

Current Concerns

The international journal for independent thought, ethical standards, moral responsibility,
and for the promotion and respect of public international law, human rights and humanitarian law

English Edition of Zeit-Fragen

Against the erosion of federalism and self-responsibility No global forces' access onto Switzerland

ev./thk. On 25 November, the Swiss sovereign votes on a revision of the "Tierseuchengesetz" (TSG, Act on Epizootic Diseases). Since 9 October, the referendum against the planned revision of the "Epidemiegesetz" (EpG, Epidemics Act) has been running parallel with this. Both laws are – as the following articles and interviews show – unnecessary, Switzerland has enough regulations concerning these issues, and both laws would have far-reaching negative consequences for our federal system by installing a centralized concentration of power in the administration – that might even threaten

the physical integrity of the individual – something that is out of the question for Switzerland. Once installed they would curtail participation and self-responsibility of the cantons as well as – in the case of the TSG – the veterinarians' and pet owners' responsibility and in the case of the EpG that of doctors and citizens.

Once again there is speculation with the fear of citizens at work – but the experience of the avian and swine flu is still in vivid memory. Also the course of the blue tongue disease raised serious questions.

In contrast, the manner in which the indeed highly hazardous EHEC infection in

Germany was mastered has clearly shown that it was the federal structures and thus the locally well-established cooperation that contributed significantly to the fact that this infection did not grow and spread to become a massive problem in all our countries. The one-sided combat of a new, yet unknown infectious disease by relying on vaccination with a hastily produced, not testable vaccine – simultaneously providing an opportunity for centralistic control and international access to unprecedented data collections – have nothing to do with real plague and epidemics control. There are experiences of such; one must simply use them. •

No to the Act on Epizootic Diseases On the Confederate vote on 25 November 2012

by Dr iur Marianne Wüthrich

In several projects a clear intention to further extend the concentration of power with the Swiss government becomes obvious: in the Prevention Act – which was luckily stopped by the Council of States in September 2012 – , in the draft of the revised "Epidemiegesetz" (Epidemics Act) and presently in the revised "Tierseuchengesetz" (Act on Epizootic Diseases). That is why one of the main arguments against this tendency is the following: Responsibility for prevention and health care of man and animal shall remain with the cantons.

On 25 November, we, the Swiss citizens, entitled to vote, have the opportunity to counter growing administration bubble in Berne and become active in defence of the well-proven federalist system. Prevention and health are primarily to remain the responsibility of the cantons. They know the local conditions better and their work is more cost-effective than that of a centralist federal authority.

The will to concentrate the power with the Swiss government is especially reflected in Article 53b of the planned Act on Epizootic Diseases according to which the Federal Council would be able to sign international treaties concerning animal health on his own without the control of the parliament and people. There is great danger that Switzerland would thereby place itself in a

dependence of international organisations and foreign pharmaceutical companies.

Instead of formulating arguments ourselves we point to the referendum committee's excellent set of *arguments in the "Federal Council's Explanatory Notes for the Swiss referendum of 25 November 2012"*.

The referendum committee's arguments

- Undemocratic concentration of power with the Confederation. By enforced conformity of the cantonal veterinary inspection offices our federal system is transformed into a centralist authority. Consequence is a significant potential to misuse power.
- The Federal Council is permitted to sign international treaties, unauthorized. That way foreign law may be taken on, Swiss law may be annulled by contradictory provisions and Switzerland can be remote-controlled by international organizations. Conflicts of interests sound a note of caution: in 2009 the WHO and their advisers partly financed by vaccine manufacturers proclaimed the highest pandemic alert for the swine flu.
- Incapacitation of animal owners and veterinarians. Restrictions of our right to objection. Compliance to questionable coercive measures may be enforced by still higher fines or penalties.

- Suppression of natural remedies and methods by one-sided preference of pharmaceutical products. The consequence: toxic residues in food.
- High costs by controversial, expensive prevention programmes and vaccine banks. Disposal of superfluous stocks or incentive to administration by force. The foreseeable explosion of costs will be shifted on us, animal owners, tax payers and consumers.
- There are no regulations for objective criteria concerning the definition of epidemics nor for the necessity of scientific proves and independent risk analysis. The official documentation of frequently occurring vaccine damages and their compensation are not guaranteed. A lack of transparency makes it possible for the Confederation and the Federal Veterinary Office (FVO) to arbitrarily declare epidemics and to order compulsory vaccination. Disregard of animal welfare by compulsory vaccination with mostly toxic, genetically modified preparations. Many pet and farm animals suffer from vaccine damage.
- Freedom of choice for health of animal and man. Therefore NO to the revised Act on Epizootic Diseases! •

Further information: <http://tsg-referendum.ch>

“The balance of shared responsibility must prevail”

“These compulsory vaccinations should be rejected”

Interview with Walter Müller, National Councillor, FDP. The Liberals, Canton of St Gall



Walter Müller
(picture ma)

Current Concerns: Mr Müller, why have you rejected the Epizootic Diseases Act “Tierseuchengesetz” (TSG, Epizootic Diseases)? National Councillor Walter Müller: For me the main reason is the de-
ranged balance between the power of

the state and the animal owner’s responsibility. The new TSG has destroyed this balance. The increase in the state’s power or, respectively, the power of the new federal administration at the expense of a loss in participation by the concerned animal owners is completely unacceptable. The animal owner has the responsibility and also has to bear the consequences in case of any damage. Adversely, the state can impose measures and the animal owners have no say in the matter.

This is what was the case with the blue tongue disease.

In the case of the blue tongue disease the state has decreed vaccinations in an overly hasty way, with a vaccine that was not entirely reliable. There were damages. Of course, it is difficult to prove this. That is why we ask for more cautiousness here. On the other hand the state is trying to usurp competences in order to be able to take drastic measures.

Is there also a loss in federalism?

Federalism is always an issue. We might take it easy as long as participation is guaranteed. But it is always an issue that the federal state wants to get more and more competences and the federal politicians who should represent their electorate tend to be willing to grant them. This does not only weaken federalism but also subsidiarity. It is always better to solve the problems at the level where they arise. Applied to epizootic diseases, the federal state is merely requested in case of highly contagious diseases. I am not going to complain about restrictions in situations of high risk. In special cases there is a need to act purposefully in order to protect the general public and

the livestock. On the other hand there are large areas where it is possible to act in a federalist and subsidiary way, without setting the whole confederation machine in motion.

The existing law – is it really sufficient? So far the issues could be resolved, couldn’t they?

Yes, there is definitely a pragmatic way, as well. If conditions are given and the relevant authorities correspond and communicate, reasonable decisions were taken, in general. The question here is whether the animal owners are consulted, particularly in case of new diseases which are not highly contagious. If for example a decision is taken to exterminate a disease because it has an impact on animal trade with sheep and goats, for example, participation of the animal owner is definitely required. If it is about regulations for the Alps regarding the question which animals can be kept there and if there should be vaccinations, then animal owners must be able to participate. This is why I think it is a fundamental issue to keep the balance between power and responsibility.

According to the new law, the federal state can conclude international contracts; what does this mean?

The rule that the federal state can conclude contracts is really against our customs. Today, if the state wants to conclude international treaties, he has to consult the foreign political commission or relevant professional organizations. This results from the division of powers. Here we are facing the same issue of power control. The federal state cannot simply do anything without the participation of the people. These are national political considerations that I find very important.

You are complaining about a lack in cooperation between the federal administrations and the directly affected individuals.

I do not oppose decisions which are in the general interest as long as the corresponding representatives are consulted. We do need options to combat highly contagious diseases. But on the other hand vaccinations are always an intervention with the animal and, hence, a risk. This also matters for the consumer. We should not deal with this carelessly. The times where we

unscrupulously believed in chemistry and pharmacy are over. I am not a fundamentalist but we need to see things realistically here. The right to participation and the balance of power and responsibility and shared responsibility is dwindling. The consequences of vaccinations for animals and the human nutrition are also unclear. These are the reasons why I am opposing this law.

You have also rejected the Epidemics Act. Here we find similar mechanisms including the transfer of competences to the federal state.

I cannot accept that it should be possible that an administration can decree vaccinations. I own my body and I will not let anyone else tell me if I have to vaccinate or not. I am claiming this right for myself and everybody else should be allowed to do the same. Compulsory vaccinations should be rejected. Sovereignty with respect to my body means that I decide what should be done to it. We find the same absurd ideas with respect to organ donation. We are told that we have to donate organs. This is not the right way. My body is my own and certainly not the state’s or anyone else’s. This has to do with the great good of freedom. I want to decide whether I want to be vaccinated. For me, compulsory vaccination is out of the question. I cannot accept it.

It seems disturbing and hardly trustworthy that the WHO is to increase its influence on our healthcare policy. What is your opinion?

The WHO resides in Geneva and if in the industry the opinion prevails that there should be vaccinations, there are obviously financial considerations involved. With the swine flu we wasted millions for worthless vaccine doses. Hysteria was stoked up and we must take care not to reduce the body’s natural defenses. There is a substantial danger to develop resistances. And the more we perform mandatory vaccinations, the higher the danger is that resistances might be formed. We have to approach this issue in a differentiated and careful way.

Mr Müller, thank you very much for the interview.

No to the revised Epidemics Act

Referendum deadline on January 17th 2013

by Dr iur Marianne Wüthrich

National Council and Council of States have accepted a radically revised version of the Epidemics Act ("Epidemiegesetz", EpG) in September 2012. Were many parliamentarians unaware that they actually agreed to a governmental insult of federal structures and the independent citizen once again, similar to the Prevention Act? All citizens are called upon to actively support the referendum, so that the people can decide about the Epidemics Act.

Arguments against the proposed Epidemics Act basically echo those against the Act on Epizootic Diseases and the Prevention Act – the EpG however goes far beyond that in how severely it interferes with cantonal sovereignty and indeed peoples' personal freedom. In fact the EpG in its current version is totally sufficient to fight contagious diseases in the population. If at all some minor adjustments might be made or the wording rephrased for the sake of readability, as in the case of the Act on Epizootic Diseases.

The Federal Office of Public Health (FOPH) ("Bundesamt für Gesundheit", BAG) however is pursuing quite different goals, as for instance the rather bizarre notion to "positively influence the health not only of the population as a whole, but also of each individual citizen" The hidden agenda behind this assault on our sovereignty and individual freedom and responsibility as citizens is the aim "to further enhance international interconnectedness and integrate Swiss law even better into the international health regulations of the WHO" (see BAG homepage www.bag.admin.ch).

Here are some crucial arguments against the revised version of the EpG:

The Federal Office of Public Health as an absolutist command center – in Orwell-style

The proposed Epidemics Act would unbalance the federalist structure of our health care system and the subsidiarity principle in an unprecedented way. It is especially alarming that the BAG doesn't even hide behind the Swiss government any longer but openly declares their will to rapidly expand their power position. Up to now the BAG had been mentioned in the Epidemics Act only as an informing and advisory body. A mere federal office is meant to be promoted by law to be in charge throughout the whole country and act as it pleases towards cantons and citizens, like some absolutist command center? In federalist and direct-democratic

Switzerland such proceedings can only be called scandalous.

- According to Art. 5 EpG the BAG was entitled to independently launch specific national programs for detection, surveillance and containment of transmittable diseases and have the cantons – who are put in charge of health care by the constitution – implement these programs.

- According to Art. 8 Abs. 2 the BAG could "advise the cantons to take certain measures regarding a particular threat to public health", such as "measures against certain persons" or "against the population" or "for the distribution of medicines".

The cantons demeaned to mere executioners of mandatory vaccinations and sexual information campaigns (allegedly for HIV/AIDS-prevention!) on behalf of the remote-controlled 5th column, sexually deviant lobby inside the BAG?

- The BAG "keeps the public, certain groups of people as well as government agencies and professionals informed about the dangers of transmittable diseases and how to prevent and fight them". (Art. 9 EpG).

The amended Epidemics Act would leave the door wide open for the BAG to step up their hideous "Information Campaigns" which have been aiming at eroding the very ethical foundations of our society for years ("Never go for a stand without some rubber 'round it"; or as in the current one: "See the doctor if your cock's caught a cold a.s.o)."

The BAG is supposed to manage transmittable diseases "in co-ordination with international systems" (Art. 11); the BAG promotes certain laboratories to become "reference centers" where they can do as they please, (Art. 17); the BAG comes up with a "national vaccination plan", which is mandatory for all doctors and medical personnel (Art. 19); the BAG is surveillance and evaluation center (Art. 24).

A duty to report to the BAG any "observations about transmittable diseases including information necessary to identify diseased, infected or exposed individuals as well as to track down routes of transmission" is supposed to be established for doctors, hospitals and other "health care institutions" (Art. 12 Abs. 1).

To put it bluntly: with the Epidemics Act the BAG would turn into some absolutist ruler bypassing any separation of powers and demeaning the cantons to become their mindless executioners: The

BAG not only defines the basics of epidemics prevention (legislative function) but at the same time advises the cantons, the population, medical personnel and laboratories what to do (executive function) and on top of that also "monitors" and "evaluates" its own perpetrations (judicative function)!

Shall sovereign Switzerland once more surrender to foreign custody?

For the Swiss government to declare a state of emergency with all emergency rights bestowed on itself and the BAG, respectively, no decision of the parliament is required, but – hear and marvel – of the WHO: The federal legislative wants to leave it to the WHO to judge whether or not a "health hazard of international dimensions" is the case, by which "public health in Switzerland is threatened" (Art. 6 Abs. 1 b).

If the WHO chooses to give out the order, the Swiss government (in other words the BAG) would declare a state of emergency and abolish all individual liberty: ordering measurements against individuals and against the entire population, degrading health professionals to mere executioners, ordering compulsory vaccinations (Art. 6 Abs. 2).

As for the Swiss government's obedience towards foreign states and international offices and organisations, we have got used to a lot of things by now – but certainly this is going too far! We still vividly remember the swine flu disaster: our agencies had themselves directed by the WHO. And certain great pharma corporations overseas earned themselves some golden noses with that. We ended up sitting on millions of vaccine vials and drugs (Tamiflu) which had to be sold cheaply or destroyed, at our own costs, of course.

Bypassing direct democracy is getting too much

Once again our referendum democracy is abolished by the EpG: The Swiss government is granted the right to sign international treaties bypassing parliament and the people. According to Art. 80 Abs. 1 EpG, the Swiss government is supposed to be entitled to sign international agreements on "the exchange of data" or the "harmonisation of measures to detect, monitor, prevent and fight transmittable diseases". That way people and parliament are not only excluded from the right to make decisions but also from the right to get information. Since only in the case

"No to the recasted ..."

continued from page 3

of referendum proposals there is a guarantee that citizens and parliamentarians actually get to read the current state treaties – who has the time to trace down all directives and treaties of the Swiss government? So the executive, i.e. the BAG, gets a carte blanche in this area, too!

**Direct access of the BAG
to Swiss school children –
bypassing cantons and parents**

The revised Epidemics Act entitles the Swiss government (which means the BAG) to carry their „sex coffers“ and other atrocities into schools throughout the country, bypassing cantons and parents: “It [the Swiss government] may oblige education and health care institutions to distribute information material about the dangers of transmittable diseases and offer counseling regarding their prevention and control.” (Art. 19 Abs. 2 c)

What the BAG has kept trying to achieve for such a long time, facing legitimate resistance from parents and teachers in many places, would become mandatory with the EpG! This is reason enough to decline this Act.

The transparent citizen

Notorious directives of the EpG about massive enhancement of the already existing computing capacity of the BAG sends a clear message. Anybody who is just “suspect” is meant to be put on file with all imaginable data about his or her private life and most intimate matters:

Art. 60 EpG Information system

- 1 The BAG runs an information system collecting data about people who are diseased, suspect, infected or suspect or who carry and excrete infectious agents.
- 2 The information system contains the following data:
 - a. Data about identity, sufficient to reliably identify and contact the person
 - b. Information about travels, places of residence, contacts with persons, animals and things;
 - c. medical test results;
 - d. data about measures of prevention and control of a transmittable disease.

By the way, all those data turning all of us into transparent citizens would not only be stored at the BAG but happily shifted around the world: The BAG, cantonal agencies and some other entities vaguely categorized as “public and private organisations” are supposed to “process the data or have them processed” [by whom?!] (Art. 58 Abs. 1), similarly our private matters are meant to be “disclosed” to federal and cantonal bodies as well as medical doctors (Art. 59 Abs. 1).

And on top of all that

Art. 62 Disclosure of personal data to foreign agencies

- 1 Implementing this law, the BAG and cantonal agencies in charge may disclose personal data including health data to supranational and international organisations which are dealing with the issues in question provided the state, supranational or international organisation

guarantee appropriate protection of the concerned person’s privacy.

And who is in charge of this creepy perfecting of a system which is certainly alien to freedom-loving Switzerland but is much more reminiscent of some inhumane dictatorships’ darkest times? Guess what: it’s the BAG, once again fulfilling all three political powers simultaneously – it stores the files while at the same time monitoring the safety of its own system, the accuracy of the information and the legality of collecting the citizens’ data! (Art. 60 Abs. 5)

Citizens are granted the right of appeal only against damages from compulsory measures, but not against storage, disclosure and distribution of their personal data. Since we are not even aware of what data are filed about us, no legal remedies are required? But the federation is supposed to be liable to the pharmaceutical industry in case they get disadvantaged somehow ... (Art. 70 EpG).

What was that again with this rule of law? Will the EpG create some kind of Patriot Act, rendering the whole Swiss population ignorant and helpless, stripped of all legal instruments indispensable in a state ruled by law, exposing their whole lives to surveillance with unforeseeable and potentially harmful consequences?

Conclusion

Just reading this amendment text is enough to send shivers down one’s spine. Did our members of parliament not even read the Act? •

Self supply with vaccines must become the administration’s duty

mw. Instead of building vaccine banks, which is costly and procures vaccines from abroad (Article 42 TSG) whose quality in the past was not always reliable – examples are swine flu and blue tongue – the Federal Council would be well-advised to ensure self-supply with vaccines for humans and animals. The national supply of sufficient and high-quality vaccines is part of the public service and can be achieved only with the farthest possible domestic production. For in this area we have stricter legislation than other countries (such as the ban on genetically modified production). The tax money that the Swiss government is today squandering and will continue to squander on the inflation of Public Health, would be more wisely invested in the reconstruction of the *Swiss Serum- & Vaccine Institute*.

The *Swiss Serum- & Vaccine Institute* Berne (*Berna*) was already founded in the 19th century as a private company. Its range of activities comprised

development, production and distribution of immune biologics (anti-bacterial- and antiviral vaccines, plasma derivatives), pharmaceuticals and veterinary products.

Under the direction of its founders *Charles Haccius*, *Johann Friedrich Häfliger* and *Albert Vogt*, the institute quickly gained a reputation in the production of vaccines against smallpox, later of vaccines to fight against epidemic diseases such as diphtheria, cholera, polio, typhoid, meningitis, hepatitis and influenza. It also developed products for emergency and veterinary medicine. In 2001, the *Swiss Serum- & Vaccine Institute* Berna was renamed *Berna Biotec AG*. The company employed 850 people worldwide in 2004, including 400 in Switzerland.

Instead of protecting the domestic production of vaccines at home for the purpose of our national self-supply against the increasingly fierce power struggle on the global market the Swiss

government stood back and watched as the *Berna Biotec AG* was bought up by the *Dutch company Crucell*, in 2006. 2011 Crucell got taken over by the US-trust *Johnson & Johnson*. (cf. www.hls-dhs-dss.ch/textes/d/D41983.php)

Thus today self-supply is not ensured in Switzerland. The US mega-trust will rarely make it its most urgent task to ensure the rapid, high-quality and cost-efficient supply of Switzerland at any time.

For, in case an epidemic breaks out and we were in urgent need of imports, the probability is high that the foreign producers first of all will supply their own states. Above all, in a world of global trade with animals goods and people – a fact the Swiss government always uses as an argument for the necessity of the Act on Epizootic Diseases – a better self-supply should have first priority in the federal policy not only with respect to vaccines.

(Translation Current Concerns)

“The Act on Epizootic Diseases must absolutely be rejected” “One should put this WHO to the acid test”

Interview with Geri Müller, National Councillor, Green Party, Canton of Aargau



Geri Müller
(picture ma)

thk. During the autumn session there was a debate on the Epidemics Act in the National Council. There were several minority motions, all of which were rejected. However, in

the final vote in Parliament MPs from all major parties disagreed, with the exception of the SP. Both the current referendum on the Epidemics Act and the battle for a vote on the Act on Epizootic Diseases referendum provide an opportunity to conduct an urgent and extensive public debate, to which Current Concerns would like to contribute.

Current Concerns: Both the new Act on Epizootic Diseases on which the Swiss will vote on 25 November and the Epidemics Act which there is an ongoing referendum are highly controversial in the population. You also registered your opposition in the National Council. Why? What bothers you about this law?

National Councillor Geri Müller: Let us start with the Epidemics Act. There are good elements in this bill that argue in its favour. You have to deal with epidemics, there is no doubt. The error lies in focusing on the vaccination campaign on the one hand and the controllability of such a campaign on the other.

Why?

There are two aspects: One is the confidence and the belief that vaccinations could prevent a substantial percentage of diseases, which has increasingly become a farce in recent years. There are two factors which are responsible for this. For one, the vaccines are recommended in collusion with the chemical industry and prescribed later. Secondly, not enough is being evaluated in terms of the background of the viral or bacterial diseases. These are processes that need to be examined much more closely. Additionally, there is the international aspect. While only a few people are at risk in Switzerland, thousands of people die from simple diarrhoea in the third world. There is very little activity in this field. It has been a spectacular failure of the WHO, as well. The focus here is much too eurocentric.

The second aspect that has made me oppose the Epidemics Act is the situa-

tion in the area of professionals. I am the president of the cantonal association for care professionals. I know that our care professionals have a very good understanding of prevention. If now, however, compulsory vaccination is introduced in the contract of employment – and that is planned with this act – there arises a very problematic situation. Thus we put an impact on a field of work that is already heavily burdened, thereby turning more people away from these occupations. There are people who do not want to be vaccinated for professional reasons. I remember that I myself suffered terribly when I was vaccinated against hepatitis due to a false assumption. To me this is too global, an approach, based on the assumption that it could be used to increase safety dramatically.

What's more is that the flu vaccination is frequently carried out for lack of personnel; those who are sick should stay at home. But you can practically not allow yourself to stay at home anymore as we do not have enough staff and you get a bad conscience about your colleagues who have to take on the additional work. Nothing is being done about this problem, apart from dragging out the “vaccination hammer” in the hope that it will prevent people from getting sick. These are my main reasons why I am against it.

The debate has drawn attention to these two points again and again – that they should be dropped, because of legal problems and because they do not belong in the Epidemics Act. It would be much better to do more research in this field instead of generating such hypes that are the result of media campaigns. We can remember all these warnings about types of animal flus: swine flu, bird flu, etc., and in the end we found out there had been absolutely no danger. The whole world was talking about a pandemic for months, about something that never really existed.

Would the production of our own vaccines in our country improve the situation?

I do not think that this is necessarily the problem. What is missing today is a careful analysis, taking a dimension of about 15 to 20 years. I am basically in favour of international cooperation. It is important to exchange experiences and evaluate them together. But this must be done in public agencies and never in the chemical industry. I think that is the problem. The chemical industry has long been present internationally and leads campaigns to sell their drugs to the people.

We have been discussing the most problematic points of the Epidemics Act. How do you judge the Act on Epizootic Diseases? Are there not direct parallels?

I see a similar problem here. I know less about veterinary medicine than about human medicine, but I realized one thing during the entire debate about the cannabis initiative. When they wanted to ban the substance of the cannabis plant, they completely forgot that Swiss farmers have had a prevention product for centuries, protecting the health and safety of livestock. It has been a normal natural food additive and saved large animals from many illnesses. However, some sick animals remained that had to be treated by normal means, otherwise we would have had to kill these animals. Most of the time there are not very many. This is again a problem of maximizing profits. There may be no mature animal that cannot be used in an economical way. We must turn away from this concept.

The fight against blue tongue disease with different vaccines with too little testing led to major problems and side effects in the animals. The Act on Epizootic Diseases may order vaccinations by law. How do you assess that?

When blue tongue occurred I witnessed the first cases. During this time I was in constant contact with several organic farmers who said that they had remedies, but were requested to apply the vaccines. All of their remedies were exclusively based on natural plants that grow here in Switzerland. It can be said that nature always develops a counter cure for a disease. However, the canton forced the farmers to vaccinate, and in extreme cases their refusal resulted in the withdrawal of the operating license. This Act now will legitimize the things that led to the problems with the bluetongue disease.

Considering your statements we ought to reject the Act on Epizootic Diseases, too?

We do have to reject it, indeed. This law contains good parts with respect to the livestock, but they have already been covered by the new Farming Act. The Act on Epizootic Diseases has amendments that cannot be tolerated, and therefore we must reject it.

I would understand the people's NO-vote on this Act on Epizootic Diseases as well as the Epidemics Act because of these amendments.

America: From colony to nation to slave

by Michael Scheuer

As Americans fixate on the presidential campaign, they also should note the status of President *Obama* and Governor *Romney*. Yes, both are presidential candidates, but both are also men who – with their predecessors and the Congress – have willingly surrendered American sovereignty and independence to Israel and its US-citizen advocates (Jewish and Evangelical), their organizations, and much of the media.

In return for campaign contributions and positive media coverage, Obama and Romney have enslaved themselves and their country to Israel and some few thousands of disloyal Jewish-Americans and their equally disloyal Christian Evangelical allies. One has to wonder whether Obama and Romney refer to Israel's Prime Minister as "Massa' Benyamin," or whether they shuffle and pull their forelocks when groveling for money from Israel's Jewish-American and Evangelical operatives.

If independence and sovereignty mean anything for a national government, they mean that that government alone decides whether or not the country it governs will go to war. In the United States, more specifically, its means – constitutionally – that the Congress will decide via a formal vote whether it will declare war on behalf of the American people, who once upon a time were its constitutional masters. This

is, at any rate, how the Founders meant the process to work.

Both houses of the craven US Congress, however, have long since illegally delegated that decision to the President, and our current President regards the Congress with such contempt that he looks first to the UN to see if it is okay for him to bomb hell out of a country like Libya or some other offending party. If on the issue of war-making Israel has become America's master – and it has, despite Obama's cowardly ducking of a face-to-face with Massa' Benyamin – the UN surely is becoming its overseer. Congress, at day's end, simply and unquestioningly pays for the US troops who go off to die in wars that have nothing to do with protecting genuine US national interests, but do please Israel, the UN, or some figment of those militarist viragoes Mrs *Clinton* and Ms *Rice*, as well as of the pro-war boys *McCain* and *Graham*, such as the "democratic and human-rights-loving Libyan and Syrian freedom fighters."

So each of us can vote as we see fit in November, but we all should recognize that neither candidate intends to restore US sovereignty and independence. As president, either man will take America to war with Iran – Obama just wants it after 6 November – because that is what Israel and its US-citizen advocates want.

Michael Scheuer, born in 1952, historian and political analyst. In 1986 he did his doctorate on the relations of the British Empire-USA Canada-United Kingdom. During 22 years Scheuer was a CIA member until 2004 having directed the unit "*Usama bin Ladin*" from 1996 to 1999. After he had left the CIA he worked as a journalist for the news agency *CBS News* and *The Jamestown Foundation*. Today Scheuer is teaching at Georgetown University in Washington. Moreover he is a security expert for various television channels and he writes books. What he has become famous for was his book "*Imperial Hubris: Why the West is Losing the War on Terror*" which appeared anonymously on request of the CIA. In 2012 he supported *Ron Paul* as a candidate for the presidency referring to the views on foreign policy which the latter represented.

Iran, of course, poses no direct military threat to the United States, but it will exact a fierce and bloody revenge after we and Israel attack by using the intelligence/terrorist surrogates it has long maintained in the United States for just such a response.

continued on page 8

"The Act on Epizootic Diseases"

continued from page 5

The other points may be discussed again, but the rest cannot be regulated in this manner.

We do have existing laws, are they not sufficient?

As for the Act on Epizootic Diseases I can tell too little, and the Epidemics Act has already shown its flaws. The mandatory exchange of data is still regulated today in a very old-fashioned manner. The databases should be the same in all the cantons, and making entries must be simplified. In an emergency, time is essential. This point should be brought up again. We have already taken initiatives to do so. It must be made more comprehensible, so that you can do research and evaluate better.

I would like to come back to the extreme hysteria about the swine flu, in the course of which less people died than with seasonal flu ...

... and it even continues. You can actually say that the swine flu did not really exist.

The people who suffered from swine flu at that time, had other serious illnesses that covered the whole thing, as far as we currently know – and by an NGO report.

I am currently doing some training at a two-day security seminar in Solothurn, and part of it deals with communication. Yesterday a Communications Officer of the German government said, referring to a satellite crash – which may range from the worst-case scenario, the crash onto a nuclear power plant, up to the crash into an empty pit and includes nothing but speculation. He said: Only report what you really know, and not what you assume to know. This is exactly what happened with the swine flu. Thus, a common fear was spread, beyond good and evil. That teaches us a lesson. We must cease to suspect something of which we have no idea.

The WHO declared the highest level of pandemics with the swine flu. That was completely beyond all knowledge about the facts. Aren't there some advisors to the WHO who have close ties to the pharmaceutical industry?

I am not sure whether the pharmaceutical companies alone were the problem. Since

its foundation, WHO has been struggling for its recognition and for being acknowledged that it has something important to say. I have already mentioned that one of its first fights was against diarrhea. There it failed miserably. It could not get things done properly. Although it is a worldwide organization with an increasing number of members, it failed to tackle the great problems that would have required a global health action. With the swine flu, it hoped to have found something important, where it could take the lead and with which it could draw the attention towards its actions. Moreover, it is dependent on the money of the individual states. It may well be that one or the other friend of the pharmaceutical industry hoped to make lots of money. But the main point is just the first one. You should really check this WHO through with painstaking care: What are its motivations, what are the basics? The principle of "Health is the absence of disease" may indeed not be the only creed of the highest health authority.

National Councillor Mr Müller, thank you for the interview.

Is China losing the diplomatic plot?

by Kishore Mahbubani, political scientist and diplomat, Singapore

In 2016, China's share of the global economy will be larger than America's in purchasing-price-parity terms. This is an earth-shaking development; in 1980, when the United States accounted for 25% of world output, China's share of the global economy was only 2.2%. And yet, after 30 years of geopolitical competence, the Chinese seem to be on the verge of losing it just when they need it most.

China's leaders would be naïve and foolish to bank on their country's peaceful and quiet rise to global preeminence. At some point, America will awaken from its geopolitical slumber; there are already signs that it has opened one eye.

But China has begun to make serious mistakes. After Japan acceded to Chinese pressure and released a captured Chinese trawler in September 2010, China went overboard and demanded an apology from Japan, rattling the Japanese establishment.

Similarly, after North Korean shells killed innocent South Korean civilians in November 2010, China remained essentially silent. In a carefully calibrated response, South Korea sent its ambassador to attend the Nobel Peace Prize ceremony for the imprisoned Chinese human-rights activist Liu Xiaobo in December 2010.

China has also ruffled many Indian feathers by arbitrarily denying visas to senior officials. Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao subsequently calmed the waters in meetings with Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, but such unnecessary provocations left a residue of mistrust in India.

But all of these mistakes pale in comparison with what China did to the Association of Southeast Asian Nations in July. For the first time in 45 years, the ASEAN Ministerial Meeting (AMM) failed to agree to a joint communiqué, ostensibly because ASEAN's current chair, Cambodia, did not want the communiqué to refer to bilateral disputes in the South China Sea. But the whole world, including most ASEAN

countries, perceived Cambodia's stance as the result of enormous Chinese pressure.

China's victory proved to be Pyrrhic. It won the battle of the communiqué, but it may have lost 20 years of painstakingly accumulated goodwill, the result of efforts such as the ASEAN-China free-trade agreement, signed in November 2002. More importantly, China's previous leaders had calculated that a strong and unified ASEAN provided a valuable buffer against any possible US containment strategy. Now, by dividing ASEAN, China has provided America with its best possible geopolitical opportunity in the region. If Deng Xiaoping were alive, he would be deeply concerned.

It may be unfair to blame China's leaders for the ASEAN debacle. More likely than not, over-zealous junior officials pushed a hard line on the South China Sea, whereas no Chinese leader, if given the choice, would have opted to wreck the AMM Communiqué. But the fact that it happened reveals the scope of China's recent poor decision-making.

The "nine-dotted line" that China has drawn over the South China Sea may prove to be nothing but a big geopolitical millstone around China's neck. It was unwise to attach the map in a note verbale responding to a joint submission by Vietnam and Malaysia to the United Nations Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf in May 2009. This was the first time that China had included the map in an official communication to the UN, and it caused great concern among some ASEAN members.

The geopolitical opportunity implied by inclusion of the map has not been lost on America, which is why the US, somewhat unusually, has made another effort to ratify the Law of the Sea Convention. Having tabled the nine-dotted line at the UN, China walked into a no-win situation, owing to the difficulty of defending the map under international law. Indeed, as the eminent historian Wang Gungwu

has pointed out, the first maps to claim the South China Sea were Japanese, and were inherited by Nationalist China.

Domestically, too, the nine-dotted line may cause problems for the government by presenting critics with a useful weapon. Any hint of compromise will expose officials politically. In other words, a few rocks in the South China Sea have put China between a rock and a hard place.

There is no doubt that China will have to find a way to compromise over the nine-dotted line. In private, it has begun to do so. Even though the line covers the waters northeast of the Indonesian-owned Natuna Islands, the Chinese government has given Indonesia categorical assurances that China does not claim the Natuna Islands or their Exclusive Economic Zone.

These private assurances calmed relations with Indonesia. So why not make similar overtures to other ASEAN states?

The legacies of Deng and his predecessor, Mao Zedong, are very different. But the People's Republic's two most important leaders did agree in one area: both bent over backwards to make territorial concessions to resolve border disputes. This explains why China was so generous to Russia, for example, in its border settlements.

Mao and Deng could do this because both provided China with strong leadership. The challenge for the world now is that China has become politically pluralistic: no leader is strong enough to make wise unilateral concessions.

Nothing will happen in China until the leadership transition is completed in November. The new administration of Xi Jinping and Li Keqiang will need some time to settle in. But America is waking up. So, too, will the rest of the world in 2016. The big question then will be: Is China as geopolitically competent as number one as it was when it was number two? •

Source: project-syndicate.org

The Compact-Magazine invites to the conference:

"Which alliances does Germany need? – Unilateral orientation towards the USA or bridge from East to West?"

Contributors:

- Prof Peter Scholl-Latour
- Prof Dr K. A. Schachtschneider
- Willy Wimmer
- Helmut Schäfer
- Alexander Rahr
- Jürgen Elsässer
- Natalia Norochnitskaya
- John Laughland

24 November 2012, 9 a.m. – 6 p.m., Berlin

Tickets and further information, see konferenz.compact-magazin.com



The EU – a peacemaker in Nobel’s understanding?

by Horst Meyer, Germany

When in 2009 the winner of the Nobel Peace Prize was called *Barack Obama*, most people were very surprised, because apart from the slogans “change” and “yes we can” he had not yet contributed anything substantial to peace. Three years later, his current balance of activities with respect to peace does not appear different than those of the previous presidents *Bush sr.*, *Clin-ton*, *Bush Jr.* None of the wars instigated by George W. Bush has ended, but on the other hand the situation has aggravated by the brutal intervention of the NATO in Libya, not to mention the still not evacuated internment camp at Guantánamo in Cuba, or the occupation of Afghanistan and Iraq.

This year’s Nobel Peace Prize being awarded to a supranational body like the EU, the criteria that have led to the nomination and the award of the Nobel Peace Prize are becoming more and more questionable.

This year’s Nobel Peace Prize laureate is the European Union, because it is said to have contributed to a peaceful Europe over the last 60 years. When this message hit the airwaves on Friday, it met with general disapproval and indignation.

It is an indisputable fact that in the 20th century Europe has seen two major wars and that especially the last one has left deep scars in the people’s minds. It is also a reality that since that time Europe has not seen any more war of that magnitude and that there has been certain reconciliation between the countries. However, the Nobel Committee may hardly have failed to realize that since the Second World War peace has rested on shaky foundations in Europe as well, and that war has even returned to Europe with the collapse of the Eastern bloc.

Belligerent activities on the Balkans

Today some European countries’ activities in the 90s in the destruction of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia are obvious. In their research work “Operation Balkan” the authors *Mira Beham* and *Jörg Becker* thoroughly analyzed the

“America: from ...”

continued from page 6

Iran’s response likewise will wreck much of what remains of the US economy by disrupting the oil-tanker traffic in the Persian Gulf and perhaps elsewhere.

And all of this pain for what? Another unjustifiable and ahistorical reliance on air power to do what it has never done and cannot do without nuclear weapons – win a war. And so we will have yet another unfinished and lost war that will further stoke the fires of the aggressive cultural

The EU – a Nobel peacemaker? A critical voice from Norway

The Norwegian political elites have appropriated *Alfred Nobel’s* peace prize to use for their own purposes. Never was this demonstrated more clearly than through the European Union becoming 2012 winner.

For 40 years Norwegian leaders have pulled and pushed to get Norway into the Union. Defeated in two referendums, *Thorbjørn Jagland*, a former foreign minister and prime minister, now the Nobel Committee chair, took revenge against his recalcitrant compatriots.

Today’s Norwegian elites dismiss Nobel and his vision of a demilitarization of international relations. In 1895 they favored his peace vision so much that Nobel entrusted Norway’s Parliament with selecting the awarders, a committee of five devoted to a global peace order, “a fraternity of nations” explained in the will with indisputable clarity. Today Parliament believes in military strength, and, failing Nobel, selects the committee from its own ranks. Nobel’s disarmament prize has, in fact, landed in the hands of its political opponents.

The 2012 prize flunks the Nobel test, the EU is not global and not for demilitarization of international relations. The union plans to be a major economic and military entity, it is a major arms exporter, two nuclear armed member nations adamantly oppose all efforts for nuclear disarmament.

In March 2012 the Swedish Foundation Authority ordered the Norwegian awarders to reread the will, respect the purpose Nobel described, and ordered the Swedish foundation to rein in its Norwegian sub-committee and place it under strict supervision. Still, last week the Norwegian waywardness continued unabated.

Shielded by strict secrecy rules the awarders have long behaved as if they were above the law. They never produce anything resembling an honest response to criticism, making Nobel’s ingenious prize an increasingly devalued and shabby institution. Both Nobel and his champions of peace, and all citizens of the world, have reason to be very angry.

Fredrik S. Heffermehl,
Lawyer and author

Western influence in the destruction of Yugoslavia and the media manipulation directed from the outside. It becomes evident, how the European Western world has intentionally worked towards a secession of the constituent republics. Among other things, withdrawing credits and increasing interest rates made deliberate use of the economic hardship of the constituent republics in order to make the people go for each other. The result is only too well known. The illegal war of aggression violating international law waged against rest-Yugoslavia under the leadership of the US and the active participation of several European countries, including Germany, gave evidence of what the EU and its member states are

again able to do despite their promise of “Never again to war”.

Causa Austria – disregard of the democratic will

In 2000, the EU showed its true character. After a coalition of ÖVP (Austrian People’s Party – conservative) and FPÖ (Freedom Party of Austria – liberal) having assumed the reins of government on the basis of democratic elections in Austria, the country was subject to sanctions and the democratic rights of the people were treated with contempt. The alleged “peace model EU” does not tolerate an EU-critical government in an EU Member State. A so-called Reflection Group had to decide

continued on page 9

war both US political parties are waging on the Islamic world.

When America was part of Britain’s Empire, Americans – as loyal British subjects – had no choice but to be at war when the British Crown was at war. In the two-plus centuries since we won independence from Britain, we have declined in manliness, commonsense, and allegiance to our Constitution to the point where we will go to war at the behest of a foreign nation and in direct violation of US national interests. In addition, our major mainstream and cable networks use the public’s air-

waves to routinely act as agents of a foreign power by supporting Israel’s Prime Minister against the US President, while disloyal American citizens enthusiastically corrupt the US political system in support of Israeli interests, Evangelical fanaticism, and the one-world fantasies of the super-national and super-corrupt UN. ... Who knows, perhaps we were better off with the Crown. It fought often, but only for genuine British interests. •

Source: <http://non-intervention.com>,
2 October 2012

"The EU – a peacemaker ..."

continued from page 8

whether the sanctions were to be ended or not. They were ended only after the enforced resignation of *Jörg Haider* (FPÖ). Democratic rights were cold-bloodedly overruled. But not enough with that.

Wars of aggression violating international law – a specialty of the EU?

Almost all EU countries are involved in the war in Afghanistan which has been raging for 11 years. They experience every day what it means to be at war, a war being conducted with extreme brutality and in violation of the international humanitarian law. After 11 years of American and European presence, the people in the country are in a situation that is worse than ever before. What started with perverting international law and was legitimized by the expulsion of the Taliban has now become a war against the Afghan people, and an end to this killing is not in sight.

Even the illegal war of aggression against Iraq, which was started under flimsy and bogus pretexts by the USA in 2003 with the participation of some European countries, the so-called "coalition of the willing", in particular the UK, Poland, Italy, Spain, etc., has not been ended until today and has claimed tens of thousands of innocent victims. Meanwhile Britain and USA have secured their oil resources.

The war against Libya in 2011, under the pretext of "protecting civilians", was nothing more than a violent regime change to get rid of an unpopular ruler, and to

get hold of the country's natural resources. Alongside the US there were the EU members France, Britain, Italy at the cutting edge. Half of European NATO countries, that are also members of the EU, got involved in this covert war of aggression.

What is going on in Syria? If the EU had had its way – China and Russia prevented it – another war of aggression would have been provoked there with the participation of the EU. Germany played a very shameful role here alongside France and England.

Where do we find the EU's commitment to peace, which deserves appreciation and would have justified awarding the Nobel Peace Prize? Does the Nobel Peace Prize Committee also follow power policy considerations?

Wherever EU countries have participated in war, the peoples of the countries concerned objected war. The numbers in the polls amounted between 80% and 90%. So if ever the peaceful forces were to be strengthened, the peoples should play a crucial role.

Germany in the leading role – whereto?

In the US journal *Foreign Affairs*, highly respected press organ of the think tank "Council on Foreign Relations", the "Germanization of Europe" is favored as a way out of the EU crisis. Thereby Germany is to play a leading role in the EU, tailor-made for power-mad *Angela Merkel*. The plans of a European federation and the advancement of centralization within the EU are included in the mission for the self-proclaimed leader state

Germany. The following quote makes your ears prick up: "If we continental Europeans want to achieve unity and cooperation – and our whole future depends on establishing and maintaining unity and cooperation within Europe – two things are required of us: each people has to abandon the desire for power over the others and to abandon unlimited autonomy beyond the European order. In this sense, it should be Germany's own intent to become the standard-bearer of Europe, not its ruler. Germany should become the standard-bearer of a new Europe that is able to maintain its position and rank among the new world powers which it deserves according to its historical development and its cultural and economic power." This quote by the chairman of the IG Farben branch Donau Chemie AG, *Richard Riedl*, is from 1944.

It has become ever more evident that Germany is increasingly assuming a dominant role in the EU. The war rhetoric against Switzerland, which has been used for years to show the small independent and successful state who is the master, does not bode well for the future, if Germany is to become the "standard bearer" of the EU.

Switzerland – a guarantor of peace

If there is a state or state formation which ought to be awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, it should probably be Switzerland. Which country can claim not to have been involved in any wars for more than 150 years and which state with its organizations such as the Red Cross can claim to have contributed so much to peace and to the alleviation of other peoples' sufferings? Having a look at the list of past Nobel laureates, it is an honor not to be among them. This year's vote confirms that point of view. •

(Translation *Current Concerns*)

The carrot for Hypo Real Estate, the stick for Switzerland?

If Mrs *Merkel* now wastes three digit billions on the rescue of Spanish banks that have operated Mediterranean mismanagement, and on Levantine markets in the size of Greece, she is modeled on someone called *Peer Steinbrück*. This gentleman was Mrs *Merkel*'s minister of finance, at the time when the "Hypo Real Estate" – a German bank holding company in the legal form of a joint stock company – had heavy losses due to speculation and was practically bankrupt. The logical – constitutional – consequences would have been to let the bank go bankrupt and launch criminal proceedings against its directors. The minister of finance saw it differently, and the bankrupt bank was nationalized at the expense of taxpayers, the first "bailout" had happened!

This government intervention in the private sector was made possible by the "Act on the implementation of a package of measures to stabilize the financial market" (Financial Market Stabilization Act – FMStG)¹ of 17 October 2008, which on this memorable day was decided by the Bundestag, approved by the Bundesrat, signed by the federal president and announced in the "Bundesgesetzblatt" (Federal Law Gazette).

So when the law came into force the following day, cash could flow from the state treasury into the empty coffers of the bank-

rupts. This forerunner of ESM, EFSF, etc. was called "Financial Markets Stabilization Fund" (FMS) or "Special Funds for Financial Market Stabilization" ("SoFFin"), and while Mr *Steinbrück* redirected German national wealth into bankrupt German banks in the second half of October 2008, he also demanded to put Switzerland on the OECD "black list" of non-cooperative states, which at that time included only Liechtenstein, Andorra and Monaco as non EU members. Literally, the finance minister said, "We must not only use the carrot, but the stick." Especially the use of the word "stick" disturbed the government in Berne, saying that this wording was inadmissible.²

Therefore the *Steinbrück* case raises so many questions. In particular the unjust, arbitrary distribution of carrot and stick certainly provides ample food for thought. What is this man's understanding of power and authority? [...]

¹ BGBl. I 2008 p. 1982

² Quelle/URL: FAZ of 22.10.2008, <http://www.faz.net/aktuell/politik/ausland/streitum-steueroasen-schweiz-bestellt-deutschen-botschafter-ein-1713566.html>

Source: <http://www.staatsklage.de/> signed René Schneider, 2. October 2012

(Translation *Current Concerns*)

How about having a CPD again?

Dear friends

Recently *Peer Steinbrück* was rather annoyed and said that he was not "a servant of the capital". The man is right. This is a nasty insinuation. Or has anyone ever heard that a servant can make up to 700,000 euro extra money in three years? No, Mr *Steinbrück* is not a servant. You must defend him. On the contrary, he is quite an exquisite friend of the capital and the banks, and he heads the "extra money ranking" far ahead of the following 9 CDU and CSU politicians. Which party is this politician a member of? Does not matter – anyway he will only become vice-chancellor in a grand coalition.

My suggestion: How about having a CPD again? Capitalist Party of Germany. It will not be banned for sure.

Songwriter *Konstantin Wecker* on: www.wecker.de/tagebuch.php?ide=245

of 9 October 2012

(Translation *Current Concerns*)

The crisis is not over, merely postponed

If the central banks want no hyperinflation, they must stop the multiplication of paper money

by Beat Kappeler

For the *National Bank's* future phasing out of the Swiss franc's lower limit of 1.20 against the euro there are good and bad news.

Good news show in the euro's light limbo above the limit at occasionally Fr 1.21. This is a quiet sign that the euro has gained strength. A disintegration of the monetary union seems unlikely, since the *European Central Bank* has promised "unrestricted" funds for the support of the bankrupt south.

A phasing out of some member countries, possibly Greece, Spain or Portugal, would also strengthen the euro, because then it would be a strong currency of strong countries. Only in case the incredible mutual hooking-up between banks, central bank and national debts turned out as finally untenable, the euro-zone would be wiped out completely or the North would resign; for the bank balance sheets are full of states bonds of the almost bankrupt South. These in turn support their banks, and the central bank supports the states as well as the banks of the South – from which the deposits have been taken out and deposited in the North.

But at present things look like muddling through, after the huge paper money creation for the agglutination of all these bank balances, national debts and central bank facilities. In that case a respective inflating of the euro-zone would then have to reduce the national debts at the expense of savers and pension funds. This is the "internal agenda" of the Central Bank and the euro-politicians.

These are today's good news. Now let us go to the bad news. Since one year the Swiss franc has been unconditionally attached to this euro-zone. The National Bank inflates the paper money amount even stronger, and an inflation of the West will spread with the fixed exchange rate of 1:1 of the Swiss franc in Switzerland. The Swiss franc is to become a dull, unappealing currency.

It should feign consumption, as well. The inflation of the foreign countries is no longer cushioned by the rising franc and thus domestic stability protected. With that the Swiss' own path has come to an end after 40 years, the pride in a hard, unbending currency must be removed from the country's self-image.

Ernst Baltensperger's new book about the Swiss franc as a "Success Story" shows that after 1978, when the National Bank intervened less and created less money the inflation rose three years later up to 6.4%, nevertheless. However, the bad news of today merely hurt our national pride; by the intervention of the national bank with the franc's limit of 1.20 the success story is continued in different manner. The country has taken its choice: We save the export economy and our prosperity, we partially sacrifice the monetary value. In a world of paper-money-flinging central banks the good one cannot preserve stability. Thanks to one's own currency this choice could be made. The Swiss franc is a tool, it is no longer an objective in itself.

But how can we imagine the opting out? The Central Bank may extend their balance sheet arbitrarily. They buy up other currencies like the euro or dollar, hold these values on the asset side and hands out new Swiss francs as passives, as "a debt" to the public.

More than 80% of the bought up currencies are invested in state bonds especially of Germany, later also of France. Today the Swiss Central Bank is probably the biggest single creditor of Germany. This bears some interest and might be safe, in case Germany does not over do itself by granting too much aid to others. If the investors consider the Swiss franc as sufficiently banal and unappealing, as inflation-threatened as all the other currencies, the National Bank can sell the bought-up government securities and currency proceeds. That way it will retract

the before-spent Swiss francs and cancel them.

Today, however, all that is not yet lying ahead. First the deliberate "financial repression" of the US and euro-central banks will press the interest below the inflation rate for some years – thanks to the current paper money creation. The National Bank will probably go along with this, because higher interest in this country would attract inflows again. That would mean that also in our country money will be invested misdirected – into real estate, stocks, gold, raw materials.

One day, however, the public will no longer go along, it will require higher interests in dollar and euro. If the central banks want to avoid hyperinflation, they must stop the multiplication of paper money.

That way these currencies will rather rise, and thus the phasing out from the lower limit of 1.20 Swiss franc might succeed eventually. This can be also orchestrated gradually, while the National Bank rises to 1.22 franc, then to 1.25 franc thus threatening the foreign currency traders with insecurity and losses. In this case the devaluation of the franc would become self-sustaining. After this valley of impairment the Swiss franc may connect once more to its success story and become stable again. Until then, however, the whole West will see an incredible skid mark, because the normalisation of the interest will then bring with it the bankruptcies and the economic depression, which one is trying to avoid today with the creation of paper money.

The crisis is postponed not over, unless the politicians of the USA and the euro use the years of financial repression, of the expropriation of the savers, for serious reforms. Bad news, good news, depending on who is who: exporter, saver, real value owner or debtor. •

Source: *NZZ am Sonntag* from 14.10.2012
(Translation *Current Concerns*)

“The EU has been a corruption- and transfer institution since its beginning”

The “Mittelstandsinstitut Niedersachsen” (SME Institute Lower Saxony) warns against further aid to Greece!

by Prof Dr Eberhard Hamer

The German population is being deceived when told that due to “European solidarity” they had to contribute increasing amounts of billions of euros “to save Greece”; which means that we either have to pay higher taxes or pay less in social security, there- by providing for the means to help Greece.

Not only the causes, but also the conse- quences are false conclusions: The alleged aid to Greece does not reach the Greek peo- ple and the Greek economy, but is immedi- ately returned to the international vulture banks, which demand high interest rates on their loans to Greece. So virtually there is no Greek bailout performed, but the inter- national banks are fed so that they do not have to face write-offs for the Greek bonds they have been gambling away.

1. Germany paid 10.8 billion euro to Greece as their first tranche in the context of the alleged “Rettungsschirm” (first rescue fund). In the same week, Greek capital- ists transferred the same amount as flight capital out of the country. Therefore, the payments did not have any impact apart from pointlessly burdening the German taxpayer. Since then tax evasion has con- tinued in Greece. The higher the aid pay- ments we pay, the higher the flight capital leaving the country.

2. The EU has been a corruption and trans- fer institution since its beginning. It sub- sidized Greece most for a long time, with resources of which approximate- ly one third originated from Germany – 24.4% of all EU funds transfers from 2004 to 2008. Twenty years of subsidy have not improved the economic power of Greece, but they apparently have be- come used to this continuous drip.

Why has Germany accepted this squandering of their resources? Why has no government protested against this senseless bloodletting? And why do they nevertheless furnish additional funds over and again?

4. The subsidized EU member states have not only been content with annual sub- sidies from the solid states - especially Germany -, but have run into debts even more than the donor countries. During 2010, the entire euro zone was in debt with 85% of its economic output (GDP) on average (including Germany with 2% less), Greece managed 143%. The critical debt for Greece was then 329 billion euro, now it is more than 360 billion euro.

Meanwhile, Greece has repeated-ly sworn to do better and to become solid – just as it did recently again.

5. Greece has been fraudulently drawn by the American high finance (*Goldman Sachs* gang) to sow the spirit of discord in the EU and cannot deleverage by state bankruptcy, by which the loans of the high finance would be lost. Therefore, in the discussion about stabilization “private equity” is no issue, but only that the other European citizens should be liable and take over the debt. On balance, Greece is a test case for the debt and liability union desired by high finance, the total liability of all euro-zone countries – especial- ly Germany – for all loans of the high fi- nance in European countries. In other words: With the help of Greece and other debt-ridden countries debt bondage and lasting tribute duty of Europe in favor of US financial imperialism is established.

6. The European Commission is pulling at the same rope, aiming at more cen- tralization, more power and less na- tional rights for a long time. The fis- cal union and the ESM was a major breakthrough for the abolition of na-

tion states in Europe, which already started with the *Lisbon contract*, and the establishment of European provin- ces – as openly pronounced by Europe spokes- man *Juncker*.

Thus, further injections of money to Greece would not improve anything, only prolong it. Greece would not receive help, but Greek creditor banks. In contrast, there is the threat of total liability for the Greek and other European debt if the ESM is not stopped.

The current euro crisis is not about Eu- rope, but about the question who has to do penance for the debt flippancy: The credi- tor banks, the individual states or all states, including the solid ones. The ESM pursues the third alternative. This would, howev- er, not be a solution, but only a delay, and would result in a total collapse of the euro system or inflationary disintegration of euro values by a series of individual break- downs of individual countries. •

(Translation *Current Concerns*)

Financial markets boom

Goldman makes billions in profit

In the third quarter US-investment bank Goldman Sachs has again gained sub- stantially. In spite of a “challenging eco- nomic environment” the performance has been respectable, says chairman of the bank Blankfein. And that is how ana- lysts see things, as well. With it Goldman Sachs joins the list of winners like Mor- gan JP Chase and Wells Fargo.

Thanks to the recovery on financial mar- kets US major bank *Goldman Sachs* won again admirably. The financial institution was able to make more than double profits in the third quarter and returned to profit- ability. Besides, above all notable rises in share prizes were extremely beneficial for the worldwide leading investment bank by own investments in securities which profited from an economic stimulus by the US cen- tral bank *Federal Reserve*. Also investment banking in total came off much better again.

Goldman showed an unexpectedly big profit of 1.5 billion dollars, after a loss of 428 million dollar a year before. The income rose by 133 percent to 8.4 billion dollars and was also clearly about experts’ forecasts.

With it *Goldman* joined the row of posi- tive balances of US-bank giants like *JP Mor- gan*, *Wells Fargo* and *Citigroup*. The stimu- lation in the capital market business, which came almost to a standstill in early summer

because of the insecurity by the euro-debt crisis, contributed substantially to the re- sult. Thus the income in investment banking climbed of about 49 percent. However, com- mercial transaction and business with compa- ny mergers are slowly regaining momentum. Consequently *Goldman* boss *Lloyd Blank- fein* spoke cautiously of a basically respect- able result in view of the difficult economic environment. He raised the quarter dividend from 46 to 50 cents for each share certificate.

In the meantime US major banks again gained as much as they did before the fi- nancial crisis. The branch’s major player *JP Morgan* picked up net 5.7 billion dollars in the third quarter, competitor *Wells Fargo* five billion dollars. Although the *Citigroup* billions-worth write-offs on a broker’s joint venture affected the net result. However, before exceptional items the profit grew about 27 percent to 3.3 billion dollar.

European financial institutions are still far away from such results. However, these figures allow investors to be optimistic that after five years the crisis in the financial sector is slowly reaching its end. •

Source: sla/rts/dpa, www.n-tv.de/economy/Goldman-mit-Milli- ardenGewinn-article7487101.html

(Translation *Current Concerns*)

“We have to stop thinking, the Greek were lazy, they are among those in Europe who work most”

“Current Concerns” interview with Joseph Zisyadis



Joseph Zisyadis
(picture ma)

g/hhg. In the following interview Joseph Zisyadis, a profound expert on the Greek situation, describes the causes of the crisis in Greece. For a long time he has observed the one-sided orientation of the economy towards

tourism and its negative impact on agriculture and the population. However, he has never only analyzed Greek shortcomings, but developed the Patoinos Project by word and deed as a way to remedy the crisis. Starting from the fact that a few decades ago Greece still had a flourishing agriculture with appropriate wine exports, he established the Patoinos Project connecting to these resources.

On Patmos in the Aegean Sea, he started an agro-ecological project in whose center he put the renewed cultivation of old Greek wine, in connection with a school for vine growing. The people on the island can now – in addition to a sustainable tourism – re-start working on their soil, growing their own vegetables and harvesting and processing their olives. In addition, a seed bank is established, which provides the population with original seeds adapted to the insular conditions. Thus the rich variety and diversity of seeds is maintained and a dependence on the big seed companies is avoided. In a later issue *Current Concerns* will introduce this pioneering project in detail.

Current Concerns: Major media report that the Greek themselves were to blame for the crisis. What are the reasons for the current crisis in Greece?

Joseph Zisyadis: There are several reasons. First, not all Greek are responsible. There are some Greek who have plunged the people into this crisis. There is no nation which would be destined to live in a crisis or to be bad. You have to stop thinking that the Greek are lazy. They are among those in Europe who are currently working most.

You have to know the history of Greece. This country was occupied by the Ottoman Empire until 1912. The country had to face a war against fascism and then a civil war.

In 1967 Greece experienced a CIA coup with subsequent military dictatorship until 1974. Each time, it was an extreme-

ly difficult time. The country has always been very poor.

The main problem is that in recent years important political decisions were taken. The Greek elites who wanted to lead Greece into the great globalization wanted to make Athens a European metropolitan city like Paris, London or Berlin. A

In Greece there are two political parties that have divided the country among themselves since 1974. These two parties, when they came to power, employed 50,000 officials. Four years later when the other party rose to power, they employed another 50,000 officials.



View of Patoinos, Domaine de l'apocalypse in Petra on Patmos. (picture jz)

typical example was the Summer Olympics of 2004. They plunged the country into debts that an entire generation of people will have to pay for.

I believe that all political decisions that were made during those years led to this crisis. It was of course prepared in advance. Today the situation is very serious, because the banks have decided that the public should pay. Why do they request 7% interest from Greece, whereas they borrow money from the European Central Bank at a 1% interest? There is no reason for that. If we could borrow the money at 1%, Greece wouldn't have a crisis. The problem is that we must give that much money to the banks. This is money that is missing for the people to make a fresh start; it is needed to recapitalize the banks and to spend it on the military. You have to know that Greece is second regarding worldwide military spending per capita.

Is the military budget that big?

Yes, indeed. The submarines are supplied by France. And the countries that provide the weapons insist on the reimbursement. Do we stop military spending then? No! We continue!

50,000 additional officials?

Yes, indeed! The political parties want to preserve their voting clientele. Another reason for the crisis are the Greek ship-owners. They own one of the largest merchant fleets in the world. The taxes they pay are absolutely minimal, actually nothing at all. In addition, they often sail under foreign flags: Panama, Chile, etc. And even those who are registered

continued on page 13

Joseph Zisyadis, Swiss-Greek dual citizen, studied theology in Lausanne and was a pastor in Paris, afterwards.

From 1983 to 1994, he worked as a cantonal secretary of the “Parti Ouvrier Populaire” (Swiss party of Labour) in the Canton of Vaud. During 1994 to 1996, he acted as secretary of the mother party “Partei der Arbeit in der Schweiz”, PdA (Swiss Party of Labour). Since 1998, again he was political secretary of the Parti Ouvrier Populaire in the Canton of Vaud.

From 1996 to 1998, he was a member of the cantonal government of Vaud, heading the Department of Justice, Police and Military Affairs. He was a member of the Swiss National Council from 1991 to 1996 and from 1999 to 2011.

“We have to stop thinking, the Greek ...”

continued from page 12

in Greece have enjoyed big tax breaks for years. The church also contributes nothing to the tax revenue. The church owns about 10% of the state's territory and has an immense fortune in real estate. They pay no taxes on their property. If these three things were settled, Greece would not be in the situation in which it finds itself today.

So you would have to reduce military spending, demand taxes from rich ship-owners and claim property taxes from the church?

This would be the base. It would lead to a different policy.

Should the drachma not be reintroduced?

The current European policy will inevitably lead to the reintroduction of the drachma. I personally believe that this will happen very soon. A few days ago, I welcomed the very words of the Bulgarian Prime Minister. Europe told them they could join the euro. But they answered, “No, no, we do not want to join the euro”. For the Bulgarians are virtually debtfree today. Greece, however, is strangled by the powerful banks, that do not abandon their prey.

There is no reason why Goldman should give up their business. This reminds us of the actions of the IMF (International Monetary Fund) against the Third World countries. The IMF granted these countries huge loans just to determine their policies subsequently.

Is the Greek government under Antonis Samaras actually selling the national capital?

Yes, they are. They sell the National Lottery, the national mail, the electricity, the gas, the islands, ports and railways. They sell everything which is then purchased by the French, the Germans, and several other foreign powers.

The entire national wealth, everything the country once developed and built up.

If the Greek had their own budget, it would be different. For us in Switzerland, it is important that we maintain our independence.

Absolutely!

I prefer doing projects like *Patoinos*. These are minor projects, but *Patoinos* is not the only one. In Greece, there are other similarly small projects. Today,

there is more direct selling between agricultural producers and the city dwellers. Greece is a country that needs to develop in an entirely different direction. Today, there are three cities with a total of 7 million people compared to a total of 10 million people. The three cities are: Athens, Piraeus, and Thessaloniki. 70% of the population live in these cities. Everything is concentrated there. The landscape is empty, desert-like. It takes campaigns for the people to return to the countryside. You have to encourage decentralization. I do not see any such projects in Greece on the part of the EU. They do not want them anyway. The EU never knows what it wishes: one year it tells the Greek to destroy all the olive trees – 20 years ago they actually uprooted olive trees! Today the EU gives subsidies to plant olive trees again. Because olive oil is considered very healthy today ... That is right. Olive trees, family farms and local tourism respecting the environment and all of them using solar energy, that would be wonderful for Greece.

What significance do projects such as Patoinos have for the population?

It will give the people the opportunity to be independent and build on their own potential. Whatever may happen, there will inevitably be a disaster. I have had phone calls from friends almost every week during the last 20 years, asking me “When will you be coming to Greece? Do not forget to bring this or that kind of medicine.” There is almost no medicine in the country. Since the pharmacist must pay for everything in advance, he will not get any more drugs. People have nothing left to buy them on their own. Today there are a large number of people with cancer or heart problems, and psychosomatic illnesses add to them. They all do not even have the money to buy the necessary drugs. It is terrible. We are back to the days when you packed ten, fifteen or twenty different drugs in your suitcase to bring them to friends.

Does the current situation in Greece resemble the one in third world countries?

Yes, it does. People are digging through trash cans. They commit suicide. The suicide rate is much higher now. Previously, the Greek hardly committed suicide, as suicide contradicts the tradition of the Greek. For the Orthodox, this is very difficult; they have always believed that you must not take your own life. In Switzerland, however, people were more used to that. We have always had a rela-

tively high suicide rate, here. In Sweden, as well, but not in Greece. Now people have no future and prefer not to become a burden to their children. They leave their property behind, a home for their children, and say I, at least, I am gone. It is awful.

We cannot accept such a situation as Europeans. We really need to find alternatives.

This is important. The alternative is not to deliver grand political speeches. People need small things to be proud of. I do this in my corner. I am proud, I will defend it. Because if you have created something yourself, you will defend it. The grand political ideas, however – leave them for better times to come. ...

We understand that projects like Patoinos could really show a way out of the crisis.

Yes, you could say so. The old structure of the country, which made it possible that the Greek agriculture was very productive, was destroyed. Greece is a very fertile country; it is not normal to buy tomatoes in Holland. Greece, however, hardly produces anything today. Local agriculture must be reestablished, by all means. Therefore you should not introduce the GM products. That would be a catastrophe, the seeds that cannot reproduce. I was in Tunisia two years ago, when the revolution was underway. We belonged to the first parliamentary delegation. When I am in a foreign country, I always go to look for local seeds, everywhere. I was at the central market in Tunis, “Do you still have tomato seeds? I want to take them to Switzerland.” – “They have not yet arrived.” – “What do you mean?” – “Well, they always come from Holland in March.” – “So there are no more domestic seeds?”

Nothing local anymore?

I think in the rural areas there are still people who collect the seeds. But in the major agricultural areas is very different now, even in Greece. Therefore, the environmental organizations that store the seeds, are very important. In Switzerland, we are lucky because we are not dependent. If we were in the EU, we would have the same situation.

Your project in Patoinos proves that everyone with compassion, energy and determination can contribute to the solution of the most urgent social and economic problems of our time. Thank you very much for this interview. •

Cooperatives and small-scale farmers as a key to feeding the world

Statement by FAO Director-General José Graziano da Silva on the occasion of the World Food Day on 16 October 2012

Honorable Staffan de Mistura,
Under-Secretary of State, Italian Ministry for
Foreign Affairs
Honorable Ministers,
Heads of Delegations,
Mr. Kanayo Nwanze, President of International
Fund for Agricultural Development,
Ms Ertharin Cousin, Executive Director of
World Food Programme
Mr. Emile Frison, Director-General, Bioversity
International,
Mr. David Nabarro, Special Representative
to the UN Secretary General on Food Security
and Nutrition
Mr. Luc Guyau, Independent Chair of the
Council
Representatives of civil society and the private
sector,
Distinguished guests, Ladies and Gentlemen

I declare now open this 32nd World Food Day which coincides with the 67th anniversary of the founding of FAO.

First of all let me say how pleased and honored I am this morning to acknowledge the presence of Ms. Elizabeth Atangana, FAO Special Ambassador for the International Year of Cooperatives. Her presence here today, after a long trip from Cameroon, is a vivid testimony of her commitment to the global effort to ensure universal food security.

The theme of World Food Day "Agricultural cooperatives – key to feeding the world" highlights the role of cooperatives in improving food security and contributing to the eradication of hunger. By drawing world attention to this strategic issue, it is my hope that this year's World Food Day will be an important milestone on the road to achieving the sustainable policy and program efforts needed to feed the present and future generations.

World Food Day gives us an opportunity to take stock of a progress we made, we have made, in our efforts to guarantee the right to food to all.

Last week FAO, IFAD and WFP presented the 2012 edition of the State of Food Insecurity in the World, SOFI. The report shows that we have made some pro-

gress towards achieving the first Millennium Development Goal, to halve the proportion of undernourished people by the year 2015.

But it also shows that that progress has slowed since 2007. Nearly 870 million men, women and children still go hungry every day. In Africa and in the Near East the number of undernourished people is still growing.

We cannot allow that in a world of plenty. We already produce enough food for every human being.

At the Rio+20 Conference on Sustainable Development, UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon launched the Zero Hunger Challenge, bringing together hunger eradication and zero stunting in children and stunting eradication, 100% increase in small farmer productivity, 100% sustainable food production, and zero food waste and loss.

I truly believe that it is possible to reach zero hunger, if we work together, focus our attention, and coordinate our efforts.

Farmers are an important part of this effort. Small-scale farmers are the main providers of food in many countries around the world, but they are also among the world's poorest people. Cooperatives can help smallholder farmers to overcome these constraints. As the theme of this year's World Food Day proclaims: they are key to feeding the world.

This year, FAO opened a liaison office space for farmers and cooperatives, here in our Headquarters. And, we are working to raise awareness of the important role of agricultural co-operatives play and build joint programs with them.

We do this with the collaboration of IFAD and World Food Programme and in coordination with the Inter-Agency Committee for the Promotion and Advancement of Cooperatives.

We work also with other partners, such as the International Labour Organization; the UN's Department of Economic and Social Affairs; the International Co-operative Alliance, and the World Farmers' Organization, private sectors and NGOs all around the world.

Cooperatives hold a key to feeding the world, but so do governments, civil society and private sector to achieve food security for all we need to work all together. It is not enough to reduce hunger. Let us set bold goals: With hunger, the only acceptable number is zero.

In my country there is a song that says a dream that we dream alone it is only a dream, but a dream that we dream together becomes real.

Thank you for your attention. •

Source: www.fao.org

Current Concerns

The international journal for independent thought, ethical standards, moral responsibility, and for the promotion and respect of public international law, human rights and humanitarian law

Publisher: Zeit-Fragen Cooperative

Editor: Erika Vögeli

Address: Current Concerns,

P.O. Box, CH-8044 Zurich

Phone: +41 (0)44 350 65 50

Fax: +41 (0)44 350 65 51

E-Mail: CurrentConcerns@zeit-fragen.ch

Subscription details:

published regularly electronically as PDF file

Annual subscription rate of
SFr. 40,-, € 30,-, £ 25,-, \$ 40,-
for the following countries:

Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brunei, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hongkong, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Qatar, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, USA

Annual subscription rate of
SFr. 20,-, € 15,-, £ 12,50, \$ 20,-
for all other countries.

Account: Postscheck-Konto: PC 87-644472-4

The editors reserve the right to shorten letters to the editor. Letters to the editor do not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of *Current Concerns*.

© 2011. All rights reserved. No reproduction, copy or transmission of this publication may be made without written permission.

On the death of major general, Dr iur Hans Bachofner (1931–2012)

me. We remember a very educated, literate, lively contemporary. He impressed by a precise choice of words characterizing his extraordinary power of thought. He knew the strategic positions on our planet better than anyone else, and not only the military ones. He closely observed the trends and classified them in the course of contemporary world history and in a personal view of humanity. His analyses were perceptive, his thinking went far beyond the normal limits; he never offered simple, ready-made recipes, but stimulated further reflection and considered his own ideas as an intermediate result in a changing world. In this sense, he was highly innovative.

He attached no importance to wealth and the pursuit of externals, for he represented the small State of Switzerland and its constant factors with an inner conviction. He was sure to defend something for which the effort is worthwhile: a common self-governed life within direct democracy, representing the everlasting armed neutrality towards the outside. He appreciated those citizens who he trained to be soldiers; he trained them hard, because his goal was to be fit for war. His relentless demands were adopted as they were factually justified and because he went ahead with a personal role model. For many of his students the classes with him were highlights, which decisively contributed to their personal development.

Bachofner felt it a burden that he had to require the utmost of the people entrusted to him in an emergency – the hazard of their own lives. He was very caring, he consistently built up the new medical service in the army, and after a period as commander of the General Staff Schools, he was most recently Chief of Staff for opera-

War has returned – but we have lost respect

- “It has been going on for eight weeks now,
- the first war of the post-war generation
 - the first war of the 68-generation in government responsibility
 - the first war of the new Left on both sides of the Atlantic, the war of the gentlemen Clinton, Blair and Schroeder
 - the first war for human rights, for values instead of territory
 - the first war of NATO ever
 - the first war after implementing the new strategy concept
 - the first war, NATO’s war of aggression, after 50 years of defense doctrine
 - the first major war without a UN mandate against a sovereign state
 - the first war in which the United States now also crassly violate the arms control agreements of the OSCE (Vienna Document of 1994)
 - the first war of the Germans since the Second World War
 - the first purely aerial warfare with prior notice that certainly no one will fight on the ground.

So many premieres is rare. And they failed completely. The war in Kosovo is still escalating, it has repercussions until Russia and China, but the signals for the opening of the final game move back and forth. Soon the Europeans who are unfamiliar to war will learn the next lesson in military history. It is called: ‘When the war is over, it is not yet over.’ It will haunt us for a long time in the constant struggle for a new world order.”

Hans Bachofner, retired Major General, on 19.05.1999 in Zurich

“Neutrality has proven its high value. It enables us to help in a more appropriate way instead of participating in a messed up war. It protects against publicity-seeking activism of politicians in a rush of emotion. It is a method tailored for a restless future which allows us to maintain independence and freedom. But it should not be further undermined.”

Hans Bachofner, retired Major General, in his presentation “War has returned, but we have lost respect”, 19 May 1999

condensed precise underlines and differentiated comments on the edge to concise summaries. Those who were given one of these commented books could learn a lot from the working technique alone. “Thinking is exhausting”, he said, who as a young man had enthusiastically boxed in the middle categories, “but you can train the brain such as the biceps and the triceps, it takes the same discipline.”

The mainstream was no orientation to him; it was worth nothing to him. He knew himself what he believed to be right. Freedom of thought was important to him, and therefore it made him sit up and take notice when muzzles were distributed. Then, he reliably became mor-

continued on page 16

tional training, so top teacher on the issues of strategy and planning.

He would talk to others, also to officers of other armies, driven by an inner interest and always by his own moral conviction to be part of a venerable citizens’ army. He passed this attitude over, it was contagious and he always put the military service into the wider context and made it a service for the protection of the community.

He supported the young, women, entrepreneurs, professionals with his advice and assistance. The lunches with him were inspiring fireworks of common thinking, of joy and sometimes of the muses. He always brought with him new books or extracts from the countless foreign newspapers and magazines which he read every day. Again and again he took new publications and withdrew into the mountains, where he not only read them, but worked them through with full concentration in his retreat. He

Sanctions recognized as a means of being forced into line in collectives?

“Do we really have to join a protecting power? Can we offer our independence in exchange for security? How much independent initiative is possible? How much stability do government, parliament and the people have in order to withstand our neighbors’ enormous pressure trying to force us into line? Has the EU-Austria affair been recognized as a classic example of a country being forced into line in a collective?”

Hans Bachofner, retired Major General, 13 May, Berne, general meeting of AUNS (Campaign for an Independent and Neutral Switzerland)



dant. He also hated vanities and people who think that at the large table in Brussels, Mons or Washington the milk was sweeter than at home. He was the first who warned the 1968 generation after the Kosovo war: "War has come back again – but we have lost the respect." In his perceptive analysis he stood up for a clever, cautious and predictable position of the neutral small state. His skepticism about armed foreign missions and the neo-colonial allied operations grew and grew. He decidedly opposed the paradigm shift of

the army XXI, rightly, as we know. Many politicians in Berne agreed with him internally, they had however not developed the same courage that characterized him.

In recent years, he repeatedly called for "Thinking the unthinkable" on family, business and community level. He relied on the dormant power of civic virtues and the community. He was sure that autonomous, independent people in free, direct democratic societies would develop better and more sustainable solutions. Responsibility must be visible and may not be collective,

was his credo. A look into the EU makes us agree once more.

He called himself a *Cassandra*. For him it was a duty and a privilege to be ahead of others. "Stay able to defend yourself, think the unthinkable", he wrote as dedication in different books.

He was man, a thinker and a military officer in good Swiss confederate tradition. We mourn with the relatives and will keep the work of this personality in our memory and in our hearts, and indeed actively: as heritage and as a mandate. •

Current Concerns

The international journal for independent thought, ethical standards, moral responsibility, and for the promotion and respect of public international law, human rights and humanitarian law

Subscribe to Current Concerns – The journal of an independent cooperative

The cooperative *Zeit-Fragen* is a politically and financially independent organisation. All of its members work on a voluntary and honorary basis. The journal does not accept commercial advertisements of any kind and receives no financial support from business organisations. The journal Current Concerns is financed exclusively by its subscribers.

We warmly recommend our model of free and independent press coverage to other journals.

Annual subscription rate of

CHF 40,-; Euro 30,-; USD 40,-; GBP 25,-

for the following countries:

Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brunei, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hongkong, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Qatar, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, USA

Annual subscription rate of

CHF 20,-; Euro 15,-; USD 20,-; GBP 12,50

for all other countries.

Please choose one of the following ways of payment:

- send a cheque to *Current Concerns*, P.O. Box, CH-8044 Zurich, or

- send us your credit card details (only *Visa*), or

- pay into one of the following accounts:

CH:	Postscheck-Konto (CHF):	87-644472-4	IBAN CH91 0900 0000 8764 4472 4	BIC POFICHBEXXX
CH:	Postscheck-Konto (Euro):	91-738798-6	IBAN CH83 0900 0000 9173 8798 6	BIC POFICHBEXXX
D:	Volksbank Tübingen, Kto. 67 517 005, BLZ 64190110		IBAN DE12 6419 0110 0067 5170 05	BIC GENODES1TUE
A:	Raiffeisen Landesbank, Kto. 1-05.713.599, BLZ 37000		IBAN AT55 3700 0001 0571 3599	BIC RVVGAT2B