

Vesten og resten!

Av: [Blogg - Parrhesia](#)

Mars 2026

3 minutters lesning.

Den grunnleggende forskjelligheten mellom øst og vest ble tilspisset da perserne ville øke sin innflytelse over de greske byene i Jonia i årene før 500 fvt. i dagens Vest-Tyrkia. Athenere og euboiere svidde av [Sardis](#) i 498 fvt. Den påfølgende hevnen fra perserkongen skulle tilintetgjøre athenerne og Hellas forsvarere. Slaget ved Marathon 490 fvt. er det mest kjente stedet i slagene som reddet utviklingen av vår kulturelle vugge. Skillet mellom øst og vest er fremdeles etter 2500 er fremdeles det samme, kulturellt og geografisk.



Utviklingen av antikkens greske kultur pågikk de neste ca. 200 år, og er fremdeles forbilledlig i mange henseender. Forskere i dag forbløffes stadig over klokskapen og prestasjoner fra denne tiden, da tekster og historien leses i nytt lys. Renessansen - igangsatt også med antikkens stoff, fikk i gang den kulturelle motoren for utvikling -frihet og fornuft. Gjennom århundredene; bort fra religiøs dumskap, tyrannier, og elendighet for de fleste, frem til et samfunn -i dag- best på frihet, selvkritikk, teknologi, vitenskap og utvikling, i et samfunn som fremdeles kan utvikle seg, og må det!

Mot Vesten (det vil si land med demokrati) -som før- er resten i varierende grad dårligere stilt, i frihet og utviklingskraft. Det gamle perserrikets Iran, med en annen begrunnelse,

har fremdeles lyst til å utslette de frie. Om enn den religiøse blindhet fullstendig har overtatt for kongens og tyranniets forakt for frihet, udugelighet (etter deres mål), og demokrati, så er begrunnelsen for forakten den samme. Athen og Hellas er byttet ut med USA og Vesten.

Det iranske prestestyret har vært flinke til å vinne tid for å komme i gang med å produsere mot atomvåpen, og et stort antall raketter for å ramme og utslette Israel, og det de ellers måtte klare. Hvorfor forhandle med noen som skal oppnå et eller annet, og så utslette deg? Bortkastet tid. Tilintetgjør da din fiende!

For å kunne danne en solid militær motmakt må man være enige i noen grunnleggende verdier. Disse verdiene ser det ut til at man ikke enes om i vår tid. Det kan få alvorlige konsekvenser, først og fremst for hele unionen av vestlige land, som øker risikoen for å miste det man har.

Et lite lys i ideløshetens tomme hull: Den finske presidenten Alexander Stubb har forstått en viktig ting. I verdenspolitikken handler det ikke bare om prinsipper, avtaler, om moral, om hvem som er best som fredsnasjon, og annet. Det handler også om å være smart, å vise at man stiller opp for venner, selv om man kan være gnistrende uenig. Men det viktigste av alt er at man har noe å bytte med i form av varer, våpen, og ikke minst intelligens og mot. Det handler om betydning, og ikke minst om overlevelse.

For få dager siden spurte president Donald Trump om støtte til å beskytte skipene i Hormuzstredet. Av Europa, Australia, Japan, fikk han nei, kort sagt. Statsminister Keir Starmer; en type med en merkelig blanding av wokisme, panikk, svakhet, manglende demokratisk identitet, nektet i forkant av Iran-angrepene å la USA bruke engelske baser, som de i tillegg har delt, som basen Diego Garcia Nsf i indiahavet. Nå har England sagt at de vil støtte, sammen med andre europeiske land.

Vår egen statsminister kunne godt fulgt opp med motet og ledelsen han har vist i støtten til Ukraina. I stedet utviste Støre og Barth-Eide en naiv forhandlingsvilje for å unngå angrep på Iran, er mot angrepet på Iran fordi det bryter med Folkeretten, roses av ledelsen, og uttrykker stor bekymring. Det viser igjen en sympati med radikale islamister, og nesten ikke til å tro, men noe man bare må ta til etterretning, slik også USA nok gjør. Troen på Taliban og Hamas, gjelder vel også ennå. Og, det kan synes som om Folkeretten mest er til for tyranner som ønsker å henrette sine egne demokratiforkjempere.

Den finske presidentens kreativitet -sett i forhold til resten- er at han for flere dager siden sa at «ja, vi kan diskutere å stille opp, hvis du hjelper til mer i Ukraina». Dette «lille» utspillet har i seg en forhandlingskraft til å kunne redde det vestlige prosjekt også for fremtiden. Makt må ha motmakt, utvikling må ha motmakt, respekt må ha motmakt. Hele universet består av harmonisk motmakt. Å ikke oppnå denne betyr ødeleggelse.

Med et nå oppløst europa-kategorisk «nei» kan relasjoner reddes, og særlig der den ene ser den andre som puslete og feig, og andre veien som «tyrannisk» og å ikke følge

internasjonale lover. Jonas Gahr Støre og Espen Barth Eide, spiller et høyt spill med vår nasjonale sikkerhet. Vi kan godt betale mer for bensinen, så lenge vi fortsetter å ha kontroll og trygghet mot atomangrep fra Iran i fremtiden.

Europeisk tenkning har bidratt til at vi ikke ennå kan beskytte oss, en dårlig energipolitikk, en dårlig økonomisk politikk, og en Trump-aversjon i den dominerende venstre-media og politikere som igjen orienterer «resten av Vesten» mot Kina. Våre åpne europagrenser de siste tiår, som skulle vise verden vår styrke i godhet, har ikke hjulpet særlig mange borgere hverken i Europa, Australia eller USA, men snarere tvert imot. Islam is coming. Sprekker vår allianse med USA er det ikke så vanskelig å se hvor veien går. Valget av Donald Trump, også 2. gang, er en reaksjon i demokratiet/folket, også mot dette!

De ulike byene Sparta og Athen -som befant seg i hver sin ende på den kulturelle skala, ble til slutt enige om å møte perserne sammen, og gi hverandre retten til å bruke sin særlige kompetanse, vise ære, og gjensidig respekt. Men, de måtte først gjennom harde diskusjoner (diskusjon; gr. *polemos* betød også krig), der de såvidt lykkes, men fornuften seiret. Når dette fungerte, ble de sterke. Om ikke hadde det aldri blitt noe Vesten.

Et eksempel der de greske byene *ikke* klarte å samle seg var mot Alexander den stores far Kong Philip II. Athen og Theben tapte i 338 f.Kr., i slaget ved Khaeronea. Hellas ble ikke fri igjen før i 1830-32, og demokrati i 1974.

Bilde av slagmarken ved Khaeronea, tatt fra borgen av gamle Khaeronea av meg.



Translation to English

Giving and Taking; The West and the Rest! By: March 2026 3-minute read.

The fundamental difference between East and West has been evident ever since the Athenians burned Sardis in the 5th century BC. The Persian king's subsequent revenge was meant to annihilate the Athenians and the defenders of Greece. The Battle of Marathon is the most famous of the battles in which, above all, Athenians and Spartans—as the strongest—saved the beginnings of what developed into our cultural cradle.

The divide is still there, after 2,500 years, both culturally and geographically. The West's first historian, who wrote about the Persian Wars—Herodotus—expresses this difference as follows: “....”

The development of ancient values and ideas from the Renaissance onward set in motion the cultural engine of progress—freedom and reason. Through the centuries, this moved us away from religious foolishness, tyrannies, and misery for the many, toward a society—today—built on freedom, self-criticism, technology, science, and development; a society that can still evolve, and must.

Against this, the rest of the world is, to varying degrees, worse off—especially the East, with Iran and other countries as the worst when it comes to freedom for their citizens, and still with a desire to wipe out the West, where Athens and Greece have been replaced by the USA and the West.

The Iranian clerical regime has been skillful in buying time to get well underway with producing nuclear weapons, and a large number of missiles to strike and destroy Israel—and whatever else they can reach. Against this, one must defend oneself, and one must know what one has. To form a counter-power, one must agree on some fundamental values. These values seem increasingly difficult to agree on in our time. This may have serious consequences, above all for the entire union of Western countries, increasing the risk of losing what we have.

The Finnish president has understood something important. In world politics, it is not only about principles and agreements, about morality, about who is the best peace nation, and so on. It is also about being smart, showing that you stand up for your protectors, that you can negotiate with your friends. But most important of all is having something to trade with—goods, weapons, and power, and not least intelligence and courage. Ultimately, it is about survival.

A few days ago, President Donald Trump asked for support to protect ships in the Strait of Hormuz. Among those who count as Western countries, he essentially received a “no.”

Prime Minister Keir Starmer—a type with a strange mix of wokism, weakness, and democratic lack of principle—refused, even before the Iranian attacks, to allow the USA to use British bases, including shared ones such as Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean.

The Finnish president's creativity—compared to the rest—is that he says: “Yes, we can discuss supporting you, if you help more in Ukraine.” This “little” statement contains the potential to save the Western project for the future as well. For now, great forces are at play that can destroy Western unity. Power must have counter-power; development must have counter-power; respect must have counter-power. The entire universe consists of harmonious counter-forces. Failing to achieve this means destruction.

His statement shows several positive attitudes, in contrast to what we might call European thinking. That thinking has contributed to our current inability to protect ourselves, to poor energy policy, poor economic policy, and a Trump aversion in the dominant left-leaning media and political class, which again orients “the rest of the West” toward China.

Our open European borders in recent decades—meant to show the world our strength in goodness—have not helped many citizens in Europe, Australia, or the USA, but rather the opposite. Islam is coming. If our alliance with the USA cracks, it is not difficult to see where the road leads.

The different city-states Sparta and Athens—located at opposite ends of the cultural scale—eventually agreed to face the Persians together, granting each other the right to use their particular strengths, honor, and mutual respect. But they first had to go through hard discussions (discussion; Greek *polemos* also meant war), where they barely succeeded, but reason prevailed. When this worked, they became strong. Without it, there would never have been a West.

An example where the Greek cities failed to unite was against Alexander the Great's father, King Philip II. Athens and Thebes lost in 338 BC, and Greece did not become free again until...

Between the USA and the rest of the West, a wedge of attitudes, expectations, and values is now developing—filled with “tolerance,” dialogue and diplomacy, understanding for Hamas, Iran, and “From the river to the sea.” Media and academia have supported a culture that does not defend a single human right. Donald Trump & Co. is also a reaction to this.

We need borders—physical, ideological, human-rights-based, and economic (anti-globalization).

If you want, I can also produce:

- a more polished, publication-ready English version

- a condensed summary
- or an analysis of the argument structure and its historical framing

Just tell me what direction you want to take.

Yes a more polished version.

Here is a **more polished, publication-ready English version** of your text. I've preserved your argument, tone, and historical framing, but tightened the language, clarified structure, and improved flow.

Polished English Version

Giving and Taking: The West and the Rest March 2026 3-minute read

The fundamental divide between East and West has been evident ever since the Athenians burned Sardis in the 5th century BC. The Persian king's retaliation aimed to annihilate Athens and the defenders of Greece. The Battle of Marathon is the most famous of the clashes in which, above all, Athenians and Spartans—then the strongest Greek powers—saved the beginnings of what would become our cultural cradle.

That divide remains, 2,500 years later, both culturally and geographically. The West's first historian, Herodotus, who chronicled the Persian Wars, described this difference in unmistakable terms: "....."

The development of ancient values and ideas—revived during the Renaissance—set in motion the cultural engine of progress: freedom and reason. Over the centuries, this helped move us away from religious folly, tyranny, and widespread misery, toward a society built on liberty, self-criticism, technology, science, and continuous development. It is a society that can still evolve—and must.

By contrast, much of the rest of the world is, to varying degrees, worse off. In the East, Iran and several other states rank among the worst when it comes to individual freedom, and some still nurture ambitions to destroy the West—where Athens and Greece have been replaced by the United States and the Western alliance.

Iran's clerical regime has been adept at buying time to advance its nuclear ambitions and to build a large arsenal of missiles aimed at Israel and beyond. Against such threats, one must be able to defend oneself—and one must know what one has. To build a counter-power, there must be agreement on fundamental values. Today, that consensus appears increasingly fragile. The consequences could be serious, especially for the Western alliance, which risks losing what it has built.

The Finnish president has grasped something essential. In global politics, it is not only about principles, agreements, morality, or who can claim the mantle of "peace nation." It is also about strategic intelligence: showing up for your protectors, negotiating with your

friends, and—above all—having something to trade: goods, weapons, power, intelligence, and courage. Ultimately, it is about survival.

A few days ago, President Donald Trump asked for support in protecting shipping in the Strait of Hormuz. Among the countries that consider themselves part of the West, the answer was essentially “no.” Prime Minister Keir Starmer—an unusual blend of wokism, weakness, and democratic inconsistency—refused even before the Iranian attacks to allow the United States to use British bases, including shared facilities such as Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean.

The Finnish president’s creativity—compared with the rest—lies in his response: “Yes, we can discuss supporting you, if you help more in Ukraine.” This seemingly small statement carries the potential to safeguard the Western project for the future. Powerful forces are now at play that could fracture Western unity. Power requires counter-power; development requires counter-power; respect requires counter-power. The universe itself is built on balanced opposing forces. Without them, destruction follows.

His stance reflects several positive instincts, in contrast to what might be called the prevailing European mindset—one that has contributed to our current inability to defend ourselves, to poor energy and economic policies, and to a widespread aversion to Trump in dominant left-leaning media and political circles, which in turn nudges “the rest of the West” toward China.

Europe’s open borders in recent decades—intended to showcase our moral strength—have not meaningfully improved life for most citizens in Europe, Australia, or the United States. Quite the opposite. Islam is coming. And if our alliance with the United States fractures, the direction ahead is not difficult to foresee.

Sparta and Athens—located at opposite ends of the cultural spectrum—ultimately agreed to face the Persians together, granting each other the right to use their particular strengths, honor, and mutual respect. But they first had to endure fierce debates (discussion; Greek *polemos* also meant “war”), barely succeeding—yet reason prevailed. When it worked, they became strong. Without it, the West would never have emerged.

A contrasting example is their failure to unite against King Philip II, father of Alexander the Great. Athens and Thebes were defeated in 338 BC, and Greece did not regain its freedom until much later.

Today, a wedge of attitudes, expectations, and values is forming between the United States and the rest of the West—filled with “tolerance,” dialogue and diplomacy, sympathy for Hamas and Iran, and slogans like “From the river to the sea.” Media and academia have supported a culture that does not defend even a single human right. Donald Trump and his allies are, in part, a reaction to this.

We need borders—physical, ideological, legal, and economic (including limits to globalization).

If you'd like, I can also:

- refine the tone further (more academic, more journalistic, more rhetorical)
- condense it into an op-ed length
- or help you restructure it into a stronger argumentative arc

Just tell me the direction you want to take.