5 mia. dollars i aktiver, der tilhører Afghanistans nation og befolkning, og andre foranstaltninger, der gør det muligt at få bank-, valuta- og vekseltransaktioner til at fungere. Forarmelsen har nået et stadium af elendighed, hvor knap 5 % af den samlede befolkning på 38 millioner mennesker har tilstrækkeligt at spise. 23 millioner lever i forskellige grader af ekstrem sult, og af dem er 8,9 millioner mennesker ved sultestadiet.

Blandt Taliban-regeringens begrænsede nødløsninger er programmet "mad for arbejde", hvor en person, der stadig er i stand til at arbejde, tilbydes 10 kg hvede for et bestemt antal arbejdstimer. Det er ubærligt. I går beskrev FN's Fødevareprogramms landechef for Afghanistan, Mary-Ellen McGroarty, situationen over for AP som en "tsunami af sult".

At reagere på denne nødsituation er en moralsk prøve for "Vesten", hvis amerikanske og NATO-styrker trak sig ud for fem måneder siden efter 20 års besættelse. Ingen løgne om "demokrati" og "værdidrevne" udenrigsrelationer kan dække over skylden i den massedød, der vil være resultatet, hvis der ikke gribes ind omgående.

Den samme moralske test er involveret i spørgsmålet om krig eller fred, i USA's og NATO's nuværende konfrontation med Rusland. I går var den sidste af de tre samtaler i denne uge mellem Rusland og "Vesten": Den 9.-10. januar fandt samtalerne sted mellem USA og Rusland (Genève), den 12. januar mellem NATO og Rusland (Bruxelles) og den 13. januar samtalerne mellem OSCE og Rusland (Wien). På initiativ af Rusland, som i december fremlagde to tekster om sikkerhedsgarantier med henblik på konkret handling, blev potentialet for et produktivt arbejde, næsten uden undtagelse, ikke overraskende,

blokeret af en kollektiv positionering med løgne og trusler fra USA og NATO.

Ikke desto mindre talte den russiske udenrigsminister Sergej Lavrov i dag, da han leverede sin årlige gennemgang af sidste års diplomati, om at fortsætte disse principielle sikkerhedsforhandlinger og med velvillighed, samtidig med at han strengt betonedede, at det, der nu forventes, er skriftlige svar på de russiske forslag til tekster, og det skal ske snart. Rusland har ikke uendelig tålmodighed, understregede han.

Næsten samtidig med afslutningen af gårsdagens OSCE-forhandlingerne i Wien, signalerede USA's nationale sikkerhedsrådgiver, Jake Sullivan, imidlertid et nyt angreb på Rusland, som siden er blevet ført ud i livet. Sullivan sagde på et pressemøde, at "efterretningstjenesten har indhentet oplysninger" om, at Rusland lige nu "forbereder en anledning, til at have mulighed for at opfinde et påskud for en invasion" af Ukraine, på samme måde som de gjorde det i 2014. Han sagde, at Rusland bruger den samme "drejebog", som de benyttede i 2014, og "administrationen vil have yderligere detaljer om, hvad vi ser som denne potentielle udlægning af et påskud, som vi vil dele med pressen i løbet af de næste 24 timer.". Lige på Sullivans stikord kom "pressen" i morges med tre bølger af artikler – med Washington Post og New York Times i spidsen – om at Rusland har aktiver indlejret placeret i Ukraine, klar til at iscenesætte et "false flag"-stunt, for at retfærdiggøre en russisk invasion. For det andet, at USA hellere må overveje at lede, ikke blot støtte, Ukraines forsvar mod Rusland i tilfælde af et angreb. For det tredje kommer rapporterne om, at der netop er sket et nyt cyberangreb på ukrainske ministerier, hvor Rusland formodes at være gerningsmanden.

Hvis denne vanvittige udenrigspolitik får lov til at fortsætte, vil resultatet blive massedød som følge af krig. Kremls talsmand Dmitrij Peskov er allerede gået ud og har fordømt disse beskyldninger som fuldstændig ubegrundede og

baseret på "rygter".

Schiller Instituttet har sammen med samarbejdspartnere mobiliseret alle mulige tiltag for at afsløre og stoppe denne dødbringende fremgangsmåde og dens bagmænd. For at få øjeblikkelig opmærksomhed på Afghanistans nødsituation vil der mandag den 17. januar kl. 11.00 (kl. 17 dansk tid) blive afholdt et webinar på i Schiller Instituttet med titlen "Stop mordet på Afghanistan".
<https://schillerinstitute.nationbuilder.com/20220117-conference>

Schiller Instituttets præsident Helga Zepp-LaRouche udtalte i går på sin ugentlige webcast: "Hvis du har noget hjerte tilbage i kroppen, så deltag i denne kampagne. For jeg tror, at hvis Vesten ikke kan mobiliseres for at hjælpe med at løse den situation, som vi har forårsaget – jeg mener, 'vi', Vesten, NATO var der i 20 år – hvis vi ikke kan løse det, vil hele verden se på Vesten med fuldstændig foragt. Så dette er en sidste chance for at vende dette, ved nu at gå sammen med alle naboerne, herunder Rusland og Kina, men europæerne og USA er de mest påkrævede. For hvis vi ikke kan gøre det, tror jeg, at dette vil være symbolet på vores undergang. Og det må vi ikke tillade, men må tage det som historiens vendepunkt." (<https://schillerinstitute.com/blog/2022/01/13/webcast-replace-nato-with-a-security-architecture-based-on-the-westphalian-principle/>)

**Er du parat til at bryde med
City of London og Wall Street**

for at forhindre atomkrig?

Den 12. januar (EIRNS) – Mellem mandag og onsdag i denne uge er verden rykket dramatisk tættere på randen af en termonuklear krig.

USA og NATO satte sig på tværs, i deres respektive sikkerhedsforhandlinger på højt niveau med Rusland den 10. og 12. januar og proklamerede deres hensigt om at fortsætte med at udvide NATO østpå, helt op til Ruslands grænse og at opstille truende atomangrebssystemer ligeledes ved denne grænse, fem minutters flyvetid fra Moskva. Den russiske viceudenrigsminister Alexander Grushko kom ud fra dagens møde i Rusland-NATO-Rådet for at meddele, at der ikke blot manglede en forenende positiv dagsorden mellem Rusland og NATO, men at USA og NATO er vendt tilbage til Den kolde Krigs fulde strategi om "inddæmning" over for Rusland, herunder "fuldspektret dominans". Rusland har ingen anden mulighed end at svare igen på inddæmnings-, afskrækkelses- og intimideringspolitikken, erklærede han.

Mandagens drøftelser mellem USA og Rusland sluttede på lignende måde.

Disse resultater er ikke overraskende, kommenterede Schiller Instituttets grundlægger, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, i dag. Bortset fra en eventuel privat kommunikation, eller bag kulisserne, mellem præsident Biden og Putin, som måske er i gang, og som tilbyder en mere rationel tilgang, kunne der meget vel komme en hurtig modreaktion fra Ruslands side. Som Putin og mange af Ruslands øverste ledere gentagne gange har advaret om i de seneste uger, kan Rusland ikke kapitulere over for de trusler, der er rettet mod dets suverænitet og eksistens. Rusland står over for en omvendt Cuba-krise, denne gang blot med en meget kortere lunte til krig.

Husk på JFK's ord for 60 år siden: "I løbet af den sidste uge

har umiskendelige beviser fastslået, at en række offensive missil anlæg nu er under forberedelse på den indespærrede ø (Cuba).” At gøre dette, mindede han verden om, “i et område, der er kendt for at have et særligt og historisk forhold til USA, er en bevidst provokerende og uberettiget ændring af status quo, som ikke kan accepteres af dette land”.

Zepp-LaRouche advarede om, at hvis de krigeriske udtalelser og konfrontationer fortsætter, så står verden højst sandsynligt over for et pludseligt opgør – som næsten øjeblikkeligt kan eskalere til den term nukleare tærskel. Der er et presserende behov for en bred mobilisering af kræfter verden over for at standse denne nedtur til helvede og hurtigt udvikle nye muligheder, der vil garantere sikkerhed og velfærd for alle parter.

– Der er behov for en ny, global sikkerhedsarkitektur til straks at erstatte NATO’s organisation og politik, som har bragt verden på krigens rand.

Den drivkraft, der presser verden mod en term nuklear krig, er sammenbrudskrisen i hele det transatlantiske finanssystem. For at deres system kan overleve, må de røveriske spekulanter i City of London og Wall Street indføre fascistiske niveauer af økonomisk udplyndring og bringe Rusland og Kina i knæ, for at sikre at der ikke er nogen reel modstand mod den førte politik.

Det transatlantiske system må underkastes en konkursbehandling efter de retningslinjer, som Lyndon LaRouche angav i sine Fire love fra 2014. Hvis dette system aflives, fjernes faren for Tredje Verdenskrig.

Gennem hele sit liv har Lyndon LaRouche gentagne gange forklaret denne nære forbindelse mellem det kollapsende finansielle system og tilskyndelsen til krig. En af hans klareste udlægninger var i en erklæring fra 23. december, 2011: “For at stoppe term nuklear krig, må man sætte gang i

det økonomiske opsving på verdensplan", som vi tidligere har citeret her på siden, og som i uddrag er den leder, der er udgivet i Executive Intelligence Review af 7. januar, 2022. Som denne leder konstaterer, bekræfter LaRouches bemærkninger fra 2011 "dette genis forudseenhed, og viser hvorfor Helga Zepp-LaRouche har opfordret til, at året 2022 – 100-årsdagen for hans fødsel – skal være kendt som "Lyndon LaRouches år".

LaRouche advarede i sin præsentation fra 2011: "Det vil være en termonuklear tredje verdenskrig – hverken præ-atomkrig eller atomkrig, men termonuklear krig. Målene er først og fremmest Rusland og Kina. Det er de to vigtigste mål....

Spørgsmålet er som følger: Det nuværende verdenssystem, det økonomiske system, er i færd med at gå i opløsning. Præcis hvordan dette vil foregå, er usikkert, men det vil ske. Hensigten er at tilintetgøre to nationer – Rusland og Kina – og det betyder atomvåben; det betyder termonukleare våben. Den del er involveret....

På nuværende tidspunkt er USA, Europas nationer, Rusland, Kina og andre lande klar til præcis denne krig.

Baggrunden for krigen er den kendsgerning, at hele verden er ved at gå fallit, især den transatlantiske region, specielt Europa, og også USA, og nationerne i Sydamerika og andre steder også ...

Bankerotten fra USA's perspektiv blev sat i gang tilbage i 2007, da man indledte processen med redningspakker. Siden da har hele den transatlantiske region, i særdeleshed USA og Europa, været fanget i en redningskrise, en hyperinflationær redningskrise. På nuværende tidspunkt er den gæld, der er blevet akkumuleret siden 2007 under dette program, af en sådan størrelse, at alle dele af Europa på nuværende tidspunkt under de nuværende regler og de nuværende ordninger er håbløst bankerotte! De vil aldrig kunne komme sig som eksisterende nationer under den nuværende gældsætning. Det samme gælder for

USA; Europa er lidt mere akut. Det er hvad der er sket... Ophavsmanden til dette forhold er briterne...

Se, hvad vi er nødsaget til at gøre – der er løsninger på denne konkurs. Først og fremmest må vi sætte verden under konkurs – det vil sige en lovlig konkursbehandling. Det kan vi for det første gøre ved, i USA for eksempel – og andre nationer kan kopiere denne foranstaltning i samarbejde med USA – at vi anvender en Glass/Steagall-lovgivning, en amerikansk Glass/Steagall-lov. Og der er nationer i Europa, som overvejer at vedtage den samme Glass/Steagall-lov.

Under en Glass/Steagall lov vil størstedelen af de europæiske nationers og USA's og andre landes gæld blive slettet, i realiteten, fordi under Glass-Steagall vil spillegælden, som er den største del af USA's gæld, simpelthen blive placeret i en særlig kategori, hvor nogen vil forsøge at finde ud af, hvordan man får denne gæld betalt – og den vil aldrig blive betalt! De vil simpelthen blive slettet af regnskaberne; der er ingen anden løsning.

At slette denne gæld fra bøgerne, at annullere redningsgælden vil betyde, at USA, og Europa, hvis de tilslutter sig, vil være i stand til at reorganisere deres finanser, skabe et kreditsystem og faktisk gå ind i en ny form for hamiltonsk kreditsystem, et banksystem, som vil sætte USA, og også Europa og andre nationer, hvis de tilslutter sig, i stand til at organisere en finansiel genopretning.

Med andre ord, hvad der ville ske omgående: Husk, at det meste af denne redningsgæld, Wall Street-gælden, London-gælden og den øvrige redningsgæld er absolut værdiløs! Den kan aldrig tilbagebetales! Den kunne aldrig tilbagebetales: Og den eneste løsning på dette var naturligvis at føre denne krig. Og hvis det britiske imperium kom ud som sejrherre i en sådan krig, med støtte fra USA, så ville de eftergive deres gæld og fortsætte deres forretninger. Men verdens befolkning ville blive reduceret kraftigt gennem sult, udsultning og så videre,

hvilket alligevel er ved at ske.”

Ruslandsekspert Jens Jørgen Nielsen deltog i Debatten på DR2 den 13. januar 2022

KØBENHAVN, 13. januar (EIRNS) – I dag, den samme dag som tidsskriftet EIR offentliggjorde et længere interview med Ruslandsekspert Jens Jørgen Nielsen med titlen “Hvorfor USA og NATO bør underskrive de traktater, som Putin foreslår”, var han blandt de otte deltagere i Debatten på DR2. Emnet var: Kold Krig med Putin?

Se Debatten her.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen anfægtede nogle af de andre debattørers udsagn om, at Rusland var en slyngelstat, som ikke kun truede Ukraine, men også de baltiske lande. De vigtigste ting, som han sagde, var:

– Problemet var, at vi ikke skabte en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur efter Sovjetunionens sammenbrud, da tiden var moden til det. Putin ønskede, at Rusland skulle blive medlem af NATO, men landet blev efterladt isoleret, og NATO udvidede sig mod øst.

– Hvis Paris-aftalen, som en anden debattør nævnte, var blevet gennemført, ville NATO ikke have udvidet sig mod øst. [Fra1997: Det Stiftende Dokument om Fælles relationer, samarbejde og Sikkerhed mellem NATO og Den Russiske Føderation]

– Det er utænkeligt, at Rusland ville angribe de baltiske lande.

- Rusland optræder som en stormagt med interesser i sit nærområde, ikke som en ideologisk magt, og landet optræder faktisk bedre end USA gjorde i Mellemøsten eller Latinamerika.
- Krim: Overdragelsen af Krim til Rusland i 2014 var ikke en klassisk annektering. Der blev ikke affyret skud, og befolkningen støtter Rusland.
- Problemet med at Ukraine er en delt nation blev ikke løst. Minsk II-aftalen (2015), som blev formidlet af Tyskland og Frankrig, ville have lavet en ny forfatning med en særlig status for det østlige Ukraine. Vesten pressede ikke på for at få den gennemført, men sendte i stedet våben til Ukraine. Det er klart, at russerne ville reagere.

Eva Flyveholm, Enhedslistens forsvarsordfører, understregede, at det var vigtigt at føre seriøse forhandlinger med Rusland.

Erstat NATO med en sikkerhedsarkitektur baseret på det westfalske princip Schiller Instituttets ugentlige webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche den 13. januar 2022

I sin gennemgang af den igangværende række af diskussioner i denne uge mellem Rusland, USA og NATO – som hun vurderede

indtil videre "ser forfærdeligt ud" – vendte Helga Zepp-LaRouche tilbage til det, hun beskrev som de to alternative tilgange til forholdet mellem nationerne. Versailles-traktaten ved afslutningen af Første Verdenskrig har det til fælles med USA's og NATO's holdning i dag, at sejrherrene i krig, som en unipolær magt, kan diktere fredens vilkår. Denne åbenlyse påstand om verdensdominans tilsidesætter andre nationers legitime ønsker og insisterer på, at de skal underordne sig den unipolære magt. Dette er typisk "magtarrogance" hos nutidens globalistiske krigshøge, som hævder, at USA "vandt Den kolde Krig" og derfor har ret til at være den dominerende verdensmagt.

I modsætning hertil var den Westfalske Fred, som afsluttede Trediveårskrigen i 1648, baseret på den idé, at anerkendelse af "andres interesser" er nøglen til en varig fred. Den direkte afvisning indtil videre, fra de amerikanske forhandlers side, af legitimiteten af præsident Putins sikkerhedshensyn, vil Rusland ikke acceptere. Selv om det er bedre at tale end ikke at tale, sagde hun, har USA's generelle holdning i disse forhandlinger "sænket den nukleare tærskel", hvilket gør det mere sandsynligt, at der vil blive anvendt atomvåben, hvis der skulle udbrude krig.

NATO, som skulle have været opløst ved afslutningen af Den kolde Krig, må erstattes, især fordi dets nuværende politiske kurs fører til en krig, hvor dets medlemmer i Europa vil blive ødelagt. Det giver ingen mening at tilhøre en sikkerhedsalliance, som fører til krig. At dæmonisere Putin og angribe Bælte-ogVej-Initiativet, når det vestlige finanssystem er ved at bryde sammen, giver heller ikke mening. Hun sluttede med at opfordre vores seere til at deltage i Schiller Instituttets online-seminar om nødsituationen den 17. januar med temaet: "Stop mordet på Afghanistan".

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

Læs afskriftet på engelsk nedenunder.

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

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

arrangeret rejser til Rusland.

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

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

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

Nogle højdepunkter:

Et højdepunkt er Jens Jørgen Nielsens personlige diskussion i 1989 med Mikail Gorbatsjov om NATO-udvidelse mod øst:

"Faktisk havde jeg en lang snak med Mikhail Gorbatsjov, den tidligere leder af Sovjetunionen, i 1989, lige da NATO begyndte at bombe Serbien, og da de indlemmede Polen, Tjekkiet og Ungarn i NATO. Man bør huske på at Gorbatsjov er en meget rar person. Han er en meget livlig person, med godt humør og en erfaren person. Men da vi begyndte at snakke, spurgte jeg

ham om NATO-udvidelsen, som foregik præcis den dag, hvor vi snakkede. Han blev meget dystert, meget trist, fordi han sagde: Altså, jeg talte med James Baker, Helmut Kohl fra Tyskland og flere andre personer, og de lovede mig alle ikke at flytte en tomme mod øst, hvis Sovjetunionen ville lade Tyskland forene DDR (Østtyskland) og Vesttyskland, for at blive ét land, og komme til at blive medlem af NATO, men ikke bevæge sig en tomme mod øst.'... Det stod ikke skrevet, for, som han sagde, "Jeg troede på dem. Jeg kan se, at jeg var naiv."

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

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

"[Man] kan forestille sig, hvad der vil ske, hvis Kina, Iran

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

Interviewet har andre afgørende afsnit:

Baggrund om NATO's udvidelse mod øst.

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

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

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

Hvordan Ukraine-krisen ikke startede med “annekteringen” af Krim, men med det han kalder “et kup” mod den ukrainske præsident Janukovitj, som ønskede økonomiske forbindelser både med EU og Rusland; plus baggrunden for Krim-spørgsmålet.

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

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

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

Michelle Rasmussen fra Schiller Instituttet i Danmark: 53 57 00 51, si@schillerinstitut.dk,
www.schillerinstitute.com; www.schillerinstitut.dk

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Hvem kan hævde at “forsvare Ukraine”, mens der begås masse mord i Afghanistan?

Den 10. januar (EIRNS) – Så mange institutioner i det amerikanske intellektuelle etablissement er nu på linje med Schiller Instituttet og kræver frigivelse af Afghanistans bistands- og reservemidler – 15 tænketanke og organisationer i et fælles brev til præsident Biden den 8. januar og andre på deres egne hjemmesider – at der helt klart er en forfærdelig erkendelse: USA's finansielle og økonomiske sanktioner er ved at myrde et uskyldigt folk, grundet utilstrækkelig loyalitet over for NATO's besættelsesstyrker. Enhver borger der tror, at denne forbrydelse ikke har noget at gøre med truslen om en overhængende, meget større konflikt om Ukraine, forveksler moralsk poseren med moral.

På de møder mellem USA og Rusland, der nu finder sted i Genève om NATO i Østeuropa og Ukraine, har amerikanske diplomater hurtigt og fuldstændigt erstattet det personlige diplomati mellem præsident Biden og præsident Putin, som synes at give håb om en løsning, med moralsk komediespil. Efter den bilaterale fase af møderne mellem USA og Rusland den 10. januar sagde talsmand for Udenrigsministeriet, Ned Price, at USA aldrig ville overveje at holde Ukraine ude af NATO, {"ikke havde til hensigt at indgå nogen aftale"} med Rusland og ikke engang "betragtede samtalerne som en forhandling". Han afsluttede sin briefing med en liste over diskussionsemner om russiske "ondsindede aktiviteter" for at hævde, at Rusland, og kun Rusland, måtte nedtrappe og gøre indrømmelser, så NATO's styrker og missiler kunne fuldføre deres lange fremrykning helt til Ruslands grænser – mens russiske tropper måtte forlade deres egne vestlige grænseregioner og "vende tilbage til deres permanente baser". Udenrigsminister Tony Blinken tilføjede samtidig et umotiveret forsøg på at hovere over Ruslands bistand til Kasakhstans regering for at kontrollere optøjer og forsøg på oprør.

Medmindre præsident Joe Biden igen griber personligt ind, er Ruslands foreslåede aftaler blevet blankt og permanent afvist. Det svarer til, at Nikita Khrusjtjov nægtede at overveje at trække sovjetiske missiler tilbage fra USA's sydlige grænse under den frygtindgydende Cuba-krise i oktober 1962. På det tidspunkt havde millioner af skræmte mennesker verden over allerede forestillet sig, hvad denne afvisning ville betyde.

Selv om konsekvensen nu "blot" er en konventionel konflikt i Ukraine, giver USA's tidligere chefvåbeninspektør og militære ekspert Scott Ritter en idé om, hvorfor det ikke ville gå godt for NATO-styrkerne.

(<https://consortiumnews.com/2022/01/10/what-war-with-russia-would-look-like/>)

Hvad nu hvis konsekvensen kun er det "fuldstændige brud på

forbindelserne", som Putin truer med, og en dyb og umiddelbar kold krig. Nationen med verdens hurtigst ekspanderende og teknologisk mest avancerede økonomi og med den største indflydelse på bekæmpelse af fattigdom og udvikling i Afrika, Syd- og Østasien [Kina] er fast partner med Rusland. Dette fremgår endnu en gang tydeligt af undertrykkelsen af det tilsyneladende mislykkede forsøg på en "farverevolution" i Kasakhstan.

Hvis Biden-regeringen har besluttet, at USA vil angribe og konfrontere Rusland og Kina sammen i en ny kold krig – modarbejde dem i rummet, bekæmpe deres politik med at eksportere atomkraft til tredjelande, kræve at de holder op med at bruge kul til energiproduktion, angribe Kinas politik for Bælte & Vej og udryddelse af fattigdom osv. – hvem vil de så have i sit hjørne? Det britiske imperium, naturligvis – de grønne kongelige og klovnen Bojo og Hendes Majestæts styrker, der er ivrige efter at blive indsat i Ukraine. Hvad vil Amerika have i reserve? Ingen udviklingskreditinstitution; et svagt økonomisk opsving efter en dyb recession; en arbejdsstyrke på 3 millioner arbejdere og 3,5 millioner arbejdspladser mindre end for to år siden; faldende realindkomster; en centralbank, der skaber økonomiske katastrofer verden over, som IMF advarede den 9. januar, og som forsøger at stoppe inflationen, den har forårsaget.

Men langt værre end alt dette er den fortsatte kvælning af Afghanistans befolkning på grund af de amerikanske sanktioner. Det forårsager en voksende kaskade af dødsfald som følge af sult og forfrysninger i hjem uden vinterbrændstof, i en nation som USA helt klart bærer ansvaret for efter 20 års krig og besættelse. Myrdet for den synd, at man ikke opretholdt en marionetregering, da NATO forlod det. {Disse} sanktioner er en forbrydelse mod menneskeheden.

Med dette Afghanistan som "banner" vil nationer instinktivt undgå et angloamerikansk forsøg på at fastsætte reglerne for verden. Der vil være en pervers ny betydning, som Schiller

Instituttets præsident, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, sagde i dag, for udtrykket "Afghanistan, imperiernes kirkegård".

Det skal forhindres, det må vendes. Politikken må ændres til en udviklingspolitik, ved hjælp af Helga LaRouches Operation Ibn Sina. Schiller Instituttets presserende organisering for dette mål vil tage sit næste skridt fremad med et webinar på Martin Luther King-dagen, mandag den 17. januar.

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 7
januar 2022**

**Den gamle verden kommer ikke
tilbage.**

**Gør 2022 til Lyndon LaRouches
år!**

**Briten forsøger at skubbe
Rusland ind i en
"bjørnefælde" i Kasakhstan.**

Med kun et par dage tilbage før de planlagte forhandlinger 10. januar mellem russiske og amerikanske diplomater på højt

niveau, om Ruslands krav om "øjeblikkelige" skriftlige sikkerhedsgarantier fra USA og NATO, har magtfulde kredse i London og Washington, som ikke vil bevæge sig bort fra at være på randen af atomkrig, lanceret endnu en provokation mod Rusland: den voldelige destabilisering af Kasakhstan. Tony Blair, George Soros og utallige internationale ngo'er medvirker i hele operationen.

En "farverevolution" i Kasakhstan har klare sikkerhedsmæssige konsekvenser for Rusland. Kasakhstan har den længste grænse til Rusland. Det er placeringen af □□Ruslands vigtigste rumopsendelsesanlæg, Baikonur Cosmodrome, en by, som Rusland i dag lejer af Kasakhstan.

Det ser ud til, at magtfulde kredse i London og Washington er opsat på at provokere den russiske bjørn til at reagere med undertrykkende vold i Kasakhstan, eller til at gøre det samme i det østlige Ukraine, for derefter at vende om og bruge dette som en færdigpakket undskyldning for at starte destruktiv økonomisk krigsførelse imod Rusland. Kort sagt, hvis de kan få Rusland til at gå i "bjørnefælden", så vil de give Rusland "Afghanistan-behandlingen" – økonomiske sanktioner og krigsførsel så alvorlig, at de sulter landet til underkastelse ... eller forsøger at gøre det. I den forstand er det forestående afghanske folkedrab på mere end 20 millioner mennesker også en forløber for 3. Verdenskrig.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche fremhævede den strategiske betydning af denne udvikling i sin ugentlige webcast: "Hvis du ville have spurgt mig for en uge siden, hvis jeg forventer en indsats for at forstyrre den diplomatiske offensiv, der hovedsageligt kommer fra Rusland og Kina, for at uskadeliggøre det, der tydeligvis byggede op som en dobbelt "cubamissilkrise" med udviklingen omkring Ukraine og Taiwan, så ville jeg have sagt, at man så absolut bør forvente en provokation til at forstyrre disse møder, og her er vi så ...

"Lad mig nu først nævne det positive aspekt:□□Der var et vist

gennembrud for blot et par dage siden, i mandags, da P5 FN-nationerne, det vil sige de permanente fem atomvåbenstater, for første gang blev enige om at bekræfte den meget vigtige erklæring, som blev forhandlet mellem Gorbatsjov og præsident Reagan i Reykjavik i oktober 1986, om at en atomkrig aldrig kan vindes og derfor aldrig må udkæmpes.”

Det er positivt, sagde Zepp-LaRouche, men nu “skal ordene følges op af gerninger. Og den udtalelse som sådan, selv om den er ekstremt vigtig, dæmper endnu ikke krisen omkring Ukraine og heller ikke krisen omkring Taiwan, men, som jeg sagde, så er det et meget vigtigt første skridt....

“Men vi har brug for en vending på hundrede procent, fordi denne konfrontation mod Rusland og Kina er selvmorderisk ... Jeg tror,□□vi har brug for en fuldstændig ændring af prioriteringer, og befolkningen er nødt til at vågne op. Deres ligegyldighed, ligegyldigheden – hos nogle af jer – over for Afghanistan er det der åbner for, at disse rådne politikker fortsætter i vores egne lande. Og vi skal have en mobilisering for et nyt paradigme, både i vores egne lande og også i relationer mellem nationer, fordi det er udtryk for samme problem i systemet.”

Udvalgt billede: Esetok, CC BY-SA 4.0 via Wikimedia Commons

»Aldrig atomkrig«-erklæringen af fem stormagter begynder 2022, LaRouches år

Den 3. januar (EIRNS) – Imens året 2022 åbende, der markerer økonomen og statsmanden Lyndon LaRouches 100-års fødselsdag,

rådførte stats- og regeringscheferne for de fem atomvåbenstater, som også er de permanente medlemmer af FN's Sikkerhedsråd (P5), sig med hinanden, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche har insisteret på, at de må gøre, og udstedte for første gang en erklæring om, at »atomkrig ikke kan vindes og aldrig må udkæmpes« (se hele erklæringen nedenunder). Ordene blev brugt af præsidenterne Biden og Putin efter deres videokonference den 7. december 2021; og denne erklæring vil nu være in mente, når USA-Rusland-NATO-forhandlingerne om Ukraine-krisen finder sted den 10.-13. januar.

Men den grundlæggende årsag til optimisme her er ikke så meget ordene i denne erklæring, men at lederne af de fem magter handlede sammen mod global krig. Helga Zepp-LaRouche havde offentligt opfordret dem til at gøre dette for præcis to år siden – den 3. jan. 2020, i den farlige periode efter USA's mord på den iranske general Qassem Soleimani – og har opfordret dem til det mange gange siden. Den 15. januar 2020, to uger efter Helga LaRouches første appel, opfordrede Ruslands præsident Putin til et P5-statsoverhoved-topmøde for at behandle problemerne med fred, sikkerhed og terrorisme – og han har også gentaget det forslag adskillige gange siden; og hans talsmand understregede i dag, at det stadig er nødvendigt efter denne »aldrig atomkrig«-erklæring.

Allerede i begyndelsen af marts 2020 havde Helga LaRouche identificeret COVID-pandemien – med krav om et moderne sundhedssystem opbygget i alle lande – som den nye betingelse for et sådant stormagtstopmøde. Dette må ske som en nødforanstaltning i Afghanistan sammen med fødevarehjælp og strømforsyningsgarantier for at redde millioner af liv. Det er starten på, gennem fysisk-økonomisk udvikling, det rigtige navn for fred; og det peger på et nyt internationalt kreditsystem, som Franklin Roosevelts Bretton Woods, i stedet for det krakkende kasino, vi har nu. Det er disse missioner, der er unikt tilgængelige gennem det Lyndon LaRouche kaldte »fire-magtsaftalen« mellem USA, Rusland, Kina og Indien. Det

gør dagens »P5«-erklæring væsentlig ud over dets ordlyd.

Erklæringen blev offentliggjort samtidigt omkring kl. 11:00 amerikansk østlig tid på alle fem præsidenters/premierministres hjemmesider. »Vi bekræfter, at en atomkrig ikke kan vindes og aldrig må udkæmpes,« siger erklæringen. »Da brug af atomvåben ville have vidtrækkende konsekvenser, bekræfter vi også, at atomvåben – så længe de fortsætter med at eksistere – bør tjene defensive formål, afskrække aggression og forhindre krig. Vi er overbevist om, at yderligere spredning af sådanne våben må forhindres«. Dette irettesætter de gale krigshøge som USA's senator Roger Wicker, der har rejst »muligheden« for et første atomangreb på Rusland i forbindelse med Ukraine.

De fem underskrivere bekræfter også vigtigheden af at imødegå atomare trusler, såvel som deres forpligtelser i forhold til traktaten om ikke-spredning af atomvåben (NPT) og dens forpligtelse til »at føre forhandlinger i god tro om effektive foranstaltninger vedrørende standsning af atomvåbenkapløbet snarligt«. De »bekræfter, at ingen af vores atomvåben er rettet mod hinanden eller mod nogen anden stat«.

De erklærede også: »Vi har til hensigt at fortsætte med at søge bilaterale og multilaterale diplomatiske tilgange for at undgå militære konfrontationer, styrke stabilitet og forudsigelighed, øge den gensidige forståelse og tillid og forhindre et våbenkapløb, der ikke ville gavne nogen og bringe alle i fare. Vi er fast besluttet på at føre en konstruktiv dialog med gensidig respekt og anerkendelse af hinandens sikkerhedsinteresser og bekymringer«.

Det russiske udenrigsministeriums talskvinde, Maria Zakharova, sagde: »Vi håber, at godkendelsen af en sådan politisk erklæring under de nuværende vanskelige forhold for international sikkerhed vil hjælpe med at reducere niveauet af internationale spændinger«. Kreml-talsmand Dmitry Peskov understregede, at Moskva stadig betragtede et topmøde mellem

verdens store atommagter som »nødvendigt«. Kinas viceudenrigsminister, Ma Zhaoxu, blev citeret af det officielle nyhedsagentur, Xinhua, at løftet »vil hjælpe med at øge den gensidige tillid og erstatte konkurrence mellem stormagter med koordinering og samarbejde«.

Men det er kun et skridt, som disse nationers ledere skal holdes til. Det transatlantiske bank- og finanssystem er på vej mod hyperinflation og krak. Det, verden absolut har brug for, er en stormagtsforhandlingsproces, som i det mindste også involverer Indien, for at iværksætte et nyt internationalt kreditsystem, der er i stand til at finansiere reel økonomisk udvikling, »TVA-lignende«, gennemgribende udvikling af fattigere regioner (TVA var et statsligt udviklingsagentur i USA til udvikling af Tennessee-dalen under depressionen i 1930'erne –red.), avanceret udvikling af atomkraft, teknologiske fremskridt drevet frem af lynprogrammer inden for rumvidenskab og fusionskraft. Vejlederen og planlæggeren af denne proces, og verdens førende i kampen for den, var Lyndon LaRouche. Dette begynder LaRouches år.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Schiller Institute released a [[memorandum]][] December 24 titled "Are We Sleepwalking into Thermonuclear World War III." In the beginning, it states, "Ukraine is being used by

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

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

%%Russian ‘Red Lines’

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

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

Because I think it’s like, if you have a power, a superpower,

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

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

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

that now.

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

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

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

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

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

And I think also this demonization of Russia, and demonization

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

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

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

%NATO Expansion Eastward

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

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

But when we started to talk, I asked him about the NATO

expansion, which was going on exactly the day when we were talking. He became very gloomy, very sad, because he said,

[[[begin quote indent]]]

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

[[[end quote indent]]]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

%%A Coup in Ukraine

But, actually, it's the same which seems to be happening now

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

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

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

what happened.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

%%Diplomacy to Avert Catastrophe

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

%%The Basis for Cooperation

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

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

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

stupid.

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

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

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

Even during the time of Yeltsin, he was also considered

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

%%'A Way to Live Together'

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

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

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

Michelle Rasmussen: A way of living together.

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

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

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

%%Ukraine, Again

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

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

policy not to become a member of NATO.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

%%Crimea

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

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

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

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

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

like that.

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

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

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

Michelle Rasmussen: Regime change?

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes, regime change.

%%The Importance of Cultural Exchanges

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes, yes.

%%The Role of Schiller Institute

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes. Definitely

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

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

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

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

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: I thank you.

Mobiliser for gensidigt sikret overlevelse – mod nedtælling til 3. verdenskrig

Foto: Geneva

På engelsk:

Dec. 27 (EIRNS)–According to the latest available reports, talks between Russia and the United States, and Russia and NATO will begin before mid-January, on the texts of the two draft agreements on security guarantees presented by Russia to the U.S. and NATO on Dec. 15. January 12 in Geneva is under consideration for the NATO-Russia talks, and before that, possibly January 10, for the bilateral U.S.-Russia meeting. This is critical diplomacy, which Russia has initiated. But also critical to stopping the countdown to World War III is the activation of citizens everywhere against the policy of brinkmanship and encroachment against Russia and China.

A barrage of warnings has come from Russia in the past 36 hours. President Vladimir Putin told Rossiya-1 TV on Dec. 26, that the talks dare not have a “destructive agenda” in which the United States and NATO, “will indulge in endless talk about the necessity of negotiations, but will do nothing but pump a neighboring country with state-of-the-art weapons systems and build up threats to Russia, and we will have to do something with these threats.”

Putin explicated the meaning of the “red line” which he has

set. He said, "I want everyone both in our country and abroad, our partners to clearly understand: the matter is not in a line we don't want anyone to cross. The matter is that we have nowhere to step back." He stressed, "They have driven us to such a line, excuse my language, that we have nowhere to move." He pointed to the risks of new missile systems deployed at a distance of four to five minutes' flight to Moscow. "Well, where are you going to go now? They have simply driven us to the state when we must say: stop!" Putin went on, that this is the reason Russia's initiative on security guarantees was made public for all nations to see.

Kremlin spokesman Dmitry Peskov spoke sternly on Dec. 26, saying that January "is when it will become clear whether the Americans are ready to give a substantive response, or they will opt for protracting the process and for seeking to initiate a policy of years-long talks." We need "an urgent, concrete solution...."

Deputy Foreign Minister Sergey Ryabkov said today, in an interview published today in the Russian {Mezhdunarodnaya Zhizn} ({Foreign Policy}) journal, among other points, that, "when we say that NATO facilities and all kinds of activities which are provocative for Russia need to be rolled back to the positions that existed in 1997, when the NATO-Russia Founding Act was signed, we are not bluffing."

Reviewing these remarks and other developments today, Schiller Institute President Helga Zepp-LaRouche stressed that our job is to make sure that a large portion of people in every country possible, understands what is going on. We are in a countdown of extreme danger, with no "wiggle room" left. We are "close to a point of no return."

The Schiller Institute posted a rush memorandum, "Are We Sleepwalking into Thermonuclear World War III?" on Christmas Eve, for circulation during the holiday period. This is currently being updated as an even more comprehensive dossier

of the actual chronology of what created the dangerous strategic showdown with Russia.

Zepp-LaRouche stressed the need to make known the extreme danger, and also that there are solutions. The best anti-war policy involves working together on common, urgent tasks, and that means a modern health system in every nation. Look at the Afghanistan emergency in that way. Afghanistan “is a branching point.” Either there will be the necessary interventions to save lives and save the nation, or it will be an “unmitigated disaster ... that marks a decay into barbarism.” We will lose all of our humanity, knowing what is coming and not doing anything about it. Acting on this, and on other humanitarian crises, as well as on the war danger, is one and the same task, as the Committee for the Coincidence of Opposites addresses.

The situation is grave. The Russian leaders are speaking out in unmistakable terms. If we co-mobilize with a growing number of people, we can bring about MAS—mutually assured survival.

Foto: fr:Utilisateur:Ork.ch

Zepp-LaRouche opfordrer NATO og USA til at underskrive de to strategiske traktater,

som Rusland har foreslået

Den 22. december (EIRNS) – I sin ugentlige webcast i dag opfordrede Schiller Instituttets stifter, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, USA, NATO og Europas nationer til øjeblikkeligt at underskrive de to strategiske traktater præsenteret af Vladimir Putins russiske regering, som et presserende første skridt til at få verden væk fra sin nuværende bane mod atomkrig.

"Jeg tror []det er en absolut presserende nødvendighed for NATO, USA og europæiske lande at blive enige om at underskrive en sådan juridisk bindende aftale med Rusland", sagde Zepp-LaRouche. "Det Rusland nu kræver i skriftlige juridiske termer, er intet andet end det der blev lovet dem i 1990 af USA og NATO", løfter, som aldrig blev holdt. I stedet blev NATO ved med at udvide sig østpå op til selve Ruslands grænser; og defensive og offensive våbensystemer samt tropper, har ledsaget denne udvidelse.

"Situationen er ekstremt bekymrende", sagde hun, "fordi der er mennesker, der er fast besluttet på denne balancegang på randen af krig , i håb om at Rusland og Kina vil trække sig. Men jeg tror ikke, at det ligger i kortene. Politikken med at omringe Rusland og Kina fortsætter, selv om Rusland har sagt, at deres røde streger er nået... Der må være en erkendelse af, at vi er på en frygtelig farlig vej, og folk må udtrykke deres modstand mod denne politik, højt og klart, før det er for sent."

Zepp-LaRouche opfordrede sine lyttere til at bruge denne juleperiode til at hjælpe med at organisere andre til at udtale sig imod denne truende katastrofe og relaterede kriser – såsom faren for at titusindvis af millioner af mennesker sulter i Afghanistan som følge af Storbritanniens, USA's og NATO's finanskrigsførelse – og at mobilisere til fordel for de politiske alternativer, som Lyndon LaRouche længe slog til lyd

for.

The Brinkmanship of Trans-Atlantic Cannot Be Tolerated

Weekly Strategic Webcast with Helga Zepp-LaRouche,

Wednesday December 22, 2021

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Hello I'm Harley Schlanger. Welcome to our weekly dialogue with Schiller Institute founder and Chairwoman Helga Zepp-LaRouche. It's Dec. 22, 2021.

And Helga, as we've been reporting over the recent weeks, the drumbeat for war continues coming from trans-Atlantic powers. The Russians are making proposals to try and address it. They seem to be getting little or no response from the West. What's the latest that you have on this?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, it is extremely worrisome, because it seems there are people committed to make a brinkmanship. Obviously, they hope that Russia, and China for that matter, will back down, but I don't think that that's in the cards. So two weeks ago, we spoke about this unbelievable statement by Sen. Roger Wicker, that he doesn't want to take the first use of nuclear weapons off the table.

Now, in the meantime, the whole thing has escalated. There was a CNN report, with an unnamed U.S. high-ranking official, the suspicion was that it was National Security Adviser Jake Sullivan, who said we only have a window of four weeks left before we have to get a breakthrough, and somehow referring to a possible plan of Russia to invade Ukraine. Which Russia has denied many times, emphatically. But if you look at the chronologically of the last several weeks—it started much earlier—but let's take the visit of the Director of the Office of National Intelligence of the United States Avril Haines to Brussels, where she briefed the NATO ambassadors about so-called hard evidence intelligence that Russia would plan and

invasion of Ukraine at the beginning of 2022.

As I said, it was denied by Russia. Then there are obviously troops being gathered at the Russian side of the Ukrainian border, which has been commented on many times by Russia, that it's their good right to do on their territory whatever they want. According to Maria Zakharova, the spokeswoman of the Foreign Ministry, there are at least 10,000 troops from NATO in Ukraine, 4,000 from the U.S. and 6,000 from other countries; and in the middle of all of that—I mean, there was the discussion between Putin and Biden on Dec. 7 on videoconference—which again looked as if this would move forward. But then, immediately, the people around Biden went back to their bellicose statements, so one never knows exactly what the U.S. policy is exactly.

And then Putin proposed two treaties, to the U.S. and to NATO. Now, these are not proposals for negotiations but ready-made treaties, one for the United States to sign, that they will basically not insist that Ukraine be in NATO, and the other one for NATO to sign, that NATO will not move any farther eastward. And the Russians, Putin, they said this is not negotiable; this pertains to the very national security interests of Russia, and they insist that these treaties be signed.

Now the reaction from the West, from [NATO Secretary General Jens] Stoltenberg, from Lambrecht, the new German defense minister, various other people, they said, they will not let Russia dictate what to do, and so forth, but there was no serious response so far. And various Russian spokesmen, Deputy Foreign Minister Sergey Ryabkov, Grushko, Lavrov, and various other people, they all said that this is very serious. If there is no response from the West, and if there is any more move to either move weapons into Ukraine, or to expand NATO in any way more eastward, there will be a military answer coming from Russia. And the bottom line has been reached, the red line has been reached.

So we are sort of in a countdown, where it's very clear that whoever is pulling the strings in NATO in the end, and sometimes one is not quite clear if it's Biden or not, or rather not, they're obviously set that this policy of encirclement against Russia and China continue. And Russia has said, the red line has been reached.

Now, this is very, very dangerous, because –

Oh yeah, then I think it was also Sullivan, said that if there is any move from Russia in respect to Ukraine, that they will punish the economy of Russia so terribly that it—anyway, so there are all these threats in the air.

And there is now a very interesting statement by Leonidas Chrysanthopoulos, a former Greek ambassador, who commented on all of that, by basically saying the West should not be so hypocritical (I'm now using my own words), but that the West should recognize that all Russia is demanding, in written, legal terms, is what was promised in 1990 to them by the United States, by NATO, in the negotiations concerning the German reunification. And this is actually a matter of record: There are now documents which everybody can look up, that on Feb. 9, 1990, Secretary of State James Baker promised Gorbachev that NATO would not move "one inch eastward," and this was also the content of the famous speech by then German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, in his speech in Tutzing, where he basically said the same thing. Naturally, everybody knows these promises, which unfortunately were not made in written form, but just verbally, they were broken almost immediately and altogether 14 countries of the former Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact were integrated into NATO; and recently, and many times earlier, Russia has made the point that to have Ukraine and Georgia in NATO is unacceptable for the very simple reason that if you look at the border between Ukraine and Russia, it leaves only a few minutes, maybe as little as 5 minutes for a missile system to reach Moscow, which obviously is much too short a time to have an effective

defense.

So, Russia makes the point that its national security interest is absolutely threatened by these moves by NATO. So we are on a countdown. And we should just keep in mind, if it comes to any war between Russia and Ukraine, which would involve any kind of—even without Western involvement—and this would escalate, Germany would immediately be the target. And if you have such statements like that of Senator Wicker, that the first use of nuclear weapons cannot be taken off the table, people should be aware of the fact, that if it comes to this, Germany ceases to exist!

So, this is one of the reasons why I have been saying NATO is no longer a security pact which is in the self-interest of Germany, because if in the case of any military conflict, Germany ceases to exist, obviously, this is not a good defense strategy.

So, I think, first of all people must make themselves familiar with this danger. According to the reports, we are in a four-week countdown, and I think it is absolute, urgent necessity that NATO and the United States and European countries do agree to sign such legally binding agreements with Russia, even if Putin, in a just-conducted meeting with some of his top military people said that even a legally binding, signed document does not give full security, because the United States has now a very long record that they pull out of treaties without any problem, overnight. But there must be a recognition that we are on a terribly dangerous road, and people must voice their opposition to this policy, loud and clear, before it is too late.

SCHLANGER: There have been some voices speaking out in the West, but not nearly enough, and then, instead, they're drowned out by people like Sullivan, who said Russia must deescalate, when the escalation is coming from the West. And the U.S. has not even responded yet to this request for these

treaties to be negotiated.

Now, unless you have something more on that, I think we need to move on to the situation in Afghanistan, where there have been some developments with the Organization for Islamic Cooperation meeting over the weekend, a potential for possible motion on unfreezing the funds. I think 46 congress members have written a letter to Biden. What's your sense? Is there some momentum building on this, especially given the reports of the danger to millions of people, including children, of starvation and freezing this winter?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes, this is the second, absolutely heartbreaking and extremely upsetting story. You know, the West talks about moral values, value-based order, human rights, democracy, all of these beautiful words, but the reality is quite ugly. Because the World Food Program representatives, I think, the head Beasley and Mary-Ellen McGroarty in Afghanistan, visiting Kabul and Kandahar in the last several days, and they come back and say that 98% of the Afghanistan population is in dire poverty, more than 90% are food insecure, without medical supplies: 24 million people are in danger of dying this winter, 3 million children, babies are dying already—and this is the 21st century and the whole world should know about it, but if you look at the Western media, after the Taliban took over in August, there was a short period when Afghanistan was in the news, but since several months you hardly hear anything about it.

Now, there was a very important conference over Friday, Saturday, Sunday in Islamabad, Pakistan, of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC); this is with 57 states, the second largest international organization after the United Nations, and they had a meeting which was addressed by the Prime Minister of Pakistan, Imran Khan. I listened to his speech and I was—not that everything was new what he said, but he said it very distinctly. He said, when the Taliban took over and the West withdrew, everybody knew that 75% of the

budget of Afghanistan came from international aid, and since that aid was immediately cut—the donor countries cut the aid right away, because the Taliban had taken over—everybody knew that the entire budget of Afghanistan was all of a sudden practically nonexistent. Then you had the freezing of the funds by the U.S. Treasury, by European banks, so there was a complete cash crisis: People could not import anything, they could not pay salaries, the whole thing broke down, and this has been going on for four months, with the result I just mentioned before.

But this is not the Taliban: When you hear the Western media, if they report anything at all, they say, “Oh yeah, the economy is now terrible, because of the Taliban.” It is *not* because of the Taliban! Because if you have, after 20 years of NATO war, NATO leaves, and the United States forces leave in a sudden fashion, the country in which they conducted war for 20 years: They leave the country, nothing has been built, no economy, no infrastructure, nothing is functioning, and then, they cut off the international lifeline, the donor monies, which make up 75% of the Afghanistan budget, they cut this off, they freeze the central bank’s funds, and then naturally a catastrophe erupts which nobody, not the Taliban or anybody else, can handle, because you have sanctions, and have a complete freeze of everything! And the West knows that! And they don’t react!

I mean, this is unbelievable! If you look at the Afghanistan situation, this is the end of any credibility of the West, and just to think that because the Western media are not reporting that, people should not think that it goes unnoticed. For example, the 57 OIC nations noticed; all the neighbors of Afghanistan noticed; all the third world noticed. So I think if this is not reversed very, very quickly, this will be of a lasting impact of a demise of the West. This is why I have said that the fate of Afghanistan and the fate of humanity are much more closely linked than most people are willing to think

through.

I find this absolutely horrendous.

What the OIC conference decided: they will set up a fund, I don't know exactly the amounts that will be available, but they will set up an office in Kabul, and the OIC has offered to coordinate international aid. So something is being done, for sure, but the problem is so gigantic that it really requires all the neighbors of Afghanistan to cooperate, and I think that the United States and the European countries—I mean, they were for 20 years in this country, and then they walk away. This is from the standpoint of international law, completely unacceptable. So Europe and the United States have an absolute moral obligation to reverse that and cooperate with the neighbors of Afghanistan and not only have immediate humanitarian aid, to alleviate the hunger, the lack of medical supplies, but then, participate in the economic buildup of the country, which can only occur by integrating Afghanistan into the Belt and Road Initiative projects—you know, the CPEC corridor from Pakistan to Kabul to Uzbekistan; the building of the Khyber Pass, and other well-defined projects which would immediately start building up the economy.

So that is what needs to be done. There are 39 congressmen who made an appeal to Biden to unfreeze the funds which are held by the Treasury: I think this is important. Obviously, this must immediately happen because the winter is already there.

SCHLANGER: And toward that end of accelerated humanitarian aid, you made the proposal which you call "Operation Ibn Sina," that is, while specific to Afghanistan, actually reflects the need for the whole world in the midst of the COVID crisis, the economic breakdown, which is the necessity for a world health system, as the front end of a massive infrastructure investment program, which could include the Belt and Road Initiative and so on. How does that look as a prospect from your standpoint?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Operation Ibn Sina, because one has to start with Afghanistan, and Ibn Sina comes from a place nearby Bukhara which is Uzbekistan, but his father was born in Balk, which is Afghanistan, and people are very proud of him. He's probably the greatest doctor who ever lived, so there is no better name to give this effort to build a modern health system in Afghanistan, than to call it after Ibn Sina. And there already has been great interest in this idea coming from several places in the region.

But more largely, we have now a new wave of the COVID-19, the Omicron variant, and, again, there is such an unwillingness by the establishment of the Western system to recognize that we have been on the wrong track, and I said in the very beginning, when it was clear this was a pandemic, in March 2020, I said we need a world health system or else this pandemic will not go away. Since then we've had all these mutations, and now we have Omicron, and there is no guarantee there will not be new mutations. And it's also clear that the idea that the rich countries are producing and hoarding vaccines, and leaving the developing countries without is not helping anybody, because if you leave entire continents without vaccinations and without modern health equipment, then this virus will mutate, as it has done so far, and it will come back and may even make the existing vaccines obsolete.

So, either we go in earnest, and say that the fact that billions of people do not have modern hospitals is unacceptable, don't have clear water, don't have enough electricity, this is something which could be done; there is no reason why we could not immediately start to build modern infrastructure, like we have it in Germany—it may be rotting, but it's still there because previous generations were a little bit smarter than the present crop of politicians—but there is no reason in the world why not technically, why not technologically, we could not start building hospitals: We need about 30,000 new hospitals around the world. That would

be easy! We could even make these hospitals prefabricated, in the United States, in Europe, and then ship the modules to the respective countries. The Chinese proved in Wuhan that you can build a modern hospital in two weeks. It could be done this way.

We could start a crash training program for medical personnel. I have called for the youth, the young people in the world to be trained to help build such an effort, like it was done by Franklin D. Roosevelt with the CCC program in the New Deal. You can train young people on the job, give them a vision and a mission in life.

And I think this is really something—you know, we cannot continue this way! The idea that every time something happens, the rich countries only take care of themselves, and the developing countries are left in the dark, that has to stop and we have to start to really think in terms of a new paradigm if humanity is supposed to come out of this crisis. And given the fact that we have now the Christmas period, the holiday season, people have some days to think. And rather than just going about your business as usual—I mean, this is a breaking point of civilization: Either we really can shape up as a human species, or it may not look so great for our perspective.

SCHLANGER: I think your last point, that in the spirit of Christmas, of generosity and love of mankind, peace and good will toward men, this would be the time to move ahead with the shift to the new paradigm.

Helga, thanks for joining us today, and I know you wish all your viewers a merry Christmas, as do I, and we'll see you again next week.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes. I wish you a Merry Christmas, and the first topic we discussed, I really want you to think about, because what we face in Europe between Russia, Ukraine, and

Europe and NATO, is like a reverse Cuban Missile Crisis. In the Cuban Missile Crisis, Kennedy pointed to the fact that an island which is only 160 miles from the coast of Florida, the idea that you could deploy nuclear missiles in such a close vicinity, obviously could not be tolerated. But nuclear missiles in NATO, in the Baltic, missile defense system in Poland, in Romania, and the idea to move lethal weapons into Ukraine, from the standpoint of the Russians, this is exactly like the Cuban Missile Crisis.

So, I really want you to use this Christmas period to really work with the Schiller Institute, and help us to stop something which could really be fatal for all of humanity. And at the same time, there are all the resources, there are so many beautiful contributions to civilizations, Beethoven's music, all the great poets, the great philosophers—read these things over these days and rethink how we should go about it, because we definitely need to change course urgently

Ligesom for 60 år siden vokser faren for atomkrig støt

Den 20. december (EIRNS) – Farten på de voksende amerikansk--russiske spændinger over Ukraine tog til over den sidste uge, således at det som lignede et håb om stabilisering for to uger siden, da præsidenterne Biden og Putin afholdt en videokonference, nu til stadighed ligner en nedtælling til krig i Europa mellem de atomare stormagter.

En højtstående embedsmand fra Det hvide Hus – sandsynligvis den nationale sikkerhedsrådgiver, Jake Sullivan – fortalte CNN søndag den 19. december, at der kun er et »tidsvindue på fire uger« til at forhindre Rusland i at invadere Ukraine. »Det som vi har foretaget os er meget kalkuleret«, sagde embedsmanden. »Men vi har blot cirka et tidsvindue på fire uger fra nu af«. Embedsmanden sagde, at USA's planlagte sanktioner »ville være overvældende, øjeblikkelige og have betydelige omkostninger for den russiske økonomi og deres finanssystem«.

Den næste dag, den 20. december, fortalte den russiske viceudenrigsminister, Sergej Ryabkov, journalister, at Biden-administrationen ikke havde svaret på Rusland foreslåede traktater om sikkerhedsgarantier i løbet af forhandlingerne den 15. december i Moskva mellem Ryabkov og den amerikanske viceudenrigsminister for europæiske og eurasiske anliggender, Karen Donfried. Forslagene inkluderede forsikringen om, at Ukraine ikke ville blive et medlem af NATO, og at yderligere opstillinger af amerikanske og NATO-styrker, samt missilsystemer tættere på Ruslands grænser, ville ophøre...

Og både viceudenrigsminister Alexander Grushko og forhandler af våbenkontrol, Konstantin Gavrilov, henviste ildevarslen til »Ruslands militær-tekniske og militære midler« som det eneste alternativ til forhandlinger om Ruslands traktatforslag. Ukraines egen regering fortsatte, i form af udenrigsminister Dmytro Kuleba, med at tale med *Washington Post* den 19. december og kræve flere »militære midler« og tropper fra USA og Storbritannien og krævede, at USA offentligt gør det klart hvor »overvældende og øjeblikkelig« den skade er, som det amerikanske finansministerium forbereder sig på at påføre den russiske økonomi og finanssystem, og at gøre dette i samarbejde med London, hvad enten de kontinentale, europæiske allierede er enige med dette eller ej.

I oktober 1962 var det USA's sydlige grænse, der var truet, på nært hold, af sovjetiske soldater og missiler i Cuba, som

truede med et ødelæggende førsteslag. I dag er det NATO's uophørlige fremmarch, tættere og tættere på Ruslands grænser. (Læs John F. Kennedys udtalelse på engelsk nedenfor.)

Ydermere krævede USA's militærchefer en invasion af Cuba for at ødelægge missilerne og andre styrker, og præsident Kennedy holdte dem tilbage – med megen møge.

Hvis ikke Kennedy og Khrusjtjov havde fundet en forhandlet løsning på Cuba-krisen, hvad ville da sandsynligvis være sket? Hundrede millioner af mennesker verden over var rædselsslagne over en umiddelbar atomkrig.

Hvordan var præsident Kennedys krav anderledes end dem fra præsident Vladimir Putins foreslåede aftale den 7. december til præsident Joe Biden? ...Kennedy og Khrusjtjov ønskede begge en løsning, og ikke én, hvor den anden præsident og hans nation blev ydmyget eller tilintetgjort gennem »overvældende, øjeblikkelig«, national beskadigelse!

Det er det, som nu må forhandles mellem præsident Biden og Putin, ved at tilsidesætte krigshøgene – nogle af dem der er så klinisk sindssyge, at de foreslår et atomart førsteslag mod Rusland, som senator Roger Wicker gjorde det den 7. december. Men en løsning må og kan opnås, hvis borgere nu rejser sig og kræver dette, og forbliver optimistiske om, at disse to nationer kan blokere den faretruende vej mod optrapning og stormagtskrig. Lad dem i stedet bruge deres energi på at forsyne Afghanistan med mad, sundhedspleje og genopbygning.

For 60 år siden fortalte præsident John F. Kennedy nationen følgende i en direkte, national TV-tale: "Within the past week, unmistakable evidence has established the fact that a series of offensive missile sites is now in preparation on that imprisoned island. The purpose of these bases can be none other than to provide a nuclear strike capability against the Western Hemisphere." The President concluded: "But this

secret, swift, and extraordinary buildup ... in an area well known to have a special and historical relationship to the United States and the nations of the Western Hemisphere ... this sudden, clandestine decision to station strategic weapons for the first time outside of Soviet soil—is a deliberately provocative and unjustified change in the status quo which cannot be accepted by this country....”

Putin og Xi tager tyren ved hornene

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

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

et svar fra russisk side.

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

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

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

Helga Zepp-LaRouche kommenterede i dag, at hvis Rusland og Kina tvinges til at vedtage storstilede modforanstaltninger

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

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

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

For at Amerika skal kunne overleve og blomstre, må det vedtage retningen, længe foreslået af Lyndon LaRouche, der etablerer en firemagts-alliance med magten til at indlede et Nyt Paradigme i global udvikling – en alliance blandt USA, Rusland, Kina og Indien, som handler på vegne af hele menneskeheden.

Billede: www.kremlin.ru