

Andreu Ginestet

<https://grey.civocracy.org/ams/article>

<https://grey.civocracy.org/discussions/790/kan>

To Pekka Haavisto, Minister of foreign affairs

Copy:

Sauli Niinistö, President of the Republic of Finland

Open Letter to be published online

Tuesday, 26th April 2022

Dear Minister Pekka Haavisto,

First of all I wish to thank you for your kindness at the reception and the time you devoted to our conversation in the ministry of foreign affairs. It was a pleasure to meet you. I would be happy to meet again, as and if political affairs demand so.

It is in the field of common awareness, that the subjects and arguments exposed in our conversation may contain aspects new to any person and require reading and thought. This has been the case in most of the conferences in which such themes were discussed, including each SDA/NATO/EU/UN conference to which I assisted. This is including the conference 2012 in which I talked privately to i.e. James Townsend, and 2014 with Alexander Vershbow and Jason Healy.

It comes with no surprise that we now read the public signatures of representatives of institutions that were in the first meeting we i.e. 2012 had at opposite ends, in peace recommendations on how to lower the risk of conflict. Javier Solana in September 2020 signed, together with 55 other former world leaders, an open letter urging the ratification of the Nuclear Arms Ban Treaty (https://www.icanw.org/56_former_leaders). Alexander Vershbow and General Breedlove i.e. signed, together with 144 other prominent ministers, ambassadors, admirals, professors etc., the European Leadership Network document – Recommendations of the Participants of the Expert Dialogue on NATO-Russia Military Risk Reduction in Europe, December 2020 (<https://www.europeanleadershipnetwork.org/group-statement/the-expert-dialogue-on-nato-russia-risk-reduction-seven-recommendations/>) The reason we see these signatures needs no explanation. Peace work progressed generally. My documents circulate in all the circles in which my notions were presented and helped avoiding worst case scenarios, Javier Solana and others being in the room.

It is a happy circumstance we met on Friday as to allow for a second thought before any decision is final. We came to you as an international group to offer critical information as to prevent that it takes 10 years before we read your signature in approaches to conflicts as we pro-



pose them. It would be a pity to let events develop in a way that leads to a path of irrelevance in irrelevant institutions. We came as a group to ask for your attention, your understanding, and to ask you to reconsider the entry of Finland into NATO.

I respect the position you took on Saturday at the delegation of the Green party confirming the intention of the green party to step into NATO. This makes your position very clear. We now must wait and see how Russia and China will react. I am sure we will soon have a reaction. I am especially interested in your plans to work for peace- while entering NATO. Our conversation reinforced the green party trend, as well as your own commitment, to work for disarmament and dialogue. We will obviously see how Russia, as well as NATO, reacts upon this suggestion, because in my perspective, and in the view of the statements out of the hand written Protocol from June 4th 2014 SDA full assembly session, which you now have, NATO never was willing to deliver peace since its founding 1949.

We must keep the real example of Mahatma Gandhi in perspective, which is at opposite ends with the use of weapons. His success proves that the way chosen by the UN 1948 and NATO 1949 is not coherent with peace methods.

Hence, if your intent seriously is to defy militarism and convey peace, it could happen that NATO either declines Finland's application, because peace work means trouble or it could be that Finland simply must comply with what NATO commands, once Finland is within NATO. Obviously this will all be ascribed in the negotiations. For you to know, Jamie Shea, my longstanding sparring-partner within NATO, just offered a glimpse of understanding of the possible future role of NATO, which seems to be defined by the war in Ukraine, as a means to i.e. combat aggressive attacks by autocrats and this debate is publicly available. I am adding the perspective for you of what Jamie Shea labels catastrophic success and where he discusses Sweden and Finland coming into NATO: <https://network2020.org/event/has-nato-found-its-21st-century-purpose/> In this statement he more than clearly defines the border with Russia as ground for NATO defense alliance to work, leaving no doubt that Russia is the enemy. In contrast listen carefully to the statements of Rajan Menon.

I stick to my proposal, and offer you my full support regarding any need for the explanation or discussion of all the notions I exposed to you on Friday. If you need more talking, explanation and debate I am ready to work for Finland and Sweden and for the sake of peace between all nations.

As I clearly stated: The entry of Finland into NATO is in the light of the arguments we discussed an atavism. In Peace work, we changed the narrative. What we explained in our meeting with you is that we allocated the concept of the enemy to the very system of violence. The system of violence is an abstract entity. The system of violence uses human beings for the purpose of achieving the targets of the system of violence. The system of violence is defeated with health, education, covering basic needs, etc. Military not only plays no role in this endeavor, because it is not trained for the task. Military and weapons are used to destroy human



happiness by all means and destroy options of peace inflicting collective trauma. NATO is the equivalent of a trigger to and bringer of collective trauma.

We must understand this point of view from the statements published i.e. in the Los Angeles Times stating that Finnish population is preparing for an invasion, “*As Finland considers NATO membership, citizens mobilize for an invasion by Russia*” and “*It may not be dramatic to most people outside Finland, but in Finnish politics to say that Russia is a potential threat and the cause for reevaluating our security policy is quite dramatic,*” he said. “*It was always obvious, but to say it is quite new.*” Finland is not preparing for peace work and i.e. non violent resistance? <https://www.latimes.com/world-nation/story/2022-04-24/as-finland-considers-nato-membership-citizens-mobilize-for-an-invasion-by-russia>

You may as well wish to understand where Finland is heading with regards to trauma if as stated in the Government report on changes in the security environment PUBLICATIONS OF THE FINNISH GOVERNMENT 2022:20 vn.fi /en on page 51: “*Finland deposits its instrument of accession with the Government of the United States.*”. You may particularly wish to understand the meaning of it in the face of the news spread in newspapers like The Economist: “*Pentagon chief’s Russia remarks show shift in US’s declared aims in Ukraine - Defense secretary Lloyd Austin said he ‘wants to see Russia weakened’ – a sign Washington now defines its goals differently.*” <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2022/apr/25/russia-weakedend-lloyd-austin-ukraine>

The Finnish “Government report on changes in the security environment” also hints to the fact that fear is the counselor, as exposed by Heidi Meinzolt in her Mail to you on April 22nd. Regarding the green party hopes to promote peace and disarmament in NATO from the inside, Margot Wahlström, former foreign minister of Sweden, had the same hopes as you. She got her warning from the US and resigned.

The bigger picture in which the European conflicts will be treated together with conflicts surging in Asia must be seen too. As Scott Ritter and Raymond McGovern point at we must listen to the last 5 minutes which are a direct warning to Finland (at 26.26 minutes in the interview). [Scott Ritter & Ray on Ukraine: “Russian ‘Incoming’ To Destroy Weapons Coming In” – Ray McGovern](#)

In the face of the new narrative based on research in science it would be an act of the past century to adhere to NATO. This option is adding unnecessary delay to the unfolding of the new narrative, in fact initiated by Gandhi, and would increase suffering to the transformation society needs. It could provide - if the decision proves wrong, which is in my understanding the case - much more trauma, where we do not want it.

Dear Minister Pekka Haavisto, it is clear to me, that you collected experiences in the field, i.e. in Africa, and in the field of disarmament that make it easy for you to understand my words. Please feel no offense if I use arguments you’re used to and tired of reading.



I guess we easily agree if I suggest that what is lacking in all the letters and documents we all read, including the government report, is the ability to put ourselves in the position of the Russian people. I do not need to mention that the Russians are surrounded by NATO bases filled with those people who planned a 10.000 megaton bomb, that the Russians had to divert with the Tsar-Bomba, surrounded by the US, that had a plan called Dropshot to annihilate Russia, the US that dropped two nuclear bombs on Japan, that has invaded Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya and so many other countries. I do not need to state what NATO did for the sake of "energy security" (because Sorin Ducaru states it for NATO on June 4th, 2014 as you can read in the protocol I handed over).

There is no need to state all the aggressive wording we receive must be interpreted as a backwards rolling and unsustainable serving the atavistic elites of wealth from fuel and energy industries. That is your argumentation: climate change is asking for urgent solutions and not for concepts promoted by people like Sorin Ducaru asking for surrender and submission instead of pacifying a shared planet, which is what you work for.

Obviously, Russian policy right now is not helping either.

This is a one more reason for me to offer my work.

Unfortunately I assume from our conversation, that Finland is not ready to host the next OSCE conference arguing that Russia wants NGOs out of the conference and free press would not be allowed. It seems Finnish politicians would rather consider access to NATO with the consequence of nullifying the option for a 1975 anniversary OSCE meeting.

Therefore, I feel obliged to report about our meeting to the peace movement, to several government agencies and to international organizations hoping to trigger an urgency OSCE meeting in Geneva a.s.a.p

I am committed to the task of establishing peace in a way that serves humankind. I am open and sincere to you. I wholeheartedly wish to help you and the Finnish people to divert a disaster.

Please accept my most sincere greetings and best wishes.

Andreu Ginestet

