

Økonomier og markeder ved at gå ned:

– LaRouches politik skal gennemføres nu!

2. august, 2016 (Leder) – Sammenbruddet af ikke alene kreditmarkederne, men også af Europas og USA's økonomier generelt, er nu i fuld gang.

Indførelsen af Glass-Steagall i valgplatformene hos begge USA's politiske partier diskutes overalt; men dette er kun et enkelt skridt hen imod et mål, som omgående må nås. Der kan ikke være tale om at vente på en handlingslammet kongressamling eller den næste Kongres: Dette skal gennemtvinges.

Hvorfor? Fordi Glass-Steagall er en afgørende del af en *statslig kreditpolitik* til genoplivning af produktion og produktivitet og til at samarbejde med de asiatiske magters globale investeringer i infrastruktur. Uden denne politik er de transatlantiske økonomier gået ind i et uigenkaldeligt kollaps, der er meget værre end blot en »bankpanik«, selv om en bankpanik allerede er i gang.

De beklagelige, falske »stresstests« af de større, europæiske banker har udløst disse bankers generelle styrtdyk på aktiemarkederne, hvor handel i de førende italienske banker tirsdag blev indstillet, efter at de angiveligt netop skulle være blevet reddet! En ekspert-beregning af »den reelle bankstress«, som blev udført som en nødforanstaltning og rapporteret i *Financial Times* samme dag, fandt, at de store europæiske banker behøver en omgående bankredning på 900 milliarder euro – svarende til en nød-kapitalisering på mere end \$1 billion som et »TARP-program« (Troubled Asset Relief Program) – for at overleve.

Tabet af vækst, og det fuldstændige tab af produktivitet i de transatlantiske økonomier, er det, der driver dette kollaps. I USA er væksten i BNP i de seneste 12 måneder 1 %; arbejdskraftens produktivitet er faldet med 1,5 % hidtil i år og er ikke steget i seks år; investering af erhvervskapital er faldet i fem af de seneste seks kvartaler; de reelle ugelønninger er igen ved at falde. Ledere fra Federal Reserve (den amerikanske centralbank, -red.) holder taler – inklusiv præsidenten for New Yorks Fed-afdeling, Dudley, i tirsdags, og formanden for USA's centralbank Yellen i sidste uge – hvor de begræder tabet af økonomisk produktivitet, som de har været med til at frembringe gennem uophørlig pengetrykning for at redde de bankerotte banker.

Vækst i mere grundlæggende aspekter, der måler effekten af nye teknologier på arbejdskraftens produktivitet, er komplet forsvundet.

De økonomiske markører i Europa er endnu værre, og offentlige investeringer i hele Europa er i det forgangne år faldet med 115-120 milliarder euro, eller omkring \$135 milliarder.

Endnu en TARP på \$ 1 billion vil ikke afhjælpe dette kollaps. Italien, der for øjeblikket er epicentret for bankkollapset, skal vedtage en national lov for at give mulighed for statskredit til vækst – et skridt, der for indeværende er forbudt iflg. EU-regler!

En Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling og en begrænsning af indskudsgaranti til kun at gælde for kommercielle banker vil bane vejen for den rette kur. Denne kur består i statslige kreditinstitutioner, der skaber kredit til både ny og mere produktiv infrastruktur og industri, og også til behovet for yderligere kredit fra private *udlåns*- banker. En håndhævelse af Glass-Steagall vil åbne op for finansminister Alexander Hamiltons succesfulde bank- og kreditpolitik.

En af støtterne for Glass/Steagall-lovforslaget i Senatet

mener, at, hvis det kan bringes til diskussion i Senatets sal, og tages ud af hænderne på den komité, der sidder på det, kunne lovgivningen omgående blive vedtaget. Den nationale debat og diskussion, der nu summer om Glass-Steagall i partiernes valgplatforme, må og skal vendes til handling for at gennemtvinge Glass/Steagall-lovgivningen.

De amerikanske og europæiske samfund har siden finanskrakket i 2008 lidt enorme tab, som ofte opregnes som et titals billioner af dollars, men som i virkeligheden kan måles som tabet af en fremtid for de unge generationer. Dette kollaps vil gøre dette tab af fremtid uigenkaldeligt, med mindre det stoppes af regeringshandlinger nu.

Enhver borger kan blive en kreativ kraft i denne indsats.

Foto: Børshandlere i panik midt i krakket i 2008.

NYHEDSORIENTERING JULI 2016: Sidste chance for at stoppe europæisk bankkrak og krig

I kølvandet på den britiske beslutning om at forlade EU står ikke blot Det Britiske Imperium og EU's drømme om et imperium for fald, men hele det defekte paradigme, den vestlige verden har været præget af. Deutsche Banks krise er en sammenbrudskrise for hele finanssystemet, og Deutsche Bank må reddes for at undgå kaos – men samtidigt må banken bringes tilbage til Alfred Herrhausens politik for realøkonomisk vækst. Frigivelsen af de 28 sider må betyde afsløringen af

Saudi-Arabiens og Storbritanniens støtte til international terrorisme og en fælles front med Rusland for at udrydde den. Chilcot-kommissionens rapport om Storbritanniens deltagelse i Irakkrigen afslører ikke blot Tony Blair som en løgner, men er en opfordring til et skifte fra det vestlige paradigme for permanent krig tilbage til respekt for FN og national suverænitet. Det mislykkede kupforsøg i Tyrkiet, som kom efter tyrkiske tilnærmedser til Rusland, vil fremskynde Erdogan's planer om total magt, men kan være med til at stoppe hjælpen til IS gennem Tyrkiet. Udtalelsen fra Den Internationale Voldgiftsdomstol i Haag øger faren for krig i Det Sydkinesiske Hav. Danmark og Europa må gå med i Kinas og Ruslands nye paradigme for fredelig sameksistens og fælles udvikling.

Dette er en redigeret version af en briefing af Tom Gillesberg, formand for Schiller Institutet, den 18. juli 2016. Den kan høres på <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=13685>

Download (PDF, Unknown)

LaRouches indflydelse: Glass-Steagalls voksende styrke i USA og også Europa

25. juli 2016 (Leder) – Interessante kommentarer på begge sider Atlanten i løbet af weekenden reflekterede den voksende sandsynlighed for en genindførelse af Glass/Steagall-princippet i den nærmeste fremtid – og som er af afgørende betydning for de transatlantiske økonomier.

Den førende finansavis på det europæiske kontinent, *Handelsblatt*, udgav den 22. juli en artikel skrevet af avisens Washington-korrespondent, og som udtrykte Glass-Steagalls voksende styrke: »Adskil, hvad ikke bør være sammenføjet«, hvilket vil sige, at man skal adskille almindelig, kommerciel bankvirksomhed med indskud og udlån fra spekulation i værdipapirer.

Handelsblatt tog udgangspunkt i de amerikanske politiske partiers valgplatforme, men støttede af egen kraft Glass-Steagall. Korrespondenten Frank Wiebe skrev, at debatten om genindførelsen af Glass-Steagall ikke er ny i USA, men, »siden Trump og Republikanerne tog spørgsmålet op igen, har Wall Street pludselig taget det alvorligt. Hidtil har Wall Street været overbevist om, at det, på trods af den store støtte til konceptet, sluttelig ikke ville være muligt at skaffe et politisk flertal for det. Nu er de ikke længere så sikre.«

Og i USA skrev en Clinton-demokratisk superdelegeret og mangeårig kampagne-toprådgiver, Elaine Kamarck, på sin Brookings Institute-blog, at noget hen efter Glass-Steagall måtte blive vedtaget af den nye Kongres og præsident. Hillary Clinton var modstander af Glass-Steagall, sagde Kamarck,

Men ved at gå med til at placere en genindførelse af Glass-Steagall i Demokraternes valgplatform, signalerede Hillary Clinton, at også hun ville støtte det ... Der har hidtil i Kongressen ikke været megen interesse for dette. Men hvis der var noget, som etablissementet hørte højt og tydeligt i primærvalgene i 2016, så var det, at millioner af amerikanere mener, at de er ofre for Wall Street, og at den næste præsident hellere må høre efter.

Tabet af Wall Streets kontrol betyder, at stiftende redaktør af *EIR*, Lyndon LaRouches syv år lange kampagne, der kræver Glass-Steagall som den dør, der vil åbne for en politik med statskredit til genoplivelse af den økonomiske produktivitet i USA og Europa, har vundet voksende indflydelse.

Handelsblatts støtte har også spredt spørgsmålet til Tyskland og Europa. »Ville der være begrundelse for at genindføre Glass-Steagall?«, spørger Wiebe. Det nuværende system giver en universel bank flere muligheder, men

Hvad der er vigtigere, så ville konceptet med en bankopdeling sandsynligvis gøre det finansielle system mere sikkert. Det afgørende punkt er, at storbankerne er for store, og at en opdeling ville gøre dem mindre igen. Argumentet er gyldigt for Europa, hvor meget store banker befinner sig i relativt små stater, mere, end det gælder for USA. Deutsche Bank-forretningsmodellen, hvor en stor investeringsbank sidder på fundamentet af en ikke særlig stærk traditionel bank, diskutes om og om igen.

Da Lyndon LaRouche påbegyndte sin kampagne for en genindførelse af Glass-Steagall i 2009, var de eneste amerikanere eller europæere, der kendte til lovens navn, de Wall Street-folk, der var lovens banemænd. LaRouches indsigt i fremtiden var af afgørende betydning for at vælge denne kamp. Han vidste, at de transatlantiske økonomiers eneste fremtid, deres eneste chance for at genoplive statskredit, produktion og produktivitet efter Hamiltons principper, gik via Glass-Steagall, der ville sætte gigantbankerne på Wall Street og i City of London i globaliseringens æra, på deres rette plads.

At afværge endnu et generelt finansielt kollaps og truslen om verdenskrig kræver, at man nu griber denne fremtid.

Foto: USA: Det var den nyvalgte præsident Franklin D. Roosevelt, der til finansoligarkiets (Wall Street og City of London) rædsel fik Glass/Steagall-bankopdelingsloven vedtaget i 1933. På dette foto fra 1935 ses FDR underskrive og dermed sætte i kraft, Loven om Social Sikkerhed (Social Security Act).

Social Security Act var en lovgivning for social velfærd, der skabte det sociale sikkerhedssystem i USA. Selv om programmet

er blevet ændret siden loven blev vedtaget, så var lovens oprindelige formål det at sørge for statshjælp til dem, der ikke kunne arbejde.

Lyndon LaRouche: Produktivitetsraterne skal i vejret – i modsat fald overlever hverken USA eller Europa

25. juli, 2016 (Leder) – London/Wall Street-banksystemet har kurs mod et krak, og den grundlæggende årsag er den fuldstændige stagnation af den økonomiske vækst, men navnlig stagnationen i produktiviteten i de europæiske og amerikanske økonomier.

Den amerikanske finansminister Jack Lew bragte sit embede i miskredit ved det nyligt afsluttede G20-møde i Kina, da han opfordrede de andre lande til at gøre alt, hvad der stod i deres magt, for at øge deres økonomiske vækst, men sagde, at den amerikanske økonomi ikke behøver nye forholdsregler til kreditudstedelse eller investering. Den økonomiske vækst i USA er så lav, at Lew har behov for at bruge europæisk nulvækst til at puste sig selv op. Kina – hvis økonomiske fremgang og kredit har holdt verden oppe i et årti, og hvis økonomiske vækst er fire gange den amerikanske – sagde sandheden ved dette møde: »Situationen i den globale økonomi er dyster«, som Kinas handelsminister sagde.

Kina fortsætter med at skabe store mængder kombineret offentlig og privat kreditudstedelse (estimeret til \$240 milliarder alene i juni) til investeringer såvel i Kina, langs med det Økonomiske Silkevejsbælte og den Maritime Silkevej, samt i Afrika, Mellemøsten og Sydamerika – såvel som også til sit rumforsknings- og teknologiprogram, det mest dynamiske i verden i dag. Men de finansielle kræfter i London og på Wall Street, der gør verdensøkonomien »dyster«, skramler fortsat henimod et nyt finansielt krak med en økonomi, der ikke har nogen kapitalinvestering, er uden produktivitet og uden profit.

EIR's stiftende redaktør, Lyndon LaRouche, lagde ikke i fingrene imellem i sin kommentar til Lews forsvar for en død økonomi. »At sætte den form for standard betyder i virkeligheden fallit«, sagde LaRouche.

Den politik må lukkes ned. Produktivitetsraterne for de realøkonomiske aktiviteter skal i vejret igen – ellers vil det hele eksplodere. USA og Europa vil ikke overleve. De kan overleve, hvis man gør, hvad der skal gøres. Og det er at sørge for, at videnskab bliver motoren for økonomiens reelle produktivitet.

Det er ligeledes videnskab, der vil være motor for menneskers og husstandes reelle indkomststigninger.

Studier af USA's økonomiske historie kalder perioden 1935-1970 for »amerikansk produktivitets guldalder« på grund af den totale produktivitets vedvarende vækstfaktor – en vækst i produktiviteten, der kan tilskrives teknologiske fremskridt snarere end blot anvendelse af flere arbejdstimer og mere kapital. Væksten kulminerede under Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal og de store infrastrukturprojekter med benævnelsen »De Fire Hjørner«, der voksede med 3,3 % om året. Det voksede stadig med lige under 3 % om året i 1960'erne under JFK, med det måske vigtigste infrastrukturprojekt af dem alle, nemlig NASA's Apolloprogram, der bragte mennesket til Månen med et

potentiale til at nå endnu længere ud.

IMF, den Europæiske Centralbank og USA's Nationale Kontor for Økonomisk Forskning taler konstant om den totale produktivitets vækstfaktor og følger den nøje, alt imens de overhovedet ikke er i stand til at frembringe en sådan vækstfaktor. IMF har netop rapporteret, at, i årtierne under Bush og Obama var denne vækstfaktor i USA var 0,5 % om året, og at nu, i 2016, er den omkring nul. I »højproduktive« Tyskland, har den også været på 0,5 % om året.

Kina, som sagde sandheden ved G20 om den globale økonomis »dystre tilstand«, har haft en vækstfaktor i den totale produktivitet på 3,1 % om året siden 2004, ifølge den seneste undersøgelse, der er foretaget ved Harvard. Det er, hvad den Nye Silkevej og det kinesiske måneprogram skaber.

LaRouche har siden 2013 udtrykt dette behov som »de fire love«: Genindfør Glass/Steagall-bankregulering (begge de politiske partier er nu, på papiret, enige med ham). Skab statslige institutioner til udstedelse af ny kredit, der er rettet mod vækst i produktiviteten. Investe i de mest højteknologiske infrastrukturprojekter, med rumforskning i spidsen. Fokusér på at skabe gennembrud i videnskabens fremskudte grænse, som er videnskab og teknologi inden for termonuklear fusion, inklusive fusionskraft og fissions/fusions-fremdrift til rejser i rummet.

»I modsat fald vil det hele eksplodere. USA og Europa vil ikke overleve.«

Kinas forpligtende engagement mht. at forøge hele befolkningens arbejdskrafts produktive evne, som eksemplificeres i bygningen af De Tre Slugters dæmning, som ses afbildet her, har resulteret i en vækstrate fire gange så stor, som den aktuelle vækstrate i USA.

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 21. juli 2016: Kupforsøget efter rapprochement mellem Tyrkiet og Rusland// og den tjetjenske vinkel Se også 2. del

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Video: 2. del:

Lyd:

Sammen med hvilket Tyskland kan Europa få en fremtid?

19. juli 2016 (Leder) – I de seneste to uger har vi – som en uopsættelig aktion, der skal gennemføres nu, i denne økonomiske og kulturelle krise – fremlagt Lyndon og Helga LaRouches forslag til at redde Deutsche Bank fra overhængende bankerot, og til at afværge krig. Fordi Tysklands økonomi er den eneste, der har et produktivt potentiale til at redde vraket af Europa ved at koble sig til Kinas storslæde projekt

for den Nye Silkevej til udvikling af Eurasien, Mellemøsten og Afrika.

I modsat fald får vi krig med Kina, eller med Rusland. Obamas Hvide Hus forsøger støt og roligt at fremprovokere krigskonfrontationer med både Rusland og Kina og kræver, at Europa fremmer disse provokationer gennem NATO. Hvis terrorsplinterne fra Obamas krige i Mellemøsten og Libyen er i færd med at bombe Europa ind i en tilstand af chok, så har de hans sympati, så længe, de fortsat går med i militære konfrontationer med Rusland og Kina. Hillary Clinton er lige så fast besluttet på denne krigspolitik.

Der er, især efter Brexit, ingen tvivl om, at Tyskland er Europas fremtid. Men hvis det er Angela Merkels og Wolfgang Schäubles Tyskland, forfalsket med det endnu mere krigeriske Grønne Parti, så får vi verdenskrig.

Derfor foreslog hr. og fr. LaRouche: Det må være Tyskland i Alfred Herrhausens ånd, den myrdede leder af den engang produktive, men nu elendige og kriminelle kæmpe, Deutsche Bank. Mere specifikt den Alfred Herrhausen, der i 1989 var i færd med at lancere en udviklingsbank til at løfte Polen og det sovjetiske Østeuropa økonomisk, mens Sovjetunionen kollapsede – og han blev myrdet.

Herrhausens plan dengang for Deutsche Bank og Tyskland, var et paradigme for, hvad Tyskland atter kan blive, såvel som også for Europas fremtid nu.

Det transatlantiske banksystem og finansielle system er ved at falde fra hinanden. Det er offer for sine egne medlemmer, de City of London-centrerede europæiske storbanker og Wall Street-storbankerne, der har knust de reelle, produktive økonomier under sig i løbet af årtiers globalisering. Det, der udløser det umiddelbart forestående krak, er ikke simplet hen italienske bankers dårlige lån, eller ejendomsfonde i London, der lukker, eller at de store tyske og schweiziske banker er i

vanskeligheder, og ikke engang ECB's og Federal Reserves sindssyge politik; men derimod ødelæggelsen af de underliggende økonomiers produktivitet hen over årtier, mens kasinoet voksede på toppen af dem.

Hvis man skal genkapitalisere de fallerede storbanker i Europa, må de tvinges til at afskrive deres kasinoer som totale tab og genvedtage de produktive formål, som Herrhausens lederskab af Deutsche Bank var indbegrebet af. Så kan man skabe statskreditter på samme måde, som Kina har været alene om at gøre i dette århundrede, til den form for projekter, der genoplivet menneskers og økonomiers produktivitet.

I løbet af de to uger, hvor vi har fremlagt dette uopsættelige forslag fra LaRouche, har der været betydningsfulde gennembrud i USA. »Det saudiske kapitel« af 11. september-historien er blevet tvunget offentliggjort.

En genindførelse af Glass-Steagall er inkorporeret i valgplatformene hos både Demokrater og Republikanere.

Men den rette måde at kæmpe for en Glass/Steagall-reorganisering af bankerne på, er ved at bruge den »vægtstang«, som er LaRouches forslag. Så bliver denne kamp en kamp for Europas, og også USA's, fremtid.

»Drama Infernale« ... og

LaRouches initiativ for Deutsche Bank er eneste udvej

17. juli 2016 (Leder) – Verden konfronteres med et *Drama Infernale*, lyder overskriften til lederartiklen i økonomisektionen af søndagens udgave af det tyske *Welt am Sonntag*. Ikke alene står det italienske banksystem umiddelbart foran en nedsmelting, med 360 milliard euro i uerholdelige lån, men hele det europæiske finansielle system er ligeledes bankerot – med den derivat-tyngede Deutsche Bank øverst på listen – rapporterer de nervøst.

Men virkeligheden er langt værre, end selv denne oprørte redegørelse indikerer. Hele det transatlantiske finansielle system er gået op i limningen, bemærkede Lyndon LaRouche i en diskussion med sine medarbejdere i weekenden, og det blev viderebragt ved begyndelsen af udsendelsen den 16. juli, i Dialog med Manhattan Projektet. Dennis Speed fra LPAC opsummerede her LaRouches bemærkninger:

»Systemet giver ikke mulighed for et eneste sikkert punkt. Forlad jer ikke på nogen rationel respons fra nogen gruppe. Dette her står på randen af en generel, global krise. Derfor er folks adfærd den, at de går totalt i panik; man vil ikke få nogen rationel respons på dette tidspunkt. Forsøg ikke at forlade jer på nogen, forsøg ikke at udvælge nogen person. Dette er en nødsituation med et problem, der haster, og vi må håndtere det ud fra dette standpunkt.«

Denne nødaktion er centreret omkring LaRouches krav om at bruge en engangs-redning til at reorganisere Deutsche Bank, baseret den myrdede bankier Alfred Herrhausens principper, for at indlede en transformation, med baggrund i en konkurs, af hele det transatlantiske finansielle system og udløse reel, menneskelig produktivitet.

I en yderligere diskussion i søndags udtalte LaRouche:

»Vi må have en positiv politik med en hyperaktiv produktivitet. Man må skabe produktivitet, reel produktivitet, ikke, at nogen holder på deres penge, eller deres penge til at spekulere for. Og spørgsmålet er: Vil vi skabe de elementer af produktivitet, som behøves for at komme fri af det, der er sket med os, gennem folk, der har forsøgt at undertrykke ting og gå uden om ting hele vejen? Dér kommer problemet ind. Hvis man ikke hævder en politik, baseret på disse principper, vil man igen havne i det samme, gamle rod.«

»Vi må vinde indflydelse på alle personer«, fortsatte LaRouche, »for hvis der ikke er enighed mht. hvad det er, man skal varetage, så får vi anarki. Og det betyder at gå tilbage til nulpunktet, eller under nulpunktet. Det er problemet. Det er spørgsmålet. Dette er, hvad man må respondere til. Hvis man ikke responderer til det, er man ingenting, så har man totalt smidt enhver fornuft ud. Og dette er den eneste måde at håndtere dette på.«

I vores internationale kampagne for at gennemføre LaRouches dramatiske Deutsche Bank-initiativ, bemærkede Helga Zepp-LaRouche, løber vi ind i uventede grader af raseri i befolkningen i hele Europa, imod Deutsche Bank og alle bankierer, et raseri, som står i vejen for deres forståelse af LaRouches krav.

»I Tyskland havde vi en uventet, virkelig uventet bølge af had mod Deutsche Bank«,

bemærkede Zepp-LaRouche.

»Konservative industrifolk, mangeårige tilhængere (som man aldrig ville have forventet ville sige noget sådant), de reagerede totalt voldsomt og sagde: 'Lad dem gå bankerot! Luk dem ned! Hvorfor skulle vi bruge én krone mere på at redde disse kriminelle slyngler?' Og jeg mener, at det er det, folk ikke rigtig kæmper sig igennem.

For Herrhausen-princippet handler ikke bare om at redde Deutsche Bank; det er, at man har en pistol for panden og siger: Enten accepterer I paradigmeskiftet, eller også går I alle ned, og vi går ned med jer. Men hvis I vil overleve, må I acceptere dette skifte. Og hvis vi havde en international kampagne – som vi har lidt af – men hvis vi havde en virkelig kampagne, ville presset blive større på den tyske regering, som er dér, hvor presset må ende.«

Lyndon LaRouche understregede ligeledes betydningen af politikken for reorganisering af Deutsche Bank:

»Understreg det igen, for det er historien. Det er præcist, hvad I må håndtere, og det er, hvad I må kæmpe imod.«

RADIO SCHILLER den 18. juli 2016: Deutsche Bank handlingsplan// Offentliggørelsen af de 28- sider om Saudi-arabiens rolle bag terror//

Terror i Nice// Kupforsøget i Tyrkiet

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Europæiske banker ved 'Sidste Udkald' før kollaps

16. juli 2016 – »Deutsche Bank må reddes, for verdensfredens skyld«, Helga Zepp-LaRouches chokerende advarsel om det kaos, der lurer bag Deutsche Banks krav om en ny, europæisk TARP-bailout, er i raketfart blevet cirkuleret til højtplacerede bankierer, økonomer og medier i hele Tyskland, Østrig og Italien. En af disse bankierer bekræftede over for Zepp-LaRouche i en diskussion over telefon den 15. juli, at hendes fremsatte krav, der placerer de London-centrerede europæiske banker »i allersidste øjeblik« før et kollaps, er korrekt, og mange bankierer ved det. I interviews til medierne »kaster de sand i offentlighedens øjne«, sagde han, med de ved, hvad der snart vil udløses over dem.

En anden kilde sagde til *EIR's* europæiske kontor i Wiesbaden, Tyskland, at behovet for at vende tilbage til Deutsche Banks myrdede, tidligere formand Alfred Herrhausens »traditionelle dyder« inden for bankpraksis, gentagent blev bragt på bane under bankens nylige generalforsamling for aktionærerne i takt med, at bankens marked og øvrige kapitalisering styrtedykkede. Zepp-LaRouches appell, der bygger på hendes mand, Lyndons LaRouches forslag, kræver, at Deutsche Bank skal genkapitaliseres med statslige midler, men at den skal udrenses ved at afskrive dens enorme mængde af giftige

værdipapirer og ved at vende tilbage til Herrhausens politik for bankpraksis til industriudvikling og produktivitet.

Endnu en højtplaceret finansperson udtalte sig offentligt om den ekstreme fare for en europæisk nedsmeltning. Philipp Hildebrand, næstformand for Black Rock (der ejer 5 % af Deutsche Banks kollapsede aktier), sagde til *Tageszeitung* den 13. juli, at den nuværende krise i de europæiske banker er ekstremt farlig og »kunne føre til det værste«. Hildebrand søgte at lokaliserer udløseren for nedsmeltningen væk fra Deutsche Bank og Tyskland, i Italien.

Men Deutsche Bank har et presserende behov for genkapitalisering. Samtidig med, at bankens cheføkonom David Folkerts-Landau kom med sine forslag til euro-bailout, og Angela Merkel og hendes finansminister Wolfgang Schäuble benægtede, at det skulle være nødvendigt at gøre noget, fik Deutsche Bank omkring 1 milliard euro i ny kapital fra Qatars kongefamilie, hvilket gør dem til den største aktieindehaver (10 %), foran Black Rock.

Ydermere har Deutsche Banks supervisionsbestyrelse skaffet sig af med Georg Thoma – der havde presset på for at få forebyggende undersøgelser og udrensninger af bankens illegale/umoralske aktiviteter – og har netop erstattet ham med Qatars fremstillede kandidat, Frankfurt-advokaten Stefan Simon.

Kilder i den amerikanske bankverden siger, at Deutsche Bank har behov for, ikke 1 milliard euro i ny kapital, men 7 – 10 milliard euro. *Handelsblatt* rapporterede den 15. juli, at Tysklands andenstørste bank, Commerzbank, også er i vanskeligheder. Den har måttet rapportere indtægter, der styrtdykede hen over det seneste år med enorme marginer, 10 – 15 %, afhængig af bankafdeling. Den europæiske Centralbanks nulrentepolitik har bragt denne forhenværende kraftstation for lån til industrien ud på afgrundens rand.

EIR kæmper for de handlinger, som LaRouche foreslår, i både Tyskland og Italien, som er krisens centrale fokusområder. *EIR*'s og LaRouche-bevægelsens kamp for at genindføre Glass/Steagall-bankopdelingsloven i USA er ligeledes af afgørende betydning.

Og i Danmark er det naturligvis Schiller Instituttet, der fører an i denne kamp for en bankopdeling, også i Danmark.

Red Deutsche Bank – red Europa og verden fra totalt, økonomisk kaos! Med Helga Zepp-LaRouches fascinerende analyse af de seneste 30 års politik. Dansk udskrift.

Den største fare, lige bortset fra en direkte Tredje Verdenskrig, ville være, at den transatlantiske sektor styrtede ud i kaos. Derfor fremkom min mand – der har en unik rekord for at have ret, mht. økonomisk forecasting, og mht. at komme med forslag til, hvordan en situation kan løses – med denne meget overraskende kommentar: at Deutsche Bank, frem for alle banker, skulle udvælges og reddes, denne ene, sidste gang, men ikke uden betingelser: De må omgående sættes under en form for konkursbehandling. En ledelseskomité bør have

ansvaret. Og dernæst må banken have en ny forretningsplan, der må gå tilbage til den filosofi, som blev praktiseret af Alfred Herrhausen, der var den sidste, moralske bankier i hele Europa, og som havde en helt anden filosofi.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Red Deutsche Bank for at finde en løsning, der vil redde menneskeheden! LaRouchePAC Internationale Fredags-webcast, 15. juli 2016

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Jeg tror, det er almindelig kendt blandt absolut alle i det internationale finansielle samfund, og i alle regeringer og blandt alle relevante personer i politiske stillinger i den transatlantiske sektor, at det, jeg nu siger her, er absolut sandt. Med andre ord: bankiererne og de ansvarlige personer i det internationale finansielle system alle er klar over, at dette system er absolut bankerot; håbløst bankerot. Det står umiddelbart foran en nedsmelting, i langt større skala end den, der fandt sted i 2008, af den

meget simple grund, at alle de indikatorer, der var til stede, før Lehman Brothers og AIG gik ned, er til stede nu, men i langt større skala.

[Vi arbejder på en dansk oversættelse af hele webcastet. Bliv på kanalen!]

Engelsk udskrift:

SAVE DEUTSCHE BANK TO FIND A SOLUTION THAT WILL SAVE MANKIND!

LaRouche PAC International Webcast Friday, July 15, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening! It's July 15th, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us for our weekly webcast on larouchepac.com. I'm joined in the studio tonight by Benjamin Deniston; and we're joined by a very special guest, via video, Mrs. Helga Zepp-LaRouche. Helga Zepp-LaRouche is the founder of the Schiller Institute, and also Chairwoman of the German BüSo (Bürgerrechtsbewegung Solidarität, Civil Rights Movement Solidarity) political party.

Helga LaRouche is joining us tonight to discuss the initiative that she and Mr. Lyndon LaRouche have taken this week to act in a very decisive manner to avert World War III and a global economic blow-out. This concerns the situation that Deutsche Bank now finds itself in.

I would like to begin by reading a Statement that Mrs. LaRouche issued a few days ago, on July 12th of this week. We will then follow that Statement by a discussion with Mrs. LaRouche herself. In the Statement that Mrs. LaRouche issued,

titled "Deutsche Bank Must be Rescued, for the Sake of World Peace," Helga wrote the following:

"The imminent threat of the bankruptcy of Deutsche Bank is certainly not the only potential trigger for a new systemic crisis of the trans-Atlantic banking system, which would be orders of magnitude more deadly than the 2008 crisis, but it does offer a unique lever to prevent a collapse into chaos.

"Behind the SOS launched by the chief economist of Deutsche Bank, David Folkerts-Landau, for an EU program of EU-150 billion to recapitalize the banks, lurks the danger openly discussed in international financial media, that the entire European banking system is {de facto} insolvent, and is sitting on a mountain of at least EU-2 trillion of non-performing loans. Deutsche Bank is the international bank, with a total of EU-55 trillions of outstanding derivative contracts and a leverage factor of 40:1, even outdoes Lehman Brothers at the time of its collapse, and therefore represents the most dangerous Achilles heel of the system. Half of Deutsche Bank's balance sheet, which has plummeted 48% in the past 12 months and is down to only 8% of its peak value, is made up of Level-3 derivatives, i.e., derivatives amounting to circa EU-800 billion without a market valuation.

"It probably came as a surprise to many that Lyndon LaRouche called today for Deutsche Bank to be saved through a one-time increase in its capital base, because of the systemic implications of its threatened bankruptcy. Neither the German

government with its GDP of EU-4 trillion, nor the EU with a GDP of EU-18 trillion, would be able to control the domino effect of a disorderly bankruptcy.

"The one-time capital injection, LaRouche explained, is only an emergency measure which needs to be followed by an immediate reorientation of the bank, back to its tradition which prevailed until 1989 under the leadership of Alfred Herrhausen. To actually oversee such an operation, a management committee must be set up to verify the legitimacy and the implications of the obligations, and finalize its work within a given timeframe. That committee should also draw up a new business plan, based on Herrhausen's banking philosophy and exclusively oriented to the interests of the real economy of Germany.

"Alfred Herrhausen was the last actually creative, moral industrial banker of Germany. He defended, among other things, the cancellation of the unpayable debt of developing countries, as well as the long-term credit financing of well-defined development projects. In December 1989, he planned to present in New York a plan for the industrialization of Poland, which was consistent with the criteria used by the Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (KfW) for the post-1945 reconstruction of Germany, and would have offered a completely different perspective than the so-called 'reform policy,' or 'shock therapy', of Jeffrey Sachs...."

Helga completes this Statement by saying:

"Herrhausen's assassination has gone unpunished.

However,

there exists 'the dreaded might, that judges what is hid from sight,' which is the subject of Friedrich Schiller's poem {Die Kraniche des Ibykus}. The Erinyes have begun their dreadful dance.

It is now incumbent upon all those who, in addition to the family, have suffered from the assassination of Herrhausen, upon the representatives of the Mittelstand, of the German economy and the institutional representatives of the German population, to honor his legacy and to seize the tremendous opportunity which is now offered to save Germany."

With that said, Helga, would you like to follow up at all with any opening statements?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, I think that it is absolutely known to everybody in the international financial community and to all governments and all relevant people in political positions in the trans-Atlantic sector, that what I'm saying there is absolutely true. In other words: the bankers and [those] responsible for the international financial system all know that this system is absolutely bankrupt, hopelessly bankrupt. It's about to blow up in a much, much bigger way than 2008, for the very simple reason that all indicators which were there before Lehman Brothers and AIG went under, are there, but much more.

The famous instrument box which they were using, or pretending to use, in 2008, has been used up: quantitative

easing, zero interest rate, negative interest rate, helicopter money. Right now you have the situation – and we have this from

extremely reliable contacts in the banking community who agree with us – where all the central banks are printing money, paper

money, like crazy, because they know perfectly well that helicopter money is not just electronic, but if you would have a

banking run right now, the whole thing would evaporate within a

very short period of time, in hours.

This is a situation where if you have an uncontrolled, chaotic collapse, which is right now eminently possible, because

you have several [inaud 0:07.39]. Not only Deutsche Bank.

You have the Italian Banking sector about to blow. You have the

British situation after the Brexit. The entire European banking

system is absolutely bankrupt. If you had an uncontrolled collapse, well, as one banker told us, after he read this statement of mine, he said, "If this is not remedied in the short

term, we are looking towards a Europe of chaos, disorder, and revolution."

The biggest danger, apart from World War III directly, would

be a plunge of the trans-Atlantic sector into chaos. Therefore,

my husband – who has a unique record of being right, in terms of

forecasting, and being unique, in terms of coming up for proposals how to remedy the situation – made this very surprising comment: that Deutsche Bank, of all banks, should be

singled out, they should be saved, one last time, but not

without conditions: They must immediately be put in a sort of receivership. A management commission should be in charge. And then they need a new business plan, which must go back to the philosophy of Alfred Herrhausen, who was the last moral banker in

all of Europe, and who had a completely different philosophy.

We had all kinds of reactions about that. It turned out the

banks are much more hated than meets the public eye. People said,

"Let these banks go bankrupt! Why don't you just close them down?

Nationalize them! Bankrupt them!" You had an outpouring of anger

coming from people you would not expect it – conservative industrialists, politicians who normally are not speaking in radical tones at all – but what came out was an explosion of anger.

It is very easy to be angry about the situation. If this

thing collapses in an uncontrolled fashion, all the life-savings

of people will be ruined. The majority of the people will have to

pay, and this will be associated with poverty. Millions of people

dying. This is not a joke.

It's not enough to be "against" something; even if banks

have behaved completely criminal and immoral. Deutsche Bank is spending right now such enormous amounts of money on legal fines

for illegal activity from LIBOR swindles, all kinds of shady operations, so that they had to write down their profit warnings.

It's not the question of "doing a favor" to Deutsche Bank. Not

at all! The question is: you must find leverage; how to bring this thing in order, before the whole thing ends up in a collapse, causing an absolute uncontrollable situation.

That is why the reference to Alfred Herrhausen is really extremely important, because he was the head of Deutsche Bank. He was a banker. Deutsche Bank had a different policy, and therefore, when you say, "We have to back to the philosophy of Alfred Herrhausen," at least the older generation knows exactly what that means. Therefore, I think we should really spread this and force people to put pressure on the situation, that this is being done. You have to "unwind" the outstanding derivatives. You have to deal with the situation that Deutsche Bank has EU-55 trillion in outstanding derivatives. Half of their balance sheet is without market valuation, which means that it's practically worth nothing, because you can't really sell it.

If you have an uncontrolled collapse, then that could be really what brings down the whole thing in a chaotic way. If you go the way Mr. LaRouche has proposed, then you can have an orderly resolution of this bankrupt system, and replace it with one which is in the interest of the people. So, it's not just a technical proposal. Several people, in response to my statement, said, "This is probably the very last chance we have to prevent a

catastrophe."

OGDEN: I would like to get a little bit more into the significance of the role played by Alfred Herrhausen in a moment;

but before we get to that, Helga, maybe you also say a little bit

more about what the strategic context of this intervention is, especially from the standpoint of the role that [inaud 13:06] play, not only as the only viable economy in Europe right now, but also the emphasis that Mr. LaRouche has placed on the relationship between Germany and Russia, being the only means by

which we can prevent the outbreak of a thermonuclear conflict.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, people have now all kinds of proposals,

like "Tobin Tax," "tax the speculators" – all these proposals are floating around. What they don't consider, is that when we're

taking about banking, we're not talking about money or financial

questions; we're taking about the physical pre-condition for a society to exist. Fortunately, the German economy, despite all of

these paradigm shifts which have occurred in the last 25 years to

the worse, the German economy is still an economic powerhouse.

You still have a very large concentration of very productive middle-level industry. Middle-level industry is normally where all the patterns are made, the technological innovation occurs.

That is really the backbone of the productive economy.

The question is: this German economy, without which all of

Europe would not function, absolutely must be protected, and not

only be protected, because right now, it is already many, many small firms which are in danger. There are other factors, like the crazy [nuclear] energy exit of Mrs. Merkel, which has increased the price of energy tremendously, but the German economy is sort of weakened; but it is still the absolute crucial

factor because in Germany you have a lot of the industrial potential which is needed not only for all of Europe, but in order to get the whole question of Eurasian cooperation on a sound ground, you need the German economy. The whole question of

the German-Russian cooperation, German-Chinese cooperation in the

development of the Eurasian Silk Road, is absolutely crucial.

So, the question is the productivity. And what has happened

with the paradigm shift of all the successors of Herrhausen – I

don't want to name all of them – but all of them went into this

high-risk maximization of profit no matter what. Ackermann wanted

25% profit, preferably every month; and they went into these completely crazy derivative operations, so that Deutsche Bank is

today {the} leading bank in terms of derivative exposure. With \$55 trillion in outstanding derivatives, that's with a GDP of the

German economy of \$4 trillion a year; it's more than 10 times more, even 12 times more the GDP of the German economy. So Deutsche Bank long has stopped to be Deutsche Bank; it's now operating from London, from New York. It has become one of the most aggressive investment banks in the world. But if it goes bankrupt, which it could at any moment; and that's why the chief

economist Mr. Folkerts-Landau put out every day since Sunday, he

put out an urgent call saying this recapitalization of the European banks must occur, or else calamity will happen. If Deutsche Bank would go under, the German economy – and with it,

all European economies – would collapse; and therefore, it's not

a question of choice. Obviously, to just put out more bail-out packages per se, as the ECB [European Central Bank] and the EU Commission have done in the past, is completely useless because

it makes the problem worse. Right now, it has reached the limit;

because after helicopter money, what else do you want to do?

It is not a choice; it is a life and death question, not

only for Germany, but really for the entire trans-Atlantic sector.

OGDEN: Now, you have emphasized that the circumstances around the assassination of Alfred Herrhausen continue to be a crime that the truth has not yet been told fully about. It's something that in the United States, we can relate to the assassination of John F. Kennedy, in terms of the magnitude of what this meant for the turning point in the policy of Germany at

that time. Obviously, it was in the context of the collapse of the Berlin Wall in the beginning of November 1989, and just less

than one month later, at the very end of November, November 30th,

Herrhausen was assassinated in a very sophisticated attack on his

convoy as he was travelling from his home to the Deutsche Bank headquarters. You said, Helga, in an article that you wrote in 1992 titled, "New Evidence Emerges in the Herrhausen Assassination Case," you said, "The key to the motive behind Herrhausen's assassination lies in 11 pages of a speech he was

to deliver in the United States only four days after he was ambushed. The speech contained Herrhausen's vision of a new kind of relationship between eastern and western Europe, which would have fundamentally altered the world's future course." And then you have a quotation from the speech, which I think is shocking when we go back and read that today, in consideration of what Mr. LaRouche and you were also both advocating for at that time. What he said, or what he was to say, in that speech that was never delivered, was the following:

"There should be assurances that the new credit will flow into specific, promising projects. It is therefore advisable that the export guarantees which the German Federal government wants to expand, be tied primarily to specific projects. In this connection, at this year's annual meeting of the IMF and World Bank in Washington, I proposed setting up a development bank on the spot; i.e., in Warsaw. Its task would be to bundle the aid and to channel it according to strict efficiency criteria. My vision is that such an institution could function somewhat like the Deutsche Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau, which traces its origins back to the Marshall Plan."

So, when you compare that speech that Herrhausen was about to give four days after he was assassinated, to what Lyn said in his speech in West Germany at the Kempinski Hotel in 1988,

when he forecast the reunification of Germany and the collapse of the Berlin Wall, he said:

"Let us say that the United States and western Europe will cooperate to accomplish the successful rebuilding of the economy of Poland. There will be interference in the political system of government, but only a kind of Marshall Plan aid to rebuild Poland's industry and agriculture. If Germany agrees to this, let a process aimed at the reunification of the economies of Germany begin; and let this be the {punctum saliens} for western cooperation in assisting in the rebuilding of the economy of Poland."

So, I think in the context of this speech that Herrhausen was about to deliver in New York, his cooperation with Helmut Kohl in terms of the reunification of Germany; and also the fact that he was on record calling for the debt relief – at least a partial debt relief, if not a full debt forgiveness of the Third World countries. He had met with the President of Mexico in 1987; he had surprised the world by delivering a speech at the World Bank in 1987 calling for the forgiveness of the debt of the Third World. All of these are right in parallel with what you and Lyn were advocating for, going all the way back to 1975, back to the Operation Juarez and also with this Marshall Plan Productive Triangle proposal at the fall of the Berlin Wall. So, I think

that certainly puts his assassination in the correct context to understand {qui bono}. Who benefitted from the fact that he was killed?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, I think I would take it a little bit

back, because this is not just a question of a murder which occurred 27 years ago. I want to recall what the period was, because most people have forgotten that Germany was not always unified; that the Berlin Wall came down. But this was one of the

most traumatic developments in the post-war period. You remember

that you had the peaceful demonstrations in the G.D.R. [East Germany], the Monday demonstrations; the Warsaw Pact still existed, and it was not clear what would happen. Would this lead

to another 1956 like in Hungary, or a new Prague Spring, where Russian or Soviet tanks come? Then the wall came down, and Mr. LaRouche had this idea about the German unification which you referenced, which he presented in the Kempinski Hotel in 1988; so

we had a plan. We put out immediately this proposal for the German unification, to have a mission; to have the Productive Triangle to take the region from Paris, Berlin, Vienna – the economic powerhouse of the world at that time – and develop corridors into eastern Europe to transform Europe. We were the only ones who had any idea, because we were the only ones who even had an inkling that the Soviet Union would collapse; which

Mr. LaRouche had already proposed in 1984. He said, if the Soviet

Union sticks to their military policy of the Ogarkov plan, which

was basically the idea to gain world dominance; then they will

collapse in five years. And I can assure you, not even the German government had any idea that unification would be real; even if that was the primary political goal of the entire post-war period. Then the Wall came down; and in the official documents which the German government published ten years later, they admitted they had no contingency plan for the case of German unification. Can you imagine that? That was the policy goal number one to have German unification; and they had no plan. But we did have a plan.

So, then developments became extremely traumatic. On the 28th of November, Helmut Kohl did probably the most important step in his entire political career by putting forward the 10-point program. This was not yet a program for German unification, but it was a medium-term plan for the moving closer together of the two German states; the West German and East German states in a federation. But he did that without consulting the Allies, and he did it without even consulting the liberal coalition partner, Mr. Genscher; but it was a first baby step in the direction of two German sovereignties. We know now that Francois Mitterrand put an ultimatum to Kohl and said, either you give up the German D-mark and its being replaced by a European common currency – what became the euro – or we will not agree to German unification.

Two days after Kohl had put out this 10-point program, Herrhausen was assassinated. Everybody in the German elite at that point – and we talked to many people at that time – said this is not just an assassination, but since Herrhausen was the closest advisor to Kohl, this was a message to Kohl. Don't

stick

your head out; do not dare to pursue and assert sovereignty. Because Germany in the entire post-war period was an occupied country; and at that time the saying went, "The best-kept public

secret of NATO is that Germany is an occupied country and will remain an occupied country." So by Kohl making this tiny baby step in the direction of sovereignty with the 10-point program,

that obviously was the contributing factor why this assassination

occurred. As you said, if Herrhausen would have made this speech

in New York in the following week, you would have had a proposal

coming from the leading banker which was practically in principle

identical to what Mr. LaRouche and I proposed at the time; namely, that the unified Germany should take Poland as an example

for the economic transformation of all the other countries of the

Comecon.

Then naturally, everything went haywire. The following EU

summit in the beginning of December in Strasburg, everybody started to attack Kohl; and in an interview later, he said these

were the darkest hours of his life. The circumstances were such

that despite the fact that Kohl knew that the euro would not function, he said this is against German interests; and he knew

absolutely that you cannot have a European common currency without political union. So, he knew it wouldn't function; he knew it was against German interests. But he was forced by the circumstances to accept it, because you had Bush, Sr. who had

the policy of containment of Germany in the EU. It is well established that originally Bush was against the German unification; and only because such more experienced political advisors like Brent Scowcroft told him if you are now against German unification, then the United States will lose all influence in Europe, so we have to basically agree to it. But let's make sure Germany gets contained. And that is what led to the infamous EU Maastricht agreement, which was the beginning of turning the EU into an imperial adjunct of the Anglo-American system. Helmut Schmidt, the late German Chancellor, in an equally surprising interview recently before he died, said the whole Ukraine crisis, which is right now what could be the trigger point for a war with Russia; really started at the Maastricht agreement, because this is when the EU decided to do exactly what NATO has been doing ever since. Namely, to go for an eastward expansion and move the EU and NATO just up to the borders of Russia.

So, the decision which was made in these really traumatic weeks and month, set the course; and if Herrhausen had been alive and advised Kohl, these conceptions could have been implemented and history would not be at the point where we are now. So, the Herrhausen assassination not only meant the lost chance of 1989; everybody agreed at that time this was an historic chance that happens at best once a century. I called the star hour of Germany, because if you had the unified Germany developing a peace plan for the 21st Century together with Russia, the whole

world would look completely different. But as I said, all the successes of Herrhausen went in the direction of high-risk speculation, globalization, money for money's sake, the rich become richer, the poor become poorer, and all the problems we have today. All the problems we have today are not just caused by this one assassination, but the assassination is symptomatic for the paradigm shift to the worse.

It's a murder which is unpunished; the so-called murderers,

the third generation of the Red Army Faction probably never existed. There was even in the first German TV channel a documentary which said there has never been any evidence that any

of the persons who supposedly were the murderers, ever really existed. So, the {qui bono} – well, it's the financial oligarchy

which profited; and it really has the smell of something quite different – of an intelligence operation – as many of the leading figures who did not fit the Yalta norm were assassinated.

But with the Herrhausen case, as you said, for Germany this is as

important in terms of paradigm shift as the assassination was of

John F. Kennedy.

And right now, when the entire banking system is absolutely

at the verge of collapse, it is the last moment to do justice and

really go back to the policies of Herrhausen. Even so, almost nobody knows anymore what real industrial banking is, because they are so money-greedy and absolutely suckers for the latest profit, that it would be a real uphill battle. But that battle must be fought if Europe and Germany and the rest of the trans-Atlantic sector are to survive; and probably beyond

that,
much of the world.

BEN DENISTON: Well, I think just looking at this transition period, I know that you and Mr. LaRouche had both made a warning that I think is very appropriate just to state in this context. That around the fall of the Wall, this lost chance of '89, you had explicitly said to the world, if we attempt this bankrupt, collapsing Soviet system with an equally bankrupt trans-Atlantic system, you're going to head to a collapse that's worse than what's happening now. I'm paraphrasing you; you might know more exactly how you stated it. But it seems like that really bridges this whole process from '89 to what we're seeing today as the culmination, the expression of what you warned of at that time. I think a challenge we have is to get across the importance of acting now on the level needed to make this shift we're talking about. What Lyn has laid out with this reform program for Deutsche Bank is the beginning out of this new paradigm. I think it's important to see it as an intervention in this whole collapse process you both had warned about and forecast this would be the consequence of failing to act then. That should give us greater impetus to know how important it is to act now while we still have the chance.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I remember that at that time, you had the

problem of the Bush administration, Margaret Thatcher, Francois

Mitterand, who absolutely really ganged up to prevent Germany from assuming any such role of having an independent policy; especially in respect to Russia. They were always saying, "Oh, the West has won over communism." The only other person outside

of us who totally contradicted them was John Paul II, the Pope of

the time; who said, the people who now are triumphant and say the

market economy is winning over communism, are absolutely wrong.

If you don't believe it, look at the condition of the Third World, to see that the West has not won; because the moral condition of the developing countries speaks to the contrary.

Naturally, that is all the more true today; because if you

look at the inhuman treatment of the refugee crisis, for example.

They are still coming by the hundreds, every week by the thousands, over the Mediterranean; drowning. Even more are starving and dying of thirst and lack of water trying to cross the Sahara. That is also the condition of this system. The system

is what causes all of this; and therefore, it is absolutely high

time that we come to the question of how can we – as a human civilization – give us an economy and a financial system which is adequate to human beings? And I think it's very important that

we go back to the question of what is actually the creation of wealth? Is it what Margaret Thatcher said, is it the ability to

buy cheap and sell expensive? The famous speaking of Margaret Thatcher being the daughter of a grocery trader, or is it the possession of raw materials? Or is it the control of the

financial system? No; it's not. The only source of wealth is the creative power of the human being; and when that creative power is applied, then you have scientific and technological progress. That is then leading to an increase of productivity in the economy.

That has been the battle between the American Revolution and the British Empire; between the free-traders and people like Alexander Hamilton who insisted that it is the creative power of labor which causes the well-being and the living standard and the longevity of the people. That was the philosophy of Friedrich List, the great German economist, who is now the most famous economist in China, by the way. That was the policy of Friedrich List and Henry C. Carey, the advisor of Lincoln; who both advised and through such people as Wilhelm von Kardoff, who was the head of the German industrial association in the time of Bismarck. Who changed the mind of Bismarck from being a free-trader into being an absolute believer in a protectionist system and the idea that you have to further the productivity and creativity of your own population as the only source of wealth.

So, there is a lot of history involved; and what we are really talking about is taking Germany back to the ideas of Bismarck, of Friedrich List, of Henry C. Carey, of Dr. William Lautenbach, who in 1932 presented a plan to the Friedrich List Organization in Germany which was identical with what Roosevelt had proposed with the New Deal and the Reconstruction Finance

Corporation, Glass-Steagall, Bretton Woods. That was all in these

proposals by Dr. William Lautenbach, who as history knows, unfortunately were not taken up; but instead you had Hjalmar Schacht, you had Hitler, you had before Mussolini, Franco, Petain, and you are in bed with fascists.

The question today is, can we, in time, go back to those

conceptions which have proven to be productive and valuable for

the economy; or are we plunging into a catastrophe of new fascism

and new wars? So, on this question of Deutsche Bank, most people

are so in the day-to-day making money, profits, and balance sheets, and having dollar notes coming out of their eyes, that they have forgotten that there is something much more important

about human life. And that is the happiness of people; the common good of people.

The reason why in this call to honor the memory of Herrhausen, using this crisis of Deutsche Bank now as a real paradigm shift to go back to these policies; why I mentioned the

great poem by Friedrich Schiller "The Cranes of Ibykus." And by

the way, I would really urge our audience right now, who probably

are not familiar with that poem, we have at translation which we

can put on the website so it's easily accessible. But this poem

is so powerful; it's written by Friedrich Schiller. It discusses

not only the murder of the beloved poet Ibykus, but more importantly even, it discusses the power of nemesis; the power

of

natural law, which is a power which works in reality. It's not that God punishes every little thief who steals something immediately by chopping off his hand; but it is a power which revenges great injustice. And this poem discusses this in a very

beautiful way by resorting to the Greek nemesis, this idea which

was used in great Greek dramas to demonstrate this principle of

the Erinyes. That there is this power that revenges this murder

and other injustices; that there is a higher power than the arbitrariness of people's will. The poem is very, very powerful.

As a matter of fact, I would even urge you to learn German, just

to read and understand that poem; because it teaches something about history. I think right now the Erinyes, those goddesses of

revenge which Friedrich Schiller has in this poem marching in the

amphitheater – in circles – they are bringing forward this higher power by the prism of the poem. It's a very, very powerful

way of reminding people that there is a higher power than what people think when they read the daily newspaper. So, please make

the effort. Read it; in English if you have to, but read it in German because there is another dimension to history than what people think. And only if you bring this forward this inner strength, this inner power which people have almost lost in the

trans-Atlantic sector because people small. They feel impotent,

they feel helpless. But what we have to unleash is exactly this

inner strength so that people really become truly human again, and take the history and the destiny in their own hands. And that's exactly what the message is of Friedrich Schiller; who always thought that man is greater than his destiny by resorting to these kinds of inner powers and higher authorities than the laws of money.

OGDEN: Well, you cited the Ibykus principle in your keynote speech to the conference that you hosted three weeks ago in Berlin; this extraordinary conference. But I thought in that context also, you made it very clear that history is working according to a higher law. That conference came just days after the Brexit vote which shocked everybody and threw all of Europe in disarray. But you said, this is the Erinyes principle in action. Tony Blair lied to get us into the Iraq War. The Iraq War set off a series of regime-change operations in the Middle East that have completely destabilized this region. That has, in turn, created this refugee crisis; and now you have the Brexit and the disintegration of Europe as the Erinyes beginning their dreadful dance, as you said in this statement once again.

I think that's also highly relevant in the context of the anticipated news today, where people have read in the press that the 28 pages, which we have fought for years to force the release of these 28 pages; the reports are in the press that these very

well could be released today. In what form, we don't know; how heavily redacted, we don't know. But again, this is the Erinyes

acting, and it's our responsibility to understand this as a principle of history; and to continue to understand that the moral arc of the Universe may be long, but it does bend toward justice. I think Martin Luther King also understood what Friedrich Schiller was getting at in this poem, as you said.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, I think that having said that, I want to come back to the absolute need to find a handle; because right now the problem is, nobody has a handle on how to intervene with

this financial crisis. And if the proposal of Mr. LaRouche is taken seriously, you have a way of dealing with the consequences

of avoiding the dangers of an uncontrollable collapse. You have

to untangle this; you have to shut down this derivative system;

you have to shut down the bubble. You have to do it in an orderly

manner, because there's no point to just say let's just close it

down or tax it or whatever. You have to find a skilled level of

how you take management of a bank – in this case, the Deutsche Bank; you have to put in a supervisory management commission which has to evaluate the validity and integrity of the outstanding obligations. Many of the derivatives have much more

than two parties; they have two, three, four, and more parties.

You have to untangle that. You probably have to write down the nominal value of these outstanding obligations. That way, you can

put a new basis, a new business plan for the bank which is in

cohesion with the idea of credit policy in general. But you have

to start to do that somewhere. The Herrhausen history and tradition is exactly what makes it very practical. We are not proposing something completely outlandish, utopian; this was the

policy of Deutsche Bank at one point.

So therefore, I want to bring it back to this point; and I

would really urge all the people who are watching to make sure this proposal is being distributed to all institutions which have

anything to do with the economy, with industry, with people in political positions who should take care of the common good. And

make sure that we get a serious debate. I know that in both election platforms of the Democratic Party and the Republican Party, you have the Glass-Steagall law in the platform. Now that

is very good; we will have the conventions in the next weeks. This is not necessarily the stated position of the candidates; but it is in the platform. So there is hope that if we mobilize

in the right way, this change can occur before it's too late. But

it's really one second, or maybe a nanosecond before midnight; so

it's not a time for complacency. It's a time for action.

Therefore, I would really urge you to join us; because we have a

beautiful future ahead of us if we do the right thing. If we miss

this moment, it can be the end of civilization; because the war

danger is very real, not only in respect to NATO against Russia,

but also the escalation around the South China Sea. We are not

in
a political void, but we are in one of these moments in
history
where a lot depends on the individual courage and the
individual
action. Therefore, I really ask you to join us to bring
history
in a better direction.

DENISTON: Absolutely.

OGDEN: Thank you very much for joining us today,
Helga. This
was a special broadcast, and I think a very important and
timely
one for the American audience. We're going to make the
statement
that you wrote on this subject – which I read from in the
beginning of the broadcast – available in the video
description
to this video and also on the website. This is absolutely one
of
the key pieces of material that people can use to, as you
said,
to do outreach to all the key layers in the United States and
elsewhere to put this proposal very seriously on the table. We
will also make the English translation of "The Cranes of
Ibykus"
available to our audience as well.

Would you like to make any final remarks before we
close, or
is that a good place to conclude our broadcast?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I just would like to really express my
hope
that enough people recognize that we have now a point where
history will be either totally a catastrophe – and most people
are already thinking that; the people who are not completely

dead because of drugs or other problems, they know that we are in a really unprecedented civilizational crisis. Even worse than any of the prewar situations of the 20th Century. Just yesterday, one of the key advisors of the Kremlin said, all the signs are of a prewar period; and that's true. We are in a prewar period; and unless we remove the real reason for the dynamic for war, which is the danger of a collapse of the trans-Atlantic financial system. Unless we remedy that, I'm almost certain that war will happen; and if that war would happen, it's the logic of war that in that case all weapons available will be used. In the case of thermonuclear weapons, that would be it; there probably would not anybody to even record what happened, because it would be the elimination of civilization. And therefore, the remedy of the financial crisis is not just a banking technical affair; it really is the question of putting society back on a course where we all can survive as a human civilization. In a certain sense, it's what {The Federalist Papers} discussed. Can we give ourselves a political order which is suitable for man to organize his own affairs and govern according to the common good? So, it's a much larger issue; and I'm very optimistic that it can be done. But it requires an extraordinary effort, and it requires all of you.

OGDEN: OK, thank you very much for joining us today, Helga.

Hopefully, we can do this at some point again in the future. Thank you all for tuning in. Please stay tuned to larouchepac.com; and take this discussion and take what Mrs. LaRouche just had to say very much to heart. So, thank you very much and good night.

Bankkollaps? Lyndon LaRouche understreger: Gå tilbage til 'Gå' og Start forfra! Produktivitet er af primær betydning – Herrhausen- metoden

15. juli 2016 – Her til morgen gentog Deutsche Banks cheføkonom David Folkerts-Landau i et interview på CNBC-TV sit krav om en bailout/genkapitalisering for de europæiske banker og sagde, at centralbankens politik er en fiasko og ødelægger kanalen for kredit til SME-sektoren (Små og Mellemstore Entrepriser). Efter en briefing om dette bemærkede LaRouche, at spørgsmålet er meget fornuftigt, men, af de involverede elementer er nogle kendte, mens andre repræsenterer tvivlsspørgsmål. Han pointerede betydningen af Alfred Herrhausen, formand for Deutsche Bank fra 1971 og frem til

november 1989, hvor han blev myrdet.

LaRouche sagde, at kapitalisering som sådan ikke er et effektivt instrument for situationen. De tvivlsomme værdier bør annulleres. Det er den eneste måde at komme ud af dette rod på. Det er ligesom at få en syg person til at blive endnu mere syg, og så kalde ham én, der 'med succes er blevet mere syg!'

Det er selve fremgangsmåden, der er problemet. Deduktiv tænkning er altid problemet. Vi står med et svindelnummer, et system, der er et falsum. Så vi må tilbage til 'Gå' og starte om igen. Man kan ikke forsøge at 'fikse det'. Det er ikke et 'fiks det'-problem.

Overvej det følgende: Hvad er det økonomiske system? Man må følge det, Herrhausen var i færd med at etablere. Han blev myrdet for at annullere denne indsats, der skabte den ødelæggelse, der fulgte. Det var formålet med mordet. Enhver idé om at »forhandle« et skifte vil være et falsum.

Der må komme en annullering af såkaldt rigdom, der ikke er berettiget til at bære dette navn. Se så på, hvad der er tilbage. Find ud af, hvad der skal gøres. Der må være et selvudviklende program for produktivitet. IKKE en proces, hvor man tinger! Man skal ind på en anden kurs. Kursen kan ikke være forhandling. Man må udvirke produktive evner, og udvirke øget produktivitet på permanent basis.

Graden af produktivitet er den primære skabelse. Man kan ikke »tilføje« noget ved at tilføje det. Man skal bygge noget nyt, til en start. Annuller alle former for forhandling. Man skal acceptere Herrhausens program. Accepter *hans* program, ikke *noget i den retning*. Motivet for at myrde ham, øjensynligt af de franske og britiske netværk – var at standse dette system. Vores fremgangsmåde må være den, ikke at tale om »forhandlinger gennem tilpasninger«. Vi må eliminere det nuværende koncept om et finanssystem, ikke »udbedre«

finanssystemet. Vi ønsker ikke et »blødere system«. Glem alt om penge, og tænk i stedet på økonomi, hvad det gør for økonomi.

Det, som det britiske/franske system gjorde ved at myrde Herrhausen, var for at forhindre en flugt fra svindelen. Man kan ikke »fikse op« noget, der var et falsum fra begyndelsen. I dag må vi komme op med et godt instrument. Afslutte det, der var forkert dengang, og nu.

Det er simpelt: 1) Herrhausen blev myrdet; og 2) briterne og andre systemer var involveret. De gjorde det for at nedlægge alt, der var forbundet med ham. Gerningsmændene havde til hensigt at forhindre Herrhausen, eller noget som ham, i nogensinde at tage styringen. Se lige på, hvem der stadig er der – George Soros, et førende problem, og britisk.

Foto: Alfred Herrhausen (1930 – 1989), tysk bankier og formand for Deutsche Bank. Var fra 1971 og frem til sin død medlem af bankens bestyrelse. Rådgiver til kansler Helmut Kohl. Ingen er nogen sinde blevet straffet for hans mord.

Det afgørende, unikke led i kæden

14. juli, 2016 (Leder) – For 48 timer siden ændrede vi altting i hele vores fremgangsmåde på globalt plan – men mange af jer gik glip af det. Tænk! Mind jer selv om, at det ikke nyttet at klage over den overhængende fare for et panik-kollaps af verdens økonomiske system ud i et dødbringende kaos. Og at advarsler mod en termonuklear tilintetgørelsесkrig i sig selv

ikke vil forhindre det i at ske alligevel – lige så lidt, som de blotte advarsler nogen sinde har forhindret krig i fortiden!

Det, Lyndon LaRouche netop har gjort, er at pege på det afgørende, unikke led i kæden, der, hvis I griber fat i DET, og trækker i DET, lige akkurat vil være i stand til at trække Europa væk fra klippekanten – og som, i absolut sidste øjeblik, kan afbøje denne historiske, tankeløse, automat-lignende march ud over afgrunden.

Skub dette til side for hellere at overveje det i morgen, og I er færdige! Der vil ikke være noget i morgen – hverken for jer, eller for nogen andre.

Alle disse overvejelser er forklaret i Helga Zepp-LaRouches udtalelse d. 12. juli, »**Deutsche Bank må reddes, for verdensfredens skyld!**«

Men der er mange mennesker, der ikke taget denne udtalelse til hjerte og indledt den omgående kovending, der er påkrævet.

Zepp-LaRouches udtalelse må studeres og genlæses i detaljer. Men for at rekapitulere nogle punkter for vores formål her: Frankrig, Italien og andre europæiske stater er totalt bankerot; Europa har inden for få dage kurs mod en nedsmeltning, som, under de nuværende omstændigheder, vil føre til krig. Tysklands derivat-tyngede Deutsche Bank kan meget vel blive udløseren af en sådan nedsmeltning, der omfatter hele Europa. Men det er paradoksalt nok Tyskland, der stadig har den potentielle økonomiske produktivitet, der kunne føre Europa tilbage mod sikkerhed. Og, hvis Deutsche Bank blev reddet fra kollaps, og man omgående vendte om og slog ind på den politik, som Alfred Herrhausens kurs stod for, ville DB blive hovedkraften i organiseringen af et sådant tysk opsving.

Lyndon LaRouche har krævet, at regeringen skal forøge Deutsche Banks kapitalgrundlag, der skal ledsages af en omgående

ændring af bankens politik tilbage til den politik i Hamiltons tradition, som Alfred Herrhausen førte. Samtidigt må der udpeges en ledelseskomité, der kan finkæmme og reorganisere bankens aktiver.

I løbet af de seneste to dage er mange af vore venner eksploderet i raseri over dette livreddende forslag fra Lyndon og Helga LaRouche og har spruttet, at de store banker er vore fjender, og at vi er modstandere af bailouts. Men, som Diane Sare fra LaRouche PAC Komité for Politisk Strategi påpegede i går, så er det letkøbt blot at aflire en liste af korrekte »holdninger«. Men hvad får man ud af det, andet end et pas til et Trotskistisk Paradis? Langt sværere [er det] at forstå og gibe den ene, sidste chance, som historien tilbyder, og som vi nu må gøre.

De, der myrdede Herrhausen, skabte en fortsat grusomhed, der ikke er sluttet den dag i dag; de, der gjorde det, må fjernes, ellers er der ingen løsning. Før eller siden vil noget, man har undladt at gøre, komme tilbage og ramme én.

Foto: USA's første finansminister Alexander Hamilton foran USA's Finansministerium i Washington, D.C.

***Helga Zepp-LaRouche vil være
hovedgæst***

***ved LaRouchePAC
Internationale Fredags-***

webcast.

Vi udlægger video samt et engelsk udskrift lørdag morgen.

Bliv på kanalen!

Nødaktion over for Deutsche Bank eneste måde at redde Europa og verden

14. juli 2016 (Leder) – Selv, mens tåber som Angela Merkel og Wolfgang Schäuble holder fast ved, at både de italienske banker og Tysklands største bank, Deutsche Bank, ikke er i alvorlige vanskeligheder, udvider cheføkonom for Deutsche Bank, David Folkerts-Landau, sin tidligere advarsel om, at hele EU-banksystemet er på randen af kollaps. Han lagde i vid udstrækning skylden for dette på den Europæiske Centralbanks præsident Mario Draghis *Quantitative Easing, QE* (kvantitative lempelser; 'pengetrykning') – med ubegrænset opkøb af

skrantende obligationer – og med nedsættelsen af rentesatserne til negative værdier. »*Europa er alvorligt syg*«, sagde han i et interview med *Die Welt* og tilføjede, at en hurtig kur krævedes og i særdeleshed forholdsregler, der atter giver gnisten til økonomisk vækst, for uden vækst kan bankkrisen ikke overvindes.

Folkerts-Landau sagde, at levestandarden i hele Europa er alvorligt truet, og at dette er en væsentlig årsag til den hastige vækst af anti-EU-følelser i hele Europa.

Lyndon LaRouche har direkte intervenereret i denne krise og påpeget den faktiske årsag til denne krise, der udspiller sig – nemlig, det politiske mord i 1989 på formand for Deutsche Bank, Alfred Herrhausen, som LaRouche identificerede som den sidste tyske bankier, der forstod bankernes nødvendige rolle i skabelse af kredit til realøkonomien. Siden dette mord er Deutsche Bank, og tysk bankvirksomhed generelt, blevet overtaget af briterne, både rent bogstaveligt i den betydning, at briterne nu ejer Deutsche Bank, og også mht. at skifte over til spekulation snarere end produktiv investering.

Se: Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Deutsche Bank må reddes for verdensfredens skyld!

De fleste transatlantiske nationers økonomier er implicit bankerot, sagde LaRouche i en diskussion onsdag med sin Komite for Politisk Strategi. Men den tyske økonomi har i sig midlerne til at redde de europæiske økonomier, og videre endnu, pga. den historiske tyske helligelse til investeringer i videnskab og teknologi. Skulle Deutsche Bank gå hen og kollapse, advarede han, ville resultatet blive ikke alene et økonomisk sammenbrud i hele Europa, men også krig – global krig.

Alt imens en genkapitalisering af Deutsche Bank derfor haster, så må det ikke blive et spørgsmål om penge *per se*, i sig selv, men derimod en reorganisering af bankens enorme eksponering

til stort set værdiløse derivater og dårlige lån, samt en tilbagevenden til produktiv investering sådan, som Herrhausen havde tænkt. Den tyske økonomi kunne dernæst levere den nødvendige margin for at bringe den europæiske økonomi tilbage til skabelsen af reel profit.

Krigsfaren kunne ikke være mere åbenlys end den er i dag. En af Putins toprådgivere, Sergei Karaganov, sagde til *Der Spiegel* i dag, at den udstrakte NATO-deployering af styrker på den russiske grænse, som blev yderligere implementeret ved NATO-topmødet i Warszawa i sidste uge, er en militær provokation, og at, »hvis NATO indleder en overskridelse – imod en atommagt som os selv – vil de blive straffet.«

På samme tid responderede Kinas ambassadør til USA, Cui Tiankai, i tirsdags til de multiple militære trusler mod Kina siden Obamas »omdrejningspunkt Asien« og den amerikanske intervention imod Kinas suverænitet i det Sydkinesiske Hav og sagde: »At sende disse hangarskibe og bombefly er en manifestation af loven, 'magt er ret'. Kina må derfor gøre modstand mod det og afvise det. Dette sker i den sande ånd af international lov. Og hvis det kan ske for os, kan det ske for hvem som helst.«

Der findes ingen delvise forholdsregler, der kan håndtere den eksistentielle økonomiske og strategiske krise, der nu konfronterer menneskeheden. Der må komme en kreativ løsning, baseret på nye principper, og som hviler på den forståelse, at ethvert menneske har et kreativt potentiale til at bidrage til menneskehedens fælles mål. En afslutning af geopolitik, og af den dyriske filosofi, der lyder »alle mod alle«, mellem individer og mellem nationer, haster, er mulig og nødvendig.

Foto: Den Europæiske Centrabanks bygning.

Glass-Steagall: Europa på randen af total finansiel nedsmeltning

12. juli 2016 (*Leder*) – Europa konfronteres med tre mekanismer, der kunne udløse en nedsmeltning, et sammenbrud, af det transatlantiske finansielle system, og enhver af disse mekanismer kunne detonere, hvad øjeblik, det skal være. Og så er de endda på ingen måde de eneste kilder til det transatlantiske, London/Wall Street-ledede systems kollaps.

For det første er de italienske banker på randen af kollaps. Man har offentligt indrømmet, at de førende italienske banker har for 360 milliarder euro gæld, der er i betalingsstandsning – og uofficielle estimerater sætter tallet langt højere. Men, som den italienske premierminister Renzi korrekt har advaret om, så er krisen omkring Deutsche Bank »hundrede gange værre«. DB sidder med aktuelle derivater til \$72,8 billioner og har et bjerg af insolvent gæld. I søndags krævede DB's cheføkonom David Folkerts-Landau en omgående haste-bailout af de europæiske storbanker til 150 milliarder euro – med start i hans egen DB. Iflg. EU-love, der trådte i kraft 1. januar, skal banker først gennemgå en bailin (ekspropriering af visse typer indeståender), før de kan få en bailout (statslig redningspakke), og dette udgør i sig selv en sikker udløser af en systemisk nedsmeltning.

Fra mandag at regne konfronteredes Londons store ejendomsfonde med et stormløb fra investorerne, i kølvandet på Brexit-afstemningen, og udsigten til et umiddelbart forestående sammenbrud af hele den britiske ejendomsboble er meget virkelig. I en klar panik over den accelererende disintegration vred det regerende Konservative Parti armen om på den ene af de to tilbageværende kandidater til partiformandsposten for at trække sig som kandidat, således,

at Theresa May kunne blive installeret som premierminister på onsdag – for at have en regering på plads til at håndtere den fremstormende krise.

Dette umiddelbart forestående, systemiske krak kan ikke adskilles fra den voksende fare for atomkrig i kølvandet på NATO-topmødet for statsoverhoveder i Warszawa i sidste uge.

Det er præcist pga. denne kombinerede fare for et kollaps ud i kaos og en potentiel udslettelseskrig, at Lyndon LaRouche har krævet en engangs-bailout af de tyske banker for at standse blødningen længe nok til at lancere et reelt skifte i politikken, baseret på **hans egne Fire Love** for, hvordan verdensøkonomien skal genoplives gennem kreditter, der er rettet mod at forbedre arbejdskraftens produktive evne, gennem investering i infrastruktur, fremskudt, videnskabelig grænseforskning, der anføres af en massiv udvidelse af rumprogrammet, og lignede tiltag. LaRouche advarede kolleger den 10. juli om, at, hvis Tyskland tager et styrtdyk ud i kaos, er krig umiddelbart overhængende. Tyskland sidder inde med nøglen til en ny europæisk politik over for Rusland, baseret på strategisk og økonomisk samarbejde, og hvis dette forhold spoleres, vil konsekvenserne blive katastrofale.

Tiden er inde til at se den nuværende krisens virkelighed i øjnene, krævede LaRouche, og til at handle på basis af denne nødsituation, som krisen kræver det.

Læs: **LaRouches Fire Love til at redde USA (og verden ...)**

SUPPLERENDE MATERIALE:

Italienske banker og Deutsche Bank

fører an i den transatlantiske sektors krak

11. juli 2016 – Pressen i den transatlantiske verden er fuld af dækning af krisen i Deutsche Bank og de italienske banker, som understreger betydningen af Lyndon LaRouches intervention, hvor han kræver en engang-bailout af Tyskland for at forhindre kaos i Europa, men baseret på behovet for gennemgribende ændringer i banksystemet for at forcere kreditter ind i realøkonomien og lukke derivativerne og andre spekulative bobler ned.

Russia Today har David Folkerts-Landaus interview med *Welt am Sonntag*, hvor cheføkonomen for Deutsche Bank (DB) krævede en haste-bailout til 150 milliarder euro, og det citerer også udtalelser fra Lorenzo Bini Smaghi, formand for Societe Generale, hvor han advarer om, at den italienske bankkrise kan brede sig til hele EU. DB-aktier er faldet 48 % i løbet af de seneste 12 måneder, Societe Generales aktier er faldet 63 %, og Bloombergs Europa-index over 500 banker og finansielle serviceselskaber er faldet med 33 %, det laveste i syv år. En tidslinje i *Bloomberg*-artiklen har titlen, »Deutsche Banks episke kollaps«, og som gør det ganske klart, at det europæiske banksystem nu står på randen af et umiddelbart krak.

RT har også en nylig, underskrevet kronik af George Soros, hvor han erklærer, at EU's kollaps er blevet »næsten uundgåeligt« siden Brexit-valget.

»Det katastrofale scenario, som mange har frygtet, har materialiseret sig og gør en disintegration af EU praktisk talt uigenkaldelig«, skrev han for Project Syndicate (som han finansierer kraftigt). Han tilføjede, at det finansielle kollaps i UK i kølvandet på Brexit var det værste i tre årtier. »Det europæiske projekts blotte overlevelse er indsatsen i forhandlingerne om, hvordan Brexit kommer til at

forløbe.« RT's dækninger bemærker, at Marine LePen mødtes med den franske præsident Hollande og pressede på for at få en folkeafstemning om en «Frexit», men blev afvist.

Reuters har også en omfattende dækning af Folkerts-Landau-interviewet. Cityam, en online finans-publikation, bemærkede, at italienske banker sidder med insolvent gæld til 360 milliarder euro, og aktier i samtlige italienske storbanker og andre banker i Middelhavsområdet – Unicredit, Banca Monte dei Paschi di Siena, Banco Popolare og Intesa San Paolo (Portugal) – er faldet med 25 % siden Brexit-valget. Michael Hewson fra CMC Markets UK citeredes for at sige, »hvis Italien går ned, vil det tage resten af Europa med sig«.

The Street havde følgende hovedoverskrift tilbage den 5. juli, »Vil Deutsche Bank initiere den næste finanzielle krise? Aktier kunne være på vej til nul«. Artiklen nævnte paralleller til Lehman Brothers og viste, at DB er i en langt værre tilstand end Lehman var mod slutningen. IMF advarede om, at det største overløb fra DB vil ramme Frankrig, UK og USA, der »har den største grad af overløb fra omverden, målt ud fra den gennemsnitlige procent af kapitaltab hos andre banksystemer pga. chokket i banksektoren i oprindelseslandet«. En grafisk fremstilling i *Wall Street Journal*, der nævnes af *The Street*, viser bank-til-bank-forbindelserne i Deutsche Bank. DB er belånt med over 40:1, langt værre end Lehmans 31:1 på tidpunktet for dens kollaps; og DB's aktuelle portefølje af derivater udgør \$72,8 billioner, hvilket er 13 % af alle globale, udestående derivater. »Hvis domino-effekten opstår, vil Tyskland, med sit BNP på \$4 billioner eller EU med sit BNP på \$18 billioner ikke være i en position, hvor de kan få kontrol over det.«

New Europe online har hovedoverskriften, »Hvorfor Deutsche Bank er den farligste bank i verden«, og spørger, hvad prisen ville være for den tyske regerings bailout, versus konsekvenserne af at lade det nedsmelte med systemiske implikationer.

Bloomberg har også advaret om, at Londons ejendomsmarked er ved at krakke, og dette er endnu en konsekvens af Brexit. Standard Life Investments annoncerede, at fra og med i dag, vil de suspendere deres UK Ejendomsfond for at afværge investorer, der kræver deres penge tilbage. Dette udløser allerede smitte, med flere andre store ejendomsinvestorers meddelelse om lignede fastfrysninger af klienternes midler, og med endnu andre, der simpelt hen meddeler, at de trækker sig ud af eksisterende handler om prima ejendomsprojekter i London.

Samlet set er tilstandene i Italien, Deutsche Bank og ejendomsmarkedet i London mere end tilstrækkelige til at eksplodere hele den transatlantiske finansielle sektor. Det er præcis pga. denne allerede igangværende krise, at nødforanstaltninger, nøjagtigt i overensstemmelse med LaRouches krav, omgående må vedtages.

RADIO SCHILLER 12. juli 2016: Lyndon LaRouche har krævet en engangs-bailout af de tyske banker for at redde hele Europa

Med næstformand Michelle Rasmussen

Lyndon LaRouche: »Vi må hjælpe Tyskland, for uden at opretholde et stabilt tysk system, kan vi ikke forhindre krig!«

11. juli 2016 (Leder) – Det transatlantiske finansielle system befinder sig på et punkt, hvor der er umiddelbar fare for et sammenbrud, og det, der er sket blot det seneste døgn, er, at den italienske premierminister Renzi på en fælles pressekonference med den svenske statsminister har erklæret, at, alt imens de italienske banker har store problemer og behøver en bail-out, så er dette af mindre betydning i forhold til de europæiske storbanker, der står over for et massivt sammenbrud af derivater. Han refererede meget specifikt til Deutsche Bank, der har en eksponering til derivater til en værdi af \$75 billioner, og som af alle betegnes som den største enkeltkilde til et nyt systemisk sammenbrud.

Renzi lagde pres på Merkel og især den tyske finansminister Schäuble for at overgive sig og tillade Italien at opgive kravene til bail-in, der har været gældende i Europa siden 1. januar, for at kunne udføre en bailout af Monte dei Paschi og andre italienske banker.

Hvad der siden da faktisk er sket er, at Deutsche Bank offentligt har opfordret til en massiv europæisk bank-bailout, hvor man selvfølgelig begynder med sig selv, og de kræver grundlæggende set en i det mindste midlertidig annullering af reglerne for bail-in. Dette er en erklæring fra Deutsche Banks cheføkonom David Folkerts-Landau i *Welt am Sonntag* i søndags. Han siger, at banken har brug for en bail-out på EU150 milliarder for at genkapitalisere, og at det må gøres uden at

ekspropriere obligationsinnehaverne og indskyderne.

Som respons på disse dramatiske udviklinger udsendte den amerikanske, politiske økonom Lyndon LaRouche et dramatisk krav om handling:

»Det, som vi præcist må gøre, er at støtte en midlertidig reorganisering af disse bankers økonomi, og dette må vi sikre for at *standse blødningen*. Med andre ord, så er pointen den at stoppe blødningen, og integrere og introducere vilkår, der vil gøre det muligt for os at opretholde en sådan operation.«

»Man må med andre ord skabe, for hele den tyske økonomi er en afgørende faktor. Det er noget rod. Vi ved alle, at det er noget rod. Det har været noget rod; det blev til noget rod ... Schäuble og så videre har gjort det til noget rod! Det ved vi. Men vi vil ikke lukke den tyske økonomi ned på baggrund af det faktum, at vi har en flok skurke, eller mistænkte skurke, der sidder i visse stillinger. Det, vi vil gøre, er, at vi vil løse det her; vi fixer det, og vi bakker det op, for en enkelt gangs skyld.«

»Ryd op i det hele, og etabler et program, der vil sikre, at Tysklands banksystem fungerer. Når det først er gjort, kan man arbejde videre derfra!«

En sådan engangs-manøvre vil nødvendigvis involvere en annullering af disse \$75 billioner i derivater og så at gå over til en bankopdeling og den slags ting, der ville gøre kredit til realøkonomien mulig.

LaRouche uddybede: »Man er nødt til at kvalificere det yderligere og sige, at vi gør det som en engangs-operation, for at redde økonomien. Og det er det.«

»Dette er en redning af økonomien, og til trods for alle de fejl, der er begået, vil vi gøre det for en enkelt gangs skyld, fordi vi vil prøve at redde *Tysklands økonomi*. Og det er, hvad der står på spil. Og Schäuble er ikke nogen nyttig

person, heller ikke Merkel.«

»Vi må hjælpe Tyskland, for uden opretholdelse af et stabilt tysk system, kan vi ikke forhindre krig!«

»Det, vi behøver, er et program, der udsteder kredit til den tyske økonomi, en éngangskredit til tysk økonomi. Og man må præsentere det på den måde, og fremstille det for folk på den måde, for at give dem *tiltro* til det, de gør, og sige til dem, at de ikke skal gentage, hvad de gjorde tidligere. Det er pointen.«

»Man må sige til den tyske økonomi, 'Hør, I har begået fejl, alvorlige fejl. Nu vil vi redde jer, men I må selv adlyde; I må gå i gang med jobbet og gøre, hvad I må gøre, og forsøg ikke at snyde mere'.«

»Jeg siger, at Tyskland er et nødstilfælde. Vi må organisere det her sådan, så Tyskland kan komme ud af dette problem. Og antage, at organisationerne i tysk økonomi vil operere på en sådan måde, at slaget vindes.«

»Og Schäuble er jo egentlig ikke på højde med mit niveau på det område ... Men fokusér essentielt på de betingelser, der må tilvejebringes, og som gør dette her muligt. I må have et system, der vil sikre den tyske økonomi, den finansielle økonomi, og det må I gøre; og I må få det til at fungere. Hvis ikke, vil I få kaos.«

LaRouche refererede til 1989-perioden, da Berlinmuren faldt og Tyskland gik i retning af en genforening, og regeringen Helmut Kohl søgte at genoplive de økonomiske og politiske bånd til Østeuropa og det, der snart skulle blive til Rusland efter Sovjetunionen.

»På den tid havde vi tilfældet med en stor leder i den tyske økonomi, der blev myrdet af franskmandene – præsidenten for Deutsche Bank, Alfred Herrhausen. Vi ønsker ikke et nyt Herrhausen-overgreb. Lad tyskerne være frie, og send de andre

ud på græs. For det var, hvad der skete. For man havde et tidspunkt her, hvor man havde en ledende person i det ledende embede i tysk politik, og man lukkede *det ned*, og man fik tingene til at gå i en anden retning, og man ødelagde den indledende fase til den tyske økonomi!«

»Så vi må sige til nogle af folkene i dette område, at de begik en stor fejltagelse, og at de bør være en smule mere generøse i deres håndtering af denne ting.«

BREXIT-afstemning er langt alvorligere og mere dødbringende end blot en reaktion. Vi må leve det nødvendige lederskab for at undgå krig. LaRouchePAC Internationale Fredags-webcast, 24. juni 2016. Video, engelsk

Det er i dag den 24. juni, 2016 – en særdeles lovende dato. Det er en meget, meget farlig periode, og vi står med ekstraordinære udviklinger på hånden. Det kunne vel næppe være

tydeligere netop nu, forskellen mellem sammenstillingen med det døde-og-døende transatlantiske system, centreret omkring den Europæiske Union; og så fremtiden med det Eurasiske System. På den ene side, med det totale sammenbrud og den bogstavelige disintegration af det europæiske system – briternes exit af den Europæiske Union, samt det transatlantiske finansielle systems totale bankerot, der nu afsløres. Og, på den anden side, Vladimir Putins og Xi Jinpings igangværende indsats for en konsolidering og sammensmelting af den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union, den Nye Silkevej, og hele verden centreret omkring Stillehavet, som Lyndon LaRouche i mange årtier har arbejdet hen imod, i form af samarbejde mellem de store nationer Rusland, Kina, Indien og andre. Valget er meget, meget klart.

Engelsk udskrift.

*(En oversættelse af første del af webcastet følger snarest.
Bliv på kanalen! - red.)*

BREXIT VOTE IS MUCH MORE SERIOUS AND DEADLY THAN MERELY A REACTION. WE MUST PROVIDE THE LEADERSHIP TO AVOID WAR.

LaRouche PAC Webcast, June 24, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good afternoon! It's June 24th, 2016.

My

name is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us for our weekly LaRouchePAC Friday evening webcast. I'm joined in the studio by

Ben Deniston from the LaRouchePAC Science Team; and via video, by

three members of our Policy Committee: Diane Sare, from New York

City; Kesha Rogers, from Houston, TX; and Rachel Brinkley, from

Boston, MA.

Today is June 24th, 2016 – a very auspicious date.

It's a very, very dangerous period, and we have extraordinary developments on our hands. I think it could not be more clear right now the distinction between the juxtaposition of the dead-and-dying trans-Atlantic system, centered in the European Union; and the future, of the Eurasian system. On one hand, with the complete breakdown and {literal} disintegration of the European system – the exit by the British from the European Union, and the complete bankruptcy which is now being exposed of the trans-Atlantic financial system. And on the other hand, the ongoing efforts by Vladimir Putin and Xi Jinping to consolidate and coalesce the Eurasian Economic Union, the New Silk Road, and the entire Pacific-centered world that Lyndon LaRouche has been working towards for many decades in the form of the collaboration between the great nations of Russia, China, India, and others. The choice is very, very clear.

Earlier today we had a discussion with Mr. LaRouche. He was very emphatic to emphasize that the crash that we're now seeing in the trans-Atlantic financial system must be blamed on Obama. This is not something which can be construed as a reaction to an event, but in fact the bankruptcy of the trans-Atlantic financial system was already a reality before this [Brexit] vote even occurred. This is not a reaction, he said. This is something that's much more dangerous, and much more serious, and much more

deadly, especially when you consider the fact that Obama is continuing to push the world towards the brink of thermonuclear war with the emerging Eurasian system of Russia and China.

Mr. LaRouche said we're experiencing a complete change in the whole fundamental situation. Everything is now going towards a crash. And it's not because of a reaction to an event, but it was already pre-determined. Mr. LaRouche said, "We're on the edge of thermonuclear war, which under the current circumstances Putin would probably win; but Obama is insane enough to continue to push the world in that direction." He said, "Putin is currently in charge, in terms of his role being hegemonic. That was very clear by the recently concluded events in the St. Petersburg International Economic Forum, and then the bilateral meetings that are going to happen this weekend between Putin and Xi Jinping."

Mr. LaRouche said, "We're on the edge of something very big.

You must get Obama out! It's very dangerous to have him in office under these circumstances. Our job is to calmly bring a solution to this crisis from inside of our role here in the United States, with Putin playing a key leadership role internationally. We are in a position," Mr. LaRouche said, "to enter into a phase in which a solution is possible."

Now, I want to open up the discussion; I want to invite Diane to elaborate a little bit more on the role that Obama,

together with David Cameron, played in creating the circumstances that we are now observing in terms of the aftermath of the Brexit.

DIANE SARE: Well, everyone has heard of the famous expression "the kiss of death"; and Obama delivered this in London on April 22nd when he went there for two purposes. One was to express his firm support for Great Britain remaining in the EU; and I'm going to read his exact comments, so that there's

no question on that. And then also, to celebrate the birthday of

Her Majesty the Queen, whom he says is one of his favorite people

– I'm reading from his remarks; and he said, "And we should be fortunate enough to reach 90, may we be as vibrant as she is. She

is an astonishing person and a real jewel to the world; not just

to the United Kingdom." And in fact, that has been Mr. LaRouche's point – that the Queen of England does not see her realm as the United Kingdom; she's been trying to run a global dictatorship, and Barack Obama is one of her tools. And like a

typical malignant narcissist, Obama either intended to crash the

entire system; or is blithely unaware of how despised he is. So,

at a joint press conference at 10 Downing Street with a British

Prime Minister who is now resigning, David Cameron, Obama admits

he said, "Yes, the Prime Minister and I discussed the upcoming referendum here on whether or not the UK should remain part of the European Union. Let me be clear: Ultimately, this is something that the British voters have to decide for

themselves; but as part of our special relationship, part of being friends is to be honest and to let you know what I think. And speaking honestly, the outcome of that decision is a matter of deep interest to the United States; because it affects our prospects as well. The United States wants a strong United Kingdom as a partner, and the United Kingdom is at its best when it's helping to lead a strong Europe. It leverages UK power to be part of the European Union." And then he adds: "Let me be clear. As I wrote in the op-ed here today, I don't believe the EU moderates British influence in the world, it magnifies it. The EU has helped to spread British values and practices across the continent. The single market brings extraordinary benefits to the United Kingdom; and that ends up being good for America, because we're more prosperous when one of our best friends and closest allies has a strong, stable, and growing economy."

So presumably, the time between April and this referendum was enough for people to stop vomiting and make it to the polls, and vote to get out of the European Union as quickly as possible; which is what many of them did.

OGDEN: Well, I think also, according to what Mr. LaRouche said – and this is absolutely the case – the crash was already happening. It's a faulty view of history to say, "Well, an event happened, and therefore there was a reaction." And Mr. LaRouche is saying, the problem is that people think in terms of

reactions; one thing happens and then another thing happens. In fact, Europe was already bankrupt. Think about what was already happening. You had major European banks refusing to put their money into the ECB; you had negative interest rates at the ECB, which is an unprecedented, never-before-happened event in the history of that system. And you had a complete breakdown of the ability of both the European and the American workforce to be able to have productive jobs or anything of that means. So, we already were in a complete bankruptcy of this entire trans-Atlantic financial system; and now today, it is more clear than ever that the New Paradigm – which is represented by Vladimir Putin's and Xi Jinping's collaboration; the combination between the Eurasian Economic Union and the New Silk Road policy of China, which is based not on an idea of rival blocs or economic competition or something like that. It's based on the idea of a win-win collaboration. Now's the time for the European countries and for the United States to finally reject this Obama paradigm; and say we are going to join this New Paradigm. And many other nations in Europe could follow very closely behind Britain and leave the European Union, since it's now clear that it's a completely bankrupt institution.

KESHA ROGERS: And Obama can follow behind Cameron and leave the United States immediately. What you're seeing right now, as

Mr.

LaRouche once said, is the end of a delusion; an end of a dead system. And the end of an era of a zero-growth paradigm; which has dominated the culture and society for far too long. And it actually goes against the true essence of our nature and being as human beings. And this is exactly the strategic conception of man and the fundamental understanding of human beings that Putin actually understands; and those who are taking this direction of the New Paradigm forward. Because it's based in the identity for the future, of actually creating the future.

I just wanted to say that tomorrow, there will be several meetings, including one I'm going to be hosting here around the space program and the identity of the great mind of Krafft Ehricke. The title of the event is going to be "Free Mankind from Terrorism and War; Embrace Krafft Ehricke's Age of Reason".

I think that's where we are right now; the question is, can we bring about an age of reason by getting the population to understand that what they have accepted in terms of the policy of dictatorship and backward, degenerate culture that we have been under for the last 15 years. Namely, with the destructive and murderous policies of 9/11, that have not to this day been brought to justice; and 9/11 never ended. That's why Obama is continuing to get away with the murderous policies that are influencing the entire world right now. That we haven't brought these crimes to the forefront; that we haven't brought the

perpetrators of these crimes – Obama, the Saudis, the British – to justice and actually declared that we are going to join with this New Paradigm. That's what really has to come across right now.

The conception of Krafft Ehricke is very crucial in understanding what has to be the turning point for the thinking and identity of our nation, based on its foundation around being the example of a true Renaissance culture. When you think about the Apollo mission, and you think about what we did with the space program; and why Obama has targetted the space program. It wasn't a matter of opinion or a budgetary question; it was a direct targetting on this potential for human progress and to continue to promote this zero-growth paradigm. What we're seeing right now is that Russia and China are saying that this is not the direction that we will allow and have mankind to go in; we're going to actually develop and promote the true conception of what human destiny actually is.

So, what you see right now in terms of after this vote indicating the further breakdown of Europe and the trans-Atlantic system, which was already in the process on the opposite side, you have something that is completely remarkable being brought in. Putin and Modi – the Prime Minister of India, President Xi Jinping in China, the SCO summit this weekend, and the signing of massive agreements for economic cooperation and development,

including space collaboration. The question is, where is the United States in this? The idea that the Renaissance conception of mankind based on this identity of creating the future and restoring a moral value to society, is seen directly in what Russia and China are doing right now; and why this is a critical call to the moral of the United States to change that and to join with that direction.

RACHEL BRINKLEY: Another important aspect is what is the solution; what are the new systems. And the question of the space collaboration between Russia and China is not just over a few projects; this is what they emphasized over the last few days. They're looking at two things – space travel for one, and space station collaboration for two; and also with an emphasis on health and the implications [of space] on human bodies. So, these are big questions; these are not just, let's put a rover and test geology or something. This is looking at how the Universe works, how the Solar System works, how the human body works; and saying that this is going to have implications on Earth in medicine, to give people a sense that this is how mankind makes advances.

This has to be in the context of the question of Alexander Hamilton, which LaRouche has emphasized, and he recently made the point that what was it that was important about Hamilton? He said, what he did in Philadelphia, what he did in creating the Constitutional system of the United States. He knew that it wasn't just the military victory that would enable the United States to survive; the intention of the United States was to

be a system that created a better future for every single individual, not a slave system. So, he created the inherent economics of political economy to create that better future; and that is what the discussion is right now. This is not just Russia and China making some oil deals, or a new pipeline or something like that; it's actually above nations as such. That's what LaRouche said about this Brexit vote; it's not just business as usual, this is not a vote on pragmatic politics. There's something bigger acting. People did not want war; they're tired of Obama's kill policies which have terrorized the planet through his support for ISIS, the refugee crisis out of Syria; this is clear. So, this is something that's being called for, there's something acting which is coming from the future.

The problem with Americans is that they've lost the sense of how to think about that, about the future. So, that's our job right now, to create that discussion and that optimism about how to do that.

BENJAMIN DENISTON: I think that's the question now. What can we create? I was just reflecting on the discussion with Mr. LaRouche earlier and some of his remarks throughout the week, and I think his emphasis that you can't respond to or interpret events is really critical at a time like this. When you're

seeing these types of developments – because the Brexit vote is one example; these are not events causing the process. These are events caused by the process; you have a breakdown process. This is an explosive development in that context, but there's already an ongoing breakdown of the trans-Atlantic system; the cultural system as much as the monetary system, the whole political system. Look at the British imperial ideology.

But the point is, if you're responding to the events of that process, you are still contained by that process. How do you break free from that process? It's a question of creativity. What are you doing to actually bring something fundamentally new to the world situation? I think that's why what you're seeing out of Russia and China now is that; it's something new. It's not just a response, crisis management or trying to handle it, or trying to respond to the events per se. We're beyond that; the events per se are death, that's where this thing is going. Be it a complete breakdown of the system, or whether it's that drive to thermonuclear war. So the question on the table now is, what can you create? What can you do that's fundamentally new to create a new system; to actually generate a new orientation for mankind, for leading nations, that doesn't come from a response to current events? That comes from a new orientation to create in the

future.

The coverage of this in the media – the markets responding

this way or that way – it's just ridiculous. The whole thing has been going down for years; and we've known it. The question

now is, not who has the best spin on what mechanism caused what;

that doesn't matter. The question now is, who's actually got an

insight into what the necessary future has to be?

SARE: I just wanted to say along those lines, to really

caution our viewers and anyone who's thinking that the way to think about this is not to say how do we put together this broken

system; like Humpty Dumpty has fallen off the wall. It's over;

and only recognizing that almost every fundamental axiom that people had about economics in the trans-Atlantic was faulty.

And

I do have to point out that in 1988, Mr. LaRouche called for the

reunification of Germany based on his knowledge of the collapse

of the Soviet Union's economy. And he made a proposal that the

West would provide food to Poland in return for early steps toward an early reunification of Germany; and exactly one year later, the Berlin Wall came down, and one year after that, Berlin

was the capital again and Germany was re-unified. And he and his

wife both said at that time, the Soviet communist system has failed; but that does not mean that the free trade trans-Atlantic

system is a success. This, too, is finished; and it's end will be much larger and more catastrophic than the disintegration of the Soviet Union as we saw in '89. So now we are truly there; and the point is for the United States to recognize what Rachel just said about Alexander Hamilton, what's embedded in our own Constitution. That that understanding of the intent of our republic, combined with what Kesha represents in terms of the space program and a true scientific orientation, is the platform from which the United States can move to the future.

And I just want to add – because Ben had sent something out and I think Kesha, too – there's something circulating on the web of 30 gigantic projects that China is engaged in building which are changing the whole planet; these are huge infrastructure projects. One of them is a 16-mile long suspension bridge across the Yangtze River; another is a group of nuclear power plants; and so on. I think the most expensive any of these projects was, was something like \$3.4 billion. The bridges might have been \$1 billion or \$750 million or something. Think about that and think about the bail-out. The first bail-out of AIG – and there was more than one; but the first bail-out of AIG was \$80 billion. Now, \$80 billion is probably more than the sum of what was spent on all of these 30 giant projects combined. You will also argue that this is not the same kind of dollars; just like that's the problem with the metric of what the space program generated, but I'm just using it as an example. Because particularly in the United States and Western

Europe, people have a totally insane view of what constitutes value and what is money. And if you just look at something like

this, you can see that the destruction, the degradation and collapse of the United States has absolutely nothing to do with money per se; because we could have taken that \$80 billion from

the AIG bail-out and invested it into high speed rail, nuclear power, getting back to the Moon, any of these things. And I think we've done a number of \$80 billion [bail-outs] just for AIG, but the policy decision was not to do that. And that's the

point of the insanity; and that's what we have to change, because

money itself has no intrinsic value. Once you understand that,

you can stop panicking about all the money that's going to be wiped out if everyone crashes and has their silly irrational responses, or maybe it's finally rationality setting in.

Money

doesn't matter per se; the question is, what is the direction of

human progress, what is the direction of humankind? From that standpoint, we can turn on a dime; not that everything is going

to be repaired instantaneously. It'll take probably two generations for the United States to achieve a standard of living

that would be appropriate for this nation. But nonetheless, the

direction could occur tomorrow; provided we do what Kesha said first at the beginning, which is that Obama is no longer in control of running the direction of this country – nor anybody who thinks like Obama.

OGDEN: Well, I think it's very important that you brought

up this question of the fictitious values at the root of this entire trans-Atlantic system; because what we're seeing in the distinction between the bankrupt collapsing system in the trans-Atlantic Europe-centered area, and then the growth in China, in Russia, in India, and in that new Eurasian system. These are not comparable types of systems; this is not one person's loss is another person's gain or something like that. These are completely two distinct species of outlook on the world; and I think that's what we're getting at here. What we're

experiencing with these crashes within the span of just a few hours, HSBC lost 10% of its stock value; Standard Charter lost 10% of its stock value; the pound was down to a 31-year low – lower than it's been since 1985. But what is all of this? This

is just the evaporation of fictitious value.

On the other hand, you have substantial, real growth in the form of the reconstruction of the New Silk Road, the development of the vast interior Eurasian continent, the development of new transport routes, these new development corridors. Diane, I think it's appropriate that you brought up the turning point in 1989 with the crash of the Soviet Union, because what we're experiencing now is something at least of that caliber, if not far, far greater than the caliber of 1989. And you're right, Mr.

LaRouche was clear at that point that the Soviet system was merely the first show to drop; now we're experiencing the second

shoe has dropped. This system is bankrupt. And at that time in 1989, is when Lyndon and Helga LaRouche planted the seeds for what has now emerged as the New Paradigm, as the new Eurasian economic system. At that time it was first – in its nascent

form – the Productive Triangle; then it became what was the Eurasian Land-Bridge. This was adopted in the form of the New Silk Road; and now this is being expanded to the World Land-Bridge. This is a vision for a global and extraterrestrial

development policy. But Mr. LaRouche made several trips to Russia during the 1990s; several trips to India as well. Mrs. LaRouche has travelled now multiple times to China in the last several years. This is the center; this is Mr. LaRouche's emphasis on the impetus of leadership, the hegemonic influence at

this time of the creative leadership of the leaders of these nations. President Putin, President Xi Jinping, Prime Minister Modi, and others.

DENISTON: I think it's worth underscoring that it's still playing out, too. We have this SCO summit going on right now, in

which the heads of these nations are going to meet. After that,

Putin is going to be travelling to China for a heads-of-state meeting with Xi Jinping. In this whole process, you're having these dialogues to solidify – and I think this is really big – solidify the Eurasian Economic Union cooperation with the New Silk Road; which I think is a huge step in these very large but

regional projects moving closer to this Eurasian Land-Bridge, World Land-Bridge perspective that Lyn and Helga have defined.

So another point of emphasis that Mr. LaRouche has had over

the past weeks, I think is very sobering and represents a very high level of thinking, is don't assume we know how any of this

is going to play out. This is a developing, creative process; there's a lot more things going on right now. And we should be

orienting towards not trying to assume we know how all these things are going to be finished, or what the results are going to be. This is an ongoing, creative process right now, and this is how you have to think about it. In the next days, as was mentioned, out of the activity we're going to be engaged in over this weekend which is very significant – both here in the United States and in Europe – that's going to be a critical escalation. But then over the next weeks also, we're just going to see a lot of important developments coming.

ROGERS: I think it's important what Diane brought up on the point of the system of monetarism that has dominated the culture and society, that has actually set mankind backwards from what the intention of the foundation of our republic actually represented under the conception of Alexander Hamilton. That's really what you have to look at, too, when you think about the cultural pessimism and the zero-growth paradigm that has continued to dominate for the past several decades now. It's interesting, because people try to say that the targetting of the space program has to do with not having enough money; we just have to take these budget cuts. And that's the same point. How much bail-outs have we put on these various financial speculators and derivatives and so forth that we could not put into the space program? The idea was that it was never about the fact there

were not enough financial resources to put into the space program. It was in the intention not to invest into the future.

And there were many people who promoted this zero-growth paradigm

that Krafft Ehricke took on directly, who stated that the space

program represented too much of a "false optimism" for the population; that it actually gave the population a sense of optimism and a sense of their identity as human beings and a commitment to the future. The empire and those promoters of zero-growth were adamant that they had to put a stop to that.

I

was reading an article from back in 1963 in the {New Atlantic};

it was referenced in a book by Marsha Freeman – "The Conquest of

Space and Stature of Man" by Hannah Arendt. Hannah Arendt was one of these major promoters of zero-growth and backwardness; and

she made the point that the fight against the space program is not that of money, but a question of man being inherently corrupt

and that nothing good could come out of scientific progress.

And that's the thing right now, is that what Russia and

China and this New Paradigm are promoting that only good can come

out of the nature of mankind's creative mental process in terms

of shaping and defining the future and creating that which has never been created before. As we're seeing with the outcome of

what China is doing with their space program. That used to be our mission; why we went to the Moon in the first place, and why

President Kennedy made the announcement that we would send a

man

to the Moon and bring them back before the decade was out. It was our obligation to take on something that was fundamentally new; that's our creative nature.

That just puts the question that this monetary system has to be thrown out the window; a new system of economic value based on the real conceptions of the creative powers of the human mind has to be brought in. And the best conception to bring that about is the space program.

BRINKLEY: Absolutely. And Mr. LaRouche made the point that

also what do we replace this system with? The idea has to be a

Eurasian policy; and that's what you see in space, that's what you see in real economy is what are the mutual interests.

Europe's only chance is to join with this policy; so Obama has explicitly prevented that. He's called for everybody on the planet not to join with Russia and China; he tried to prevent it,

whether it was Japan, Mexico, all the coups going on in South America right now – Argentina. Puerto Rico is being destroyed and murdered by Obama and Wall Street. LaRouche said this is also why the [Brexit] vote occurred; Obama's economic policies,

his defense for this doomed system is clear. Also the question

of Obama said our great ally is Great Britain, and it will be now

and forever. Well, what are we showing with the 28 pages? Saudi

Arabia did not act alone; actually this part might not be in the

28 pages, but it's in many other pages that are there to be released. Through the BAE deal, Prince Bandar, to be found out

that Great Britain might not be our greatest ally. And Obama's

defense of Britain, of Wall Street, his continual murder policy,

the fact that somewhere 111-114 Americans commit suicide every day; that this is Obama's policy. He is a murderer; and he has got to be removed. That's the fact; it's an absolutely evil intention, and he's got to be thrown out.

SARE: I'd just like to add along those lines: One is we

are having our regular Saturday meeting here in Manhattan, although it's slightly expanded. I will be keynoting it; and we

have Jason Ross from the Science Team is here and others, to present these two views. We also are holding a concert on Sunday

afternoon, dedicated to Sylvia Olden Lee, called "In Praise of Sylvia Olden Lee", who was one of our very important collaborators in the Schiller Institute in this fight for the question of Classical beauty. And Classical music is something

which can strengthen people, which strengthens our better angels,

as Abraham Lincoln might have said, to actually insure that justice is done. And I bring these things up, because here in the US, you have this really diversionary, silly spectacle of debates about gun control and Congressmen rolling around on the

floor and things like that; pretending that they're in some kind

of civil rights sit-in, when here you have the murderer-in-chief

- President Obama – presiding over a weekly kill session on

Tuesdays, deciding who he's going to kill. Then you had September 11th, which Rachel was alluding to, where close to 3000

Americans were killed; and justice has not been done. And Obama

– as Bush before him – is covering up for the perpetrators of the crime and colluding with them as best we know.

And I think this is a very important flank for those people who say, "Well, it's impossible; we only have a couple more months. In January, we have a new President anyway." Well, just

look at what's been happening in the last few weeks, to see how

quickly things can change. NATO has deployed 50,000 troops in exercises on the border of Russia. Do you really think we should

just presume that we're going to safely avoid thermonuclear war

while we have a killer lunatic who is now more desperate than ever as President of the United States? I think it's very important that people stop pretending or picking other so-called

"issues" which are really non-issues; when we have a great crime

which was committed 15 years ago on September 11, 2001, which has

not been addressed. By addressing this and getting to the truth

of what was involved in this – the Saudi role, the British role,

the Wall Street role, the FBI role, the Bush role, Obama's role;

by addressing that, we have a lever by which to expel the current

President from the White House and hopefully land him safely in

jail where he belongs. And to change therefore, the direction

of
the United States.

OGDEN: If Obama was so interested in Britain's staying in the EU, perhaps as Kesha suggested, he could follow suit after David Cameron and announce his resignation as well. To his credit, David Cameron has announced that he is leaving his post as Prime Minister before his term is over.

DENISTON: Obama might be too big of a narcissist; it'll take more aggressive action for that one.

OGDEN: But I do think that absolutely, Diane, what you just said about the events that are coming up this weekend – both in New York and then, Kesha, what you're hosting down in Texas – the emphasis has got to continue to be, what is the creative intervention that can be made to uplift the American people and to lead the American people. That was one thing that really did stick out when we were speaking with Mr. LaRouche earlier today; that it's never enough just to have the correct analysis of events. Our emphasis has got to be, how do we calmly bring a solution to the table that will be the solution to this crisis? And that's what you were saying, Ben, that we're in completely uncharted territory; this is an unprecedented situation in the history of mankind. You have no idea what's going to happen tomorrow, what's going to happen the next day. It was almost a comedy to watch how surprised all the pundits and the investors and the big masters of universe and everybody were, when they

thought that they were going to sleep last night with the remain
vote having come out on top. And then they wake up this morning
and lo and behold, it's the completely opposite result. That proves to you that these guys have no idea what they're doing.

Diane, you brought this up in the webcast last week.
Why would you give anybody any credit, when they had no idea that the Crash of 2008 was right around the corner? Why would you put your trust in these people? So, you have a completely unprecedented situation. The rise of the Eurasian system is not something which is a fait accompli; this is what's driving the directionality of the possibility of a thermonuclear war breaking out. Granted, the support for the sanctions and for the NATO maneuvers in Europe is now becoming increasingly less strong; but that doesn't mean that you're by any means guaranteed that we can avoid a fate such as that. So, it's decisive action and it's creative leadership in the case of what we are able to provide; and Mr. LaRouche was clear that it's the unique capability of the members of this Policy Committee to provide that kind of leadership within the United States.

So again, I just want to emphasize the importance of these two events that we have coming up this weekend. So, I think with that said, you can watch for coverage of those events as they are broadcast. The regular Saturday meeting will be live, available

on the LaRouche PAC website tomorrow for Manhattan; and we encourage you to participate in that in person if you are in the area, as well as the events in Texas. And please stay tuned to larouchepac.com as things rapidly change.

If you haven't yet, make sure you subscribe to our YouTube channel; make sure you don't miss any of these critical discussions. And also become a regular subscriber to our Daily Updates which are delivered directly to your inbox via email. So, thank you for tuning in, and please stay tuned to larouchepac.com.

Lyndon LaRouche: Intet kan standse krakket – Putins rolle, samt en økonomisk vision efter Hamiltons principper, er afgørende

Det transatlantiske finansielle system vil nedsmelte. Intet kan standse det. Det vides ikke præcis, hvornår krakket kommer, men vi må være forberedt til denne uundgåelige ekslosion. Systemet er uigenkaldeligt ude over et punkt, hvor det kan håndteres eller reformeres. Vi befinder os på randen af et uforudsigeligt krak. Vi må have en ny fremgangsmåde, der

må baseres på rationelle kræfter i det transatlantiske område, der kan tage de nødvendige, radikale skridt.

18. juni, 2016 (Leder) – Under en indledende diskussion som forberedelse til LPAC's fredags-webcast, kom Lyndon LaRouche med følgende kommentarer (parafrase):

Det transatlantiske finansielle system vil nedsmelte. Intet kan standse det. Det vides ikke præcis, hvornår krakket kommer, men vi må være forberedt til denne uundgåelige ekspllosion. Systemet er uigenkaldeligt ude over et punkt, hvor det kan håndteres eller reformeres. Vi befinder os på randen af et uforudsigeligt krak. Vi må have en ny fremgangsmåde, der må baseres på rationelle kræfter i det transatlantiske område, der kan tage de nødvendige, radikale skridt.

Putin forstår denne krise, og hans perspektiv, som det reflekteres i hans bemærkninger ved Det Økonomiske Forum i Skt. Petersborg, er uforligneligt. USA og Storbritannien er de mest upålidelige. Det mest risikofyldte væddemål på denne planet udgøres af Obama. Obama vil tabe, punktum. Et helt nyt finanssystem er den eneste mulighed.

Folk, der vil kalde sig intelligente, må indse, at spekulation ikke vil virke. Hele hasardspilssystemet må annulleres. Al hasardspilsgæld må annulleres, og vi må begynde helt forfra – baseret på principper, der er totalt forskellige. Det Britiske [økonomiske] System må bringes til ophør. Det samme er tilfældet med det franske system, efter de Gaulle-perioden. En total, global genopbygning kræves; ingen studehandler. Det amerikansk-europæiske finanssystem er umuligt. Sig »Nej!«. Vi må vende tilbage til et system, der er baseret på fysiske værdier, ikke pengeværdier. Vi må begynde forfra, med Hamiltons økonomiske principper som udgangspunkt.

Foto: Den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin taler til plenarforsamlingen på Skt. Petersborg Internationale Økonomiske Forum, 17. juni, 2016. Foto: kremlin.ru

Supplerende materiale:

Uddrag af Putins tale til plenarforsamlingen på Skt. Petersborg Internationale Økonomiske Forum, 17. juni 2016

I øvrigt er de aktuelle, geopolitiske spændinger, til en vis grad, relateret til økonomisk usikkerhed og udtømning af de gamle kilder til vækst. Der er risiko for, at det vil stige, eller endda blive kunstigt fremprovokeret. Det er i vores fælles interesse at finde en kreativ og konstruktiv vej ud af denne situation.

[Der findes] et enormt og voksende potentiale inden for digitale og industrielle teknologier, robotics, energi, bioteknologi, lægevidenskab og endnu andre områder. Opdagelser inden for disse områder kan føre til sande teknologiske revolutioner og til en eksplosiv vækst i arbejdskraftens produktivitet. Dette sker allerede, og det vil uundgåeligt ske

...

Vi kan faktisk allerede i dag se forsøg på at sikre eller endda monopolisere fordelene ved næste generations teknologier. Dette er, mener jeg, motivet bag skabelsen af afgrænsede områder med opsatte regler som en barriere for at reducere udvekslingen af banebrydende teknologier ...

Man kan kontrollere spredningen af visse teknologier i en vis tid, men i nutidens verden er det nærmest umuligt at holde dem tilbage i et inddæmmet område, også selv om det er et stort område. Men denne indsats kunne føre til, at grundforskning,

der nu er åben for den fælles udveksling af viden og information gennem fælles projekter, også indelukkes, hvor der opstilles afspærrende barrierer.

... vi kan kun udvikle os effektivt sammen, ved at opbygge et samarbejde. Vi er overbevist om, at et sådant samarbejde faktisk kan opbygges som en del af et fleksibelt og åbent integrationsmiljø, der opmuntrer til konkurrence inden for videnskabelig forskning og et bredt udvalg af teknologiske løsninger, der gør det muligt for de deltagende lande fuld ud at bruge deres kompetence og deres potentiale ...

Vi er bevidste om de imponerende udsigter i forbindelse med samarbejde mellem EAEU [Eurasisk Økonomisk Union] og andre lande og integrationsforbindelser. Flere end 40 stater og internationale organisationer har udtrykt deres ønske om at etablere en frihandelszone med den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union. Vi og vore partnere mener, at EAEU kan blive et af centrene i et større, fremvoksende integrationsområde ...

Sammen med vores kinesiske kolleger har vi planlagt at påbegynde officielle forhandlinger så tidligt som i juni måned, om skabelsen af et omfattende handelspartnerskab og økonomisk partnerskab i Eurasien, med deltagelse af staterne i den Europæiske Union og Kina. Jeg forventer, at dette vil blive et af de første skridt hen imod skabelsen af et betydeligt, eurasisk partnerskab. Vi vil helt bestemt genoptage diskussionen om dette betydningsfulde projekt på det Østlige Økonomiske Forum i Vladivostok i begyndelsen af september ...

Venner, det projekt, jeg netop har omtalt – projektet for det større Eurasien – er selvfølgelig åbent for Europa, og jeg er overbevist om, at et sådant samarbejde kan blive til gensidig fordel. På trods af alle de velkendte problemer i vores relationer, er den Europæiske Union fortsat Ruslands hovedpartner inden for handel og økonomi ...

Jeg forstår også vore europæiske partnere, når de taler om de komplicerede beslutninger for Europa, som blev truffet under forhandlingerne om dannelsen af det transatlantiske partnerskab. Det er indlysende, at Europa har et enormt potentiale, og en satsning på kun én regional forbindelsespartner indsnævrer tydeligvis dets muligheder. Under de omstændigheder er det vanskeligt for Europa at opretholde en balance og bevare et rum for en udbytterig manøvre.

Som de nylige møder med repræsentanter for tyske og franske erhvervskredse har vist, så er europæiske virksomheder villige og rede til at samarbejde med dette land. Politikere bør møde virksomhederne på halvvejen ved at udvise kløgt, samt en vidtskuende fleksibel fremgangsmåde. Vi må atter oprette tillid til de russisk-europæiske relationer og genoprette vores samarbejdsniveau.

Vi husker, hvordan det hele begyndte. Rusland igangsatte ikke det aktuelle sammenbrud, afbrydelse, problemer og sanktioner. Alle vore handlinger har udelukkende været i besvarelse. Men vi bærer ikke nag, som man siger, og vi er rede til at komme vore europæiske partnere i møde på halvvejen. Men dette kan under ingen omstændigheder blive en vej med ensrettet færdsel.

Lad mig gentage, at vi er interesseret i, at europæere går med i projektet for et storstået eurasisk partnerskab. I denne sammenhæng hilser vi den kasakhstanske præsidents initiativ, med at afholde konsultationer mellem den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union og EU, velkommen. I går diskuterede vi dette spørgsmål ved mødet med præsidenten for den Europæiske Kommission.

Det vil yderligere være muligt at genoptage dialogen mellem eksperter på et teknisk niveau, om en bred vifte af spørgsmål, såsom handel, investering, lovgivning inden for teknik og toldadministration. På denne måde kunne vi skabe fundamentet for yderligere samarbejde og partnerskab ...

Vi anser det naturligvis for vigtigt at fortsætte samarbejdet omkring betydningsfulde forskningsprojekter, såsom ITER-forsøgskraftværket og den frie elektron-røntgenlaser, for blot at nævne nogle få. En fælles indsats vil gøre det muligt for os virkelig at forøge både Europas og Ruslands teknologiske konkurrencedygtighed. Det rækker at sige, at, i 2015 investerede Rusland 1,2 mia. euro i fælles højteknologiske projekter med Europa ...

Et præsidentielt råd for strategisk udvikling og prioritetsprojekter vil blive skabt i den nærmeste fremtid. Deres ydmyge tjener vil stå i spidsen, mens rådspræsidiet vil blive ledet af premierminister Dmitry Medvedev ...

Verden har brug for et så magtfuldt land som USA, og det har vi også, men vi har ikke brug for, at det konstant blander sig i vore anliggender, fortæller os, hvordan vi skal leve og forhindrer Europa i at opbygge en relation til os.

FRA SPØRGSMÅL & SVAR:

Jeg ønsker ikke at tro på, at vi er på vej hen imod en ny Kold Krig, og jeg er sikker på, at ingen ønsker dette. Vi gør ganske bestemt ikke. Det er ikke nødvendigt. Hovedtankegangen bag udviklingen af internationale relationer er, at, uanset hvor dramatisk, det kan synes at være, så er det ikke tankegangen bag en global konfrontation. Hvad er problemets rod?

Det skal jeg sige jer. Jeg må bringe jer lidt tilbage i tiden. Efter Sovjetunionens kollaps, havde vi en forventning om generel fremgang og generel tillid. Desværre måtte Rusland konfrontere flere udfordringer, for at tale i moderne vendinger: økonomisk, samfundsmæssig og intern politik. Vi fik udfordringer som separatisme, radikalisme, aggressiv international terror, for det var utvivlsomt al-Qaeda-militante, som vi bekæmpede i Kaukasus, det er en åbenlys

faktor, og det kan der ikke være to meninger om. Men, i stedet for støtte fra vore partnere i vores kamp mod disse problemer, fik vi ulykkeligvis noget andet – støtte til separatisterne..., efterretningsstøtte, finansiel støtte og regeringsstøtte ...

Sovjetunionen eksisterede ikke længere; Warszawa-pagten eksisterede ikke længere. Men af en eller anden grund fortsætter NATO med at udvide sin infrastruktur hen mod Ruslands grænser. Det begyndte længe før i går. Montenegro er ved at blive et NATO-medlem. Hvem truer Montenegro? For vores position bliver totalt ignoreret.

Et andet, lige så vigtigt, eller måske det vigtigste spørgsmål, er den ensidige [fra USA's side] opsigelse af ABM-traktaten. ABM-traktaten blev engang indgået mellem Sovjetunionen og USA af en meget god grund ... Traktaten var udtænkt til at skabe en strategisk balance i verden. Men de droppede imidlertid ensidigt traktaten og sagde venligt, Dette er ikke rettet imod jer. I ønsker at udvikle jeres offensive våben, og vi antager, at det ikke er rettet imod os.

Ved I, hvorfor de sagde sådan? Det er simpelt: der var ingen, der forventede, at Rusland i begyndelsen af 2000, da landet kæmpede med sine interne problemer, var revet itu af interne konflikter, politiske og økonomiske problemer, tortureret af terrorister; at Rusland da ville genopbygge sin forsvarssektor. Der var tydeligvis ingen, der forventede, at vi var i stand til at opretholde vore arsenaler, for slet ikke at tale om at få nye strategiske våben. De tænkte, at de ville opbygge deres missilforsvarsstyrker, mens vore arsenaler skrumpede.

At dette blev gjort under påskud af at bekæmpe den iranske atomtrussel. Hvad er der så blevet af den iranske atomtrussel nu? Der er ikke nogen; men projektet fortsætter. Og sådan er det, skridt for skridt, det ene efter det andet, og så fremdeles.

Så begyndte de at støtte alle mulige former for 'farvede revolutioner', inklusive det såkaldte Arabiske Forår. De støttede det ihærdigt. Hvor mange positive syn hørte vi om, hvad det var, der foregik? Hvad førte det til? Kaos.

Jeg er ikke interesseret i at give nogen skylden. Jeg vil ganske enkelt sige, at, hvis denne politik med ensidige handlinger fortsætter, og hvis skridt i den internationale arena, hvor disse skridt er meget følsomme for det internationale samfund, ikke bliver koordineret, så er sådanne konsekvenser uundgåelige. Og modsat, hvis vi lytter til hinanden og taler ud fra en balance mellem interesser, så vil dette ikke ske. Ja, det er en vanskelig proces, processen med at nå til enighed, men det er den eneste vej til acceptable løsninger ...

Af hvilken årsag, støttede de kuppet i Ukraine? Jeg har ofte talt om dette. Den interne politiske situation dér er kompliceret, og den opposition, der nu sidder ved magten, ville efter al sandsynlighed være kommet til magten på demokratisk vis, gennem valg. Sådan er det. Vi ville have arbejdet sammen med dem, som vi havde gjort det med den regering, der sad ved magten før præsident Janukovitj.

Men nej, de skulle absolut gå frem med et kup, med tab, med udløsning af blodsudgydelser, en borgerkrig, og med at skræmme den russisktalende befolkning i det sydøstlige Ukraine og i Krim. For hvad? Og efter at vi var nødt til, simpelt hen nødt til, at tage forholdsregler for at beskytte visse samfundsgrupper, begyndte de at optrappe situationen, at ophidse til spændinger. Efter min mening, så gøres dette, bl.a., for at retfærdiggøre eksistensen af den Nordatlantiske Blok. De har brug for en ekstern modstander, en ekstern fjende; i modsat fald, hvorfor skulle denne organisation i det hele taget være nødvendig? Der er ingen Warszawa-pagt, ingen Sovjetunion – hvem er det rettet imod?

Hvis vi fortsætter med at handle i overensstemmelse med denne

tankegang, med at optrappe [spændinger] og fordoble indsatsen for at skræmme hinanden, så vil det en dag komme til en kold krig. Vores tankegang er fuldstændig anderledes. Den fokuserer på samarbejde og søgen efter kompromis. [Applaus]. (Udskriftet af Putins tale er ikke komplet.)

Putin præsenterer vision for fred og udvikling ved SPIEF

Præsident Vladimir Putin henvendte sig til plenum-sessionen ved Skt. Petersborg Internationale Økonomiske Forum (SPIEF) (17. juni 2016) med en slagkraftig politisk og økonomisk vision for Eurasiens fremtid, og som konsekvens deraf for Verden, idet den imødegår Obamas aggressive krigsforberedelser. Han fremførte, at de geopolitiske spændinger i virkeligheden drives af den økonomiske krise. Han appellerede stærkt til EU-nationerne om at afslutte det destruktive sanktionsregime, idet han identificerede det faktum, at de er et resultat af Obamas manipulation. Han pegede på de tyske og franske erhvervsledere, som har åbnet op for en genetablering af relationerne med Rusland, og opfordrede politiske ledere til at mødes med dem på halvvejen, for at reetablere tillid mellem EU og Rusland.

Putin sagde, at Verden, og Rusland, behøver et stærkt USA, men ikke et USA, der blander sig og forhindrer Europa i at bygge bånd. Om TTIP sagde han, at Europa ville blive alvorligt begrænset, hvis det blev bundet til et enkelt regionalt tilknytningsforhold. Han gentog adskillige gange, at hans vision for et 'Stor-Eurasien' sammen med specielt Kina, var åbent for alle – og i særdeleshed for EU-nationerne.

Han gennemgik i detaljer sin plan for genopbygning af den russiske økonomi, baseret på fremstillingsvirksomhed, anvendelse af teknologier i industrien, 3 millioner nye jobs i små og mellemstore industrivirksomheder i år 2020, og endnu

mere fokus på videnskab og teknologi inden for uddannelserne.

Dette er, hvad Obama kalder sin succesfulde "internationale isolation" af Rusland.

Forlæng Verdenslandbroen ind i Sydvestasien og Afrika: Afskrift af Hussein Askarys tale på Schiller Institutets og EIR's seminar på Frederiksberg den 18. april 2016



Kommer senere på dansk.

Hussein Askary Speech in Copenhagen to the Schiller Institute-EIR

Seminar "Extend the World Land-Bridge to Southwest Asia and Africa," April 18, 2016

{Hussein Askary had fair number of graphics and charts, which he used to illustrate his presentation.}

TOM GILLESBERG: The next speaker is somebody very unique and unusual, Hussein Askary originally comes from Iraq and had

to get out under very nasty circumstances, as many others. But

that became a blessing at least for our organization, because Hussein, through Norway, ended up to become part of the international LaRouche organization in 1994, and has since then

been contributing quite fantastically to our international work.

And he is one of the authors of the original {New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge} report; but then also made a decision, that this cannot simply stay in the English language,

or Chinese. This also has to be in the Arabic language. So Hussein took it upon himself to translate this into the Arabic language and then also of course, write some extra parts to it,

which is necessary for the present circumstances in Southwest Asia to have.

This report just came out. It was release on March 17, in Cairo, in a meeting presided over by the Egyptian Transportation

Minister who then introduced Hussein, and the hope of course is

that this will become something read and studied and acted on in

the whole Arabic world, as well as the rest of the world. So Hussein?

HUSSEIN ASKARY: You have heard Helga today, giving a very stern and sobering warning about the state of affairs in the world, the dangers are very real to the world today. What I am going to do, and please don't misunderstand me, I'm not going to

give you a picture of how rosy and nice things are, either in Southwest Asia, the so-called Middle East, or in Africa, but, as

they say in sports, you have to keep your eye on the ball. What

Helga just said, is that there is a new paradigm in the world, which can lead to a completely different, and new world order. And it's that paradigm, within which myself, the Schiller Institute, and the people we are talking to, we want to direct their attention to that new paradigm.

I'm thankful to Leena Malkki for her beautiful singing, and, especially, the {Aida} aria. It was actually performed at the opening of the Suez Canal, the second Suez Canal, last year. The idea of great projects, the idea of great challenges, like Hela was explaining, this idea of being in space, looking at

the world from space, and, also, the idea of major projects, like

the Suez Canal, like the Three Gorges Dam in China, the New Silk

Road, the effect they have on people, is that they challenge their imagination, and challenge their creativity, because they

represent major difficulties, major technical problems, intellectual problems, that have to be solved, before you achieve

these major projects. And that transforms the idea of people. It

also gives people an idea of a creative constructive identity,

and the position of man in the world, on this Earth, and also in the universe. That is why we try to work on these concepts of the New Silk Road, the extension of the New Silk Road, to {inspire} people to think outside of the box, outside of the box of geopolitics, which Helga was trying to explain. We have to get out of geopolitics. We have to act {human} again. But that has practical implications. There are practical problems, and other issues, and even scientific issues we have to resolve. So, for those who are not familiar, this is the extension of the New Silk Road. The New Silk Road has existed as the new strategic policy of China since 1996, but we want to expand this into a global collaboration, a blueprint, as Tom said, a concept for peace and cooperation among nations. We have to connect the Economic Belt of the Silk Road (the one with the yellow), which is already being built. As Helga said, the first train arrived from China to Tehran last month. There are projects going on in Siberia. So there are trains going from Asia to Europe. There is no problem with that. We need to extend it into the Southwest Asia region, the so-called Middle East (I can explain later why I say Southwest Asia, and not the Middle East), and into Africa, and of course, into the Americas. So, you can see that the red lines are where we have the biggest deficits, the biggest deficits in infrastructure, both transportation infrastructure, but also in other needs, deficits in water, and deficits in electricity.

What is different in the Arabic part, which I rewrote certain parts of it, like the Southwest Asia part, we also added

the Arabian Peninsula, also, to the idea of the connection to the

New Silk Road. This is no longer simply a Silk Road; this is the

World Land-Bridge, which can unite all the continents of the world.

In 1996, I had the great fortune to work with Helga Zepp-LaRouche and the team of {EIR} to make the first major study

of the New Silk Road, and it was that one which was adopted by the Chinese government as the strategic policy of China. It was

also a thick report like this.

This work is being done, mostly in East Asia, Central Asia, Iran, Turkey, Russia, all these nations are involved, but what is

lacking is the connection to the rest. So it has been 20 years since that idea emerged, but there was no response from the countries in the Arab world, for example, or in Africa.

Now, the idea with all these lines is not only about trade. We want to warn people, that we are not talking about moving goods from China to Europe. That's not our concept. That's a byproduct. What we mean by the New Silk Road, the World Land-Bridge, that we need to create development corridors: a development corridor where you bring power, water, and technology

to areas that are landlocked, that are far from industrial zones,

and, explore the resources, human and natural resources of that

region, to develop new centers of economic activity. Like landlocked nations, like in Central Asia, or the Great Lakes region in Africa. That's the concept. It's not about trade, although trade is an important aspect of this.

In 2002, Mr. Lyndon LaRouche, the American economist and political leader, the husband of Mrs. LaRouche, was in Abu Dhabi,

in a conference about oil, and the role of oil in world politics,

and the future of oil. And there were many ministers of oil actually from the Arab countries – the gentleman to the right is

the energy minister of the United Arab Emirates – and Mr. LaRouche shocked everybody, and said that the Arab countries, or

the Gulf countries, have to gradually stop exporting raw oil, and

actually use raw oil and gas as an industrial product, for petrochemicals, plastics, where every barrel of oil will give many times its value, rather than burning it as energy. He said

that you should use your position in the world, as a crossroads

of continents. You have to utilize that position as a crossroads

for world trade, but also, the connection between Africa, Asia and Europe.

So I added these to the Arabic version, because I think that this is a very unique area in the world, not only that its strategic location is very unique, no other part of the world has

that; you also have two-thirds of the world's energy resources,

so-called, oil and gas in that region, but also, most importantly, you have about 450 million people. Most of them are

young people. And actually, many of them have a good education.

You also have nations with a very ancient history and culture, and a very historical identity, like Egypt, Ethiopia, Iran, and

so on, and they also have an idea of themselves as becoming key players in the world, but we hope that they will become key players in the world in the economic, scientific and cultural sense.

The problem is that all these advantages have been turned into disadvantages. So this region has become a center for global

politics, for global geopolitics, and that is why we see the conditions we have in the whole Middle East region becoming like this.

Our idea is, now we have this new situation with the Russian intervention, the prospect, the possibility of having a peaceful

political solution in Syria, the prospect of uniting many powers

to fight ISIS and al-Qaeda, and so on, both in Iraq and Syria, and also in Libya. But this should be followed, as Helga said, we

need a Marshall Plan, we need an economic development plan, to establish peace on a true basis.

The reason I joined the Schiller Institute in 1994, was that I was in Oslo, and I was working as a translator, and there was a

Palestinian children's delegation coming with Yasser Arafat; and

I was going around with them, and, at that time, you had the Oslo

peace agreement. A week later, I saw a sign that the Schiller Institute was having a meeting in Oslo. They had a very interesting title. They said in the meeting that if you don't start with the economic development of the Palestinian people, the people in Jordan, Syria, Israel, and so on, if you don't base

the peace process on a solid economic basis, this whole thing will fail. And the peace process is, of course, dead now, both

because of that, but also because of geopolitics which has prevented reaching a true peace.

So, therefore, to establish true peace, we need an economic and scientific program. Helga referred to president Xi Jinping's

visit to the region in January this year. I consider this as an

historic turning point, actually, because at that point, in late

January, Saudi Arabia and Iran were at the point where there was

a big risk of a direct war between Iran and Saudi Arabia, because

of the beheading of a Shi'a clergy in Saudi Arabia, which led to

demonstrations, the burning of the Saudi Embassy in Tehran, and

so on. So the Chinese intervention came at a very crucial point,

where they said, "Look, all these religious conflicts and problems you have with each other, can lead the whole world into

a disaster. Why don't we work on our method? We offer you to join

the New Silk Road. We offer economic development, and technology,

and even financing, so we can connect all of your countries which

are in conflict with each other together into this global process." And this is very, very important. And nations in the region have to really grasp that opportunity now, and, instead of

discussing the fate of President Assad, they should discuss what

kinds of economic projects they should work together on.

One of the issues that I didn't mention, is that, for example, even as Helga said, Saudi Arabia and Turkey, they can

join this, if they stop this other policy, because we also have one of the largest concentrations of financial power in the Gulf countries; the so-called sovereign funds of the Gulf Cooperation Council countries is about \$2 trillion. This can be transformed into credit.

In the report, I propose the establishment of the Arab Infrastructure Investment Bank. A bank which will be financed by these rich countries, which would have a capital of \$100-200 billion, and that capital will only be earmarked for infrastructure and development projects.

So every nation has a role in this. And in the report, we have also added, which is not in the English report, a plan, a general outline for the reconstruction of Syria, by utilizing Syria's position also as a bridge for the Silk Road, both from Asia, and from Europe, into Africa. We also propose the construction of a Syrian National Reconstruction Bank, which is

very important. We have a very important chapter in the report about how nations can internally finance major infrastructure programs. Because, the big question, which comes all the time when I am in Arab countries, or in Africa, is, they say "OK. This

sounds good. Who will pay for this? Where will the money come from?" Actually, you don't really need money, in that sense. You

can create the money, but you have to know where to use that money. As Helga said, the central banks in Europe and the United

States are pumping massive amounts of liquidity into the financial and banking system. But none of that is transformed into technologies or projects, public projects, or housing projects, or industrial projects in Europe or anywhere. So

money

is being printed, but it is not being used.

But there is a method, which we call the Hamiltonian national credit system, which every nation can actually internally generate credit to finance part of its national development plans, and this is one thing we put in the Syria plan. Because every time there is a war like in Bosnia, in Lebanon, and so on, you have donor conferences, where every nation says that we will give you so much money, 100 million, 50

million, but there is no centralized idea about how to rebuild the whole country. It all depends on donations, small drops which

come. We want something massive. We want something big.

Foreign

governments should contribute to that by exporting technology to

Syria, for example, which Syria cannot afford to build, or afford

to buy, in the current situation.

Also, a part of our plan for Southwest Asia is to fight against desertification, by managing and creating new water resources, stopping the expansion of the desert. This is the Iraqi Green Belt project to stop the effect of sand and dust storms, which actually is a big problem for many cities in Iraq,

sometimes even reaching into Iran, by building a Green Belt, planting trees in a large scale, a belt by using both ground water and water from the rivers. This is a kind of national program which can unite the people of Iraq for an idea of their

future together. Not Sunni, Shi'a, Kurdish, Turkish, and so on,

and so forth. These are the kinds of projects, real physical projects, which will challenge people to work together in a country like Iraq.

Now, I took this Egyptian model, because in Egypt, you have

a very terrible situation, which is the accumulation of 30 years of destructive economic and financial policies, mostly caused by former President Mubarak's and Anwar Sadat's collaboration with the IMF and the World Bank. There should be a shift in the way Egyptians consider their economy. Because Egypt always waits for the IMF or the World Bank, the EU or the United States to give some money so that they can start something new. And usually money does not go to large scale. Europe, the United States, the UN, the IMF and the World Bank will {never} finance large infrastructure projects. That's the policy. Small, small, small is beautiful. That's what they say.

But in Egypt, with the new leadership in Egypt, you have the focus on mega-projects, which is a necessity. If you want to save Egypt's economy, Egypt's entire infrastructure has to be built from scratch again. There should be new industrial and agricultural centers, which they are focusing on. Using high technology, they try to attract the highest levels of technology, and internal financing. You know, President el-Sisi, when they wanted to build the Suez Canal, there was no money, as usual, they said. So what he did was something unique. He went outside the central bank. He went outside the budget, and said, "I will go on TV, and I will tell the Egyptian people that we want to build this canal. It's crucial for our nation. We want you to give the money."

In 2013 I wrote a memorandum for Egypt, an Egyptian Economic Independence Document, I called it. Actually, inside Egypt, you

can raise more than \$100 billion, because there are resources inside Egypt. People, even today, buy dollars. They take part of

their salary, and buy dollars or gold, and keep it at home, so that financing disappears from the system. It's not reinvested in

the system. People keep their money because of the unstable economic situation.

But if you encourage the Egyptian people with this kind of national development projects, which will put their kids to work,

unemployed young people, they would come out with the money. And

this is what el-Sisi did. I wrote at the time, that they should

build a National Development Bank, not just one fund for the Suez

Canal, as they did. But as soon as President el-Sisi came on TV

and said, "We want to build this canal, but we don't have the money. We want the Egyptian people to pay for it." So they went

out, and in one week they raised \$8 billion. And people were queuing late into the night; I met a banker last year, who said,

"We had to stay open into the night, because people were queuing

at the banks to buy the bonds!" Egyptians are real patriots. They

love their country, but if they are encouraged by good leadership.

Of course, the Suez Canal is not giving back what was supposed to be already from the beginning, because world trade has collapsed. The level of transit in the Suez Canal has gone

down, not because of Egypt's policy, but because the world economy is going down. Global trade has been collapsing. But the

idea is to use the Suez Canal as a development zone. And this is

what I got from people in the Suez Canal Authority – that they are not only thinking about transport of goods, but they want to

utilize that route to build new industrial zones around the canal, like we showed in the development corridor idea. And, of

course, Egypt has a very key role, both in the Arab world – it's

the most important Arab country – and also in Africa.

Now Egypt has one big problem – it's the demographic problem. People say that Egypt is overpopulated. That's not true.

Egypt is not overpopulated. Cairo is overcrowded! Ninety million

people live on only 5% of the land of Egypt; 95% of the land of

Egypt is empty. It's not used, but it's not overpopulated. The United States and Europe have been financing the Egyptian government with hundreds of millions of dollars for family planning, so that women will have fewer children. But no projects

were built to expand Egypt's economic potential to accommodate to

the new generations, so that they can have new agricultural and

urban centers out in the desert!

After I was in Egypt last year, I wrote a report for a major economic conference in Egypt to attract investment; but these are

the ideas which came out of both the conference, and my observations about Egypt's role in the New Silk Road. In Egypt,

people were very negative to the idea of the New Silk Road, because they said that the transshipment on the Silk Road will take away trade from the Suez Canal – that shipments will go from Asia to Europe by land, and we will lose. So there are a lot

of people in Egypt who are actually against the idea. But I was

telling people, “Look. It’s not about trade. If you have economic

development, you will need more Suez Canals to accommodate the trade. But if the world economy is not growing, there is no development, there will be no trade. And people will compete on

attracting trade into other areas.”

So the idea is to develop Egypt’s economy, but also contribute to more development and more trade among nations. And

it’s in utilizing Egypt’s position to connect to Sub-Saharan Africa, to North Africa, the Middle East, and to the Arabian Peninsula. Interestingly, after I was in Egypt, last week the Saudi King was in Egypt, and they decided to build this bridge.

At Sharm el-Sheikh, there is a connection over the Gulf of Aqaba.

I think that the Egyptian President invited the Saudi King to support the building of this bridge between the Saudi territories

and southern Sinai, which will turn Sinai from an isolated area,

suddenly into becoming the center between two major economies.

There are now big problems in Egypt, because the President made a terrible mistake by conceding sovereignty over the Tiran

and Sanafir islands to the Saudis. There was a dispute between the two countries for many years, but President el-Sisi suddenly

declared that they are Saudi islands, and now there is a big

uproar in Egypt. And the mistake was that there was no public discussion about it. The parliament didn't have anything to say

about this. So, now there will be a review of the agreement.

But

the idea of this project is very important.

Now, for Egypt to get out of that demographic box, is for Egypt to expand its economic activities into the desert. This is

the development corridor proposed by Dr. Farouk El-Baz, who is a

space scientist, and he is right now an advisor to the President.

And he designed this idea of creating the new valley, the new Nile Valley, by building railways, roads, and new urban centers.

I added these green zones, because these are actually becoming new agricultural areas that the Egyptian government wants to invest in, by creating new farmlands – they are talking about 4

million acres of land, and settling young people into these regions, and building new agro-industrial centers. But what is needed is to extend the development corridor, the black line, into the economic zones.

This is the Africa Pass. One of our Egyptian friends, an engineer, presented this at our conference in 2012, it's the same

idea, connecting Egypt to North Africa, to Europe, and into the

Great Lakes region of Africa. Now, the Great Lakes region countries, like Rwanda, Burundi, the eastern Congo, Uganda, they

have massive problems of economic development, also because they

are very far from the transport corridors of the world. We wrote

a series of reports two years ago about the cost of shipment

of a container. The Danish shipping company A.P. Møller-Mærsk has statistics that the cost of a shipment of a container from Singapore to Alexandria is \$4,000, to Mombasa in eastern Kenya, it becomes \$5,000; but to the capital of Uganda, it goes to \$8,000, because there are no good roads to ship that container! Into Rwanda and Burundi it reaches \$10,600 per container. So they cannot bear the cost of shipment of containers that maybe have technology inside them, and machines, and that is a major problem for these so-called land-locked countries. So you need to have new lines of transport which will reduce the cost of the transport. Now these are ideas which the African nations, the African Union, have had for many years. There are many very nice plans, but the attitude of the rest of the world to Africa, because Africa, by itself, does not have the technology, at least, to build these projects, and there has been no willingness in Europe, or the United States, to finance, or contribute to building the projects proposed in any of these major reports, to integrate the infrastructure of Africa and enhance economic development. Because without infrastructure, you cannot have economic development. But some of these lines are now coming on the agenda, thanks to the intervention of the BRICS nations, and also of China. For example, the Cairo-Cape Town highway idea, President Jacob Zuma of South Africa, presented this actually twice at the BRICS summit in 2013 and 2014, and he said, "This is a crucial, a key element in the development of Africa. We need to work with the

BRICS nations and China, Russia and India to build these projects." There are 400 road and rail projects involved in this.

But this is a big challenge, both in terms of financing, and in terms of technology.

There is also the possibility of connecting the river systems of Africa for river transport, like in Europe, the Main-Rhine-Danube Rivers are an important transport artery, and

development artery. In the same way, you can connect the Nile to

the Great Lakes, to the Zambezi River through a number of canals,

and so-called trans-modal transport systems, where you can ship

from rivers to rail, and back to rivers, to lakes, and so on, in

an easy way.

Filling the gap which the United States and Europe have left for many, many years, now the Chinese-. Well, in Europe, we have a very problematic and twisted relationship to poverty, to

poor countries, to underdeveloped countries. Europeans look at Africa as a burden. It's a problem. How do we solve this problem?

But the problem is that the whole focus has been on aid, emergency relief, and so on, and so forth, but that really doesn't solve problems. I mean, people talk about genocide. In Africa, every year there are 4 million children who die. Now, talk about a war crime. There are 700,000 children before the age of five who die every year in Africa. So, you cannot solve

these problems with small aid projects here and there. You need

to think big. You need to provide those people with adequate transport, electricity, water systems, and this cannot be done

by so-called aid programs. In Africa 600 million people don't have access to electricity, out of 1 billion. But you look at the Chinese, when they look at an underdeveloped country, they see an opportunity. They see potential. They see a "win-win" strategy – new markets, new areas of development, and they should intervene in that situation.

It is the same idea that President Franklin Roosevelt of the United States had. All of his fights with Churchill were exactly about this problem. Roosevelt told Churchill in the middle of World War II, that you British are very stupid, because you suck the blood of the Africans, and you get pennies, you get nothing, by sucking their blood. But if you develop Africa, as independent nations, as modern nations, as we did with the United States, then you will gain much, much more; if you treat them as humans, if you develop their infrastructure, schools and hospitals. And this is exactly what the Chinese are thinking about. Out of the problem, they see an opportunity. Prime Minister Li Keqiang was in East Africa, and also Nigeria in May 2014, and immediately said, "We want to help Africa to connect all the capitals with railways," which is a big deficit problem. And they started from East Africa. And now there are projects being built from Lamu, a new port, into the land-locked South Sudan, into Uganda, into Rwanda and Burundi. And China is both financing major parts of this, but also contributing to building it, to solve the problems of the land-locked countries and the need for development.

China recently completed, it's not running yet, but part of the railway is running, from Djibouti to Addis Ababa. There is an

old railway, which is not functional, built by the French colonialists, but now there is a new, electrified railway, which

goes from Djibouti to Addis Ababa.

Two interesting things about this railway are, firstly, that Ethiopia is always associated with famine and food problems. Some

of these problems still exist. These are on the way to being solved, but to bring food from the ports to inside the country usually took two months, because of the lack of infrastructure.

So starving people could not have food in time. Even if the food

existed in the port, coming from around the world to Djibouti, it

was almost impossible to bring the food to the people who needed

it. Now, that food can be shipped in 10 hours, to the capital, and also to other areas. The other interesting fact about this railway is that China is not just building the railway, and financing it, but training and educating engineers and workers to

run these systems.

Now, Ethiopia has a massive infrastructure plan for connecting all the major cities of Ethiopia, with the railway and

roads. The other thing about the railway is that it is all electrified. And the Ethiopians will use all these new dams they

are building, to electrify the railway. So they don't need import

oil, and gas and diesel to run the railway system. They will domestically provide the energy to run the trains.

So, Ethiopia, I am very sure it will never be associated

anymore with famine and poverty. Ethiopia is a great nation, a very proud nation. They have massive resources, but these resources have been dormant, have not been utilized. But now, with the Chinese intervention, and also India is active there, these resources will be developed.

This is just a metaphorical picture. This is the Mombasa-Nairobi railway being built by a Chinese and a Kenyan worker. In Africa, the propaganda goes that the Chinese never let

the locals work in these projects. They bring their own workers,

they bring their own engineers, their own technology, they build

the thing, and then they leave. It's not true. They always involve local workers. They train them, because they cannot run

these systems; the locals will have to run these systems themselves.

But they are also training the labor force in Uganda. They are building an Army Corps of Engineers, so that the Army can play a positive role in the development of the country.

Traditionally, the Army Corps of Engineers played a very important role, even in advanced countries. So this is part of the same project.

Another important infrastructure project for Africa is Transaqua. Lake Chad is drying up, which is a known fact, and 30

million people are affected, because they live as fishermen, or

they have grazing land around the lake in Chad and Nigeria, and

Niger. All these countries are affected. There are 30 million people around that region, and there will be massive migration actually from the Lake Chad region. So there is an idea called Transaqua, which was developed by one of our friends, an Italian

engineer, to bring 5% of the water from the Congo River, or

the tributaries of the Congo River, and build a 2,800 km.-long canal into the Chari River, and then flow downwards into Lake Chad, to refill the lake; but also to have a new economic zone, and build the Mombasa-Lagos highway, which was one of the plans I showed earlier.

So you can transform that part of Africa, which in people's minds is a complete jungle, into a new economic zone, but also to bring water to the Lake Chad region.

Now, there are some other issues I want to address. One of the big deficits of course in Africa, is the energy consumption.

And as I said not everybody has that; the average international level of energy consumption is about 2,800 [kw?] but that's not equal. The only two countries which are exception are South Africa and Libya, before that. So the energy needs in Africa are {enormous}! I mean Africa has a lot of wealth, but also the hydropower potential which has never been built. But the attitude of the Western countries, like the Obama administration, they have something called "Power Africa Initiative," that certain nations in Africa will get energy provided. But they're not talking about hydropower, they're not talking about nuclear power, they're not talking about coal or gas or so on. They're talking about so-called "renewable" or "sustainable energy." And the International Energy Agency has a criteria for access to

energy, which is a modern access to energy is about 100kw-hours

per year per person. And this diagram shows very ironically, that that amount will be consumed by an American in three days!

But they expect Africans to live with that for a whole year! Here's just one more ironical idea: My refrigerator can consume

many times as much as an Ethiopian individual.

These are the criteria for President Obama's Power Africa plan, that the plan will eventually help these nations come to this line, while the real needs are that big now, and they will

be that big in a few years. So, all these ideas to help Africa

from the Obama administration, they're not adequate! It's just a

complete bluff. It does not help, if you just look at the numbers.

And this is also another irony of the Obama administration policy. These are the sources of energy for the American people,

the American economy, and these are what the Obama administration

{doesn't} want you to do. So it's "do as we say, not as we do."

So the United States produced 37% of its energy from coal, that's

forbidden for Africa; 30% produced by natural gas, that's a very

suspicious policy, because there's the carbon problem; 19% nuclear – absolutely no nuclear for Africa; 7% hydropower – the

United States is very suspicious of hydropower projects, and so

on and so on. So what is left is solar, so-called geothermal, and biomass, which the United States produced only 0.1% of its

needs. But that's recommended for Africa. [laughter] So anyway, the idea is that if Africa joins the new paradigm shift, African nations, they have exactly, in African families and African individuals, they have exactly the same needs as we

have; as we have in Europe or in the United States. There is absolutely no difference. So they're trying to convince the Africans that they should just, maybe, if they're lucky they could get a lightbulb at home, so the kids can read, by having a

solar battery. They will not bite!

I mean, if you bring electricity to a village, what people will do, is not simply have a lightbulb, if you bring electricity

to a village, – and one of our friends made a study in India –

is that people will start to want to use new devices. They have

to have other appliances at home, you need to have a stove, so women don't have to many hours and cut trees and come home and cook with the wood, and suffocate with the smoke. Farmers will

have to have tractors. They will need to have workshops which use electricity; people will want to have TV sets, computers. They want to build industrial projects. They will need refrigeration which is a big problem in Africa, because most of

the food produced in the Sub-Saharan goes wasted because there's

no refrigeration.

So just to give yourself an illusion that you will provide every African lightbulb, just forget about it! Because the needs

of those people are so immense, and they will not give up on their right to have a living standard which is similar to ours.

Why shouldn't they have it? And this is what – here, in the

ideology in Europe and the United States I know, they should not have this kind of technology, they should not have this kind of development in Africa, because that's not "sustainable." Which is not true. It is sustainable, if you provide the tools and the technology to do that. Actually in Africa, there are more resources than in Japan or in the United States and Europe, to sustain industrial development!

So the problem is in the policy. The problem is how they look at Africa, and how they look at the problem of poverty and so on. And that has also to change, exactly as we changed with geopolitics, we have to change our attitude to the problems of Africa, and have really the right methods to solving them, and treating African nations as equal to us, and African families as equal to us, and African individuals as equal to us.

Nobody here will give up their living standard, and live in the forest – maybe some people who do, there are some Danes and Norwegians... [laughter] But we want to have education. We want to have warm housing, we want to have clean water; we want to have a future for our kids; we want to have trains which go on time. This is what the Africans want. You know, there's nothing different, we're all one human race!

So, when you design policy and you say, "No, Africans should have 'sustainable energy,' not nuclear power," then you are breaking with that idea of a real human family and equality.

So

I think I'll stop here. [applause]

Dias til talen:



Et håb for USA og Europa: Asiens og Ruslands lederskab

21. marts 2016 (*Leder fra LaRouchePAC*) – Kollapset af de transatlantiske landes finanssystemer er nært forestående. Det er netop blevet signaleret i Den europæiske Centralbanks chefs meddelelse om, at de nu undersøger at kaste »helikopterpenger« ind i bankkonti i hele Europa; og i den tyske Centralbanks chefs eksplorative offentlige udbrud imod denne inflationsskabende plan. Centralbankerne har forsøgt enhver form for bailout i syv år, og finanssystemerne er nu ved randen af et gennemgribende kollaps.

Nationerne må nu dramatisk og omgående ændre deres politik for at redde deres økonomier og befolkninger fra Wall Streets og City of Londons kollaps.

Og der er kun én kurs for ændring, der vil lykkes: den politik, der er modelleret efter præsident Franklin Roosevelt's politik – med nedlukning af Wall Streets kasinoer og udstedelse af statslig kredit til produktive formål – men

koordineret på globalt plan.

Til at gennemføre dette kan lederskabet kun komme fra Asien: fra Kina, Rusland og Indien.

Kina er i færd med at bygge landbroer tværs over Eurasien og ind i det kollapsede Europa, og endda muligvis ind i USA via Beringstrædet. Inden for to år planlægger Kina at landsætte et rumfartøj på Månenes bagside og observere og undersøge universet på måder, der hidtil ikke har været muligt fra Jorden eller fra fartøjer i kredsløb. Kina og Indien er nu verdens mest dynamiske rumnationer.

Kinas »Nye Silkevejs politik« med udstedelse af kredit og opbygning af broer, der spænder over kontinenter, med ny, økonomisk infrastruktur, står måske også på randen af at bringe økonomisk udvikling til Mellemøsten og Nordafrika. Dette er fundamentet for en varig fred og stabilitet. At føre den Ny Silkevejs udvikling gennem Mellemøsten og Nordafrika, og erklære ørkenen krig, er det eneste udviklingsperspektiv for hele denne region. Og det er den eneste basis for at vende Europas »flygtningekrise« omkring.

Vladimir Putins initiativ i Syrien har vendt kursen for anliggender i Mellemøsten hen mod en forhandlet fred og stabilitet, for første gang, siden George W. Bush' katastrofale krig i Irak.

Dette er lederskab.

Den ganske lille styrke, der har katalyseret dette lederskab, har været LaRouchePAC og Schiller Instituttet. Hen over 30 år er Lyndon og Helga Zepp-LaRouches politik med den »Eurasiske Landbro« blevet Kinas politik, især over for Rusland og Indien. I et gennembrud i sidste uge i Cairo blev det offentligt Egyptens politik, gennem en konference med repræsentant for Schiller Instituttet Hussein Askary og Egyptens transportminister som hovedtalere.

Ved afgørende konferencer 23. marts i Frankfurt og 7. april i New York City vil denne politik blive forelagt europæiske nationer og USA: Gå med i Den nye Silkevej, tag lederskabet i Asien og samarbejd med det, eller gå ind i en håbløs bankerot. Alt afhænger af disse begivenheders succesfulde indflydelse.

Foto: Begyndelsen af Silkevejen, Xian, Kina. Kinas nye økonomiske Silkevejs-udviklingspolitik, »Ét bælte, én vej«, er åben for tilslutning fra alle nationer. (CC BY-SA 2.0)

SPØRGSMÅL OG SVAR

med formand Tom Gillesberg

den 10. marts 2016:

Rusland og Ukraine; Hillary Clinton;

Nykredit; finansspekulation;

EU-Tyrkiet; Schiller Partiet

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 3. marts 2016:

**Schiller Instituttet har
foretræde for Folketingets
Udenrigsudvalg:**

**Syrisk våbenhvile er en
chance for fred gennem
økonomisk udvikling//**

Helga Zepp-LaRouche i Indien:

**Forlæng Silkevejen til
Mellemosten**

Sagen om Nykredit/Totalkredit

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**Video: Den
Asiatiske
Infrastruktur**

Investeringsbank (AIIB) præsident Jin Liquns tale i København den 2. marts 2016

Redrawing the Global Financial Map – Jin Liqun President of the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank

“How Can the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank Contribute to Economic Development and Integration in Asia? What is in it for Europe/Denmark?”

Meeting arranged by Copenhagen University's Asian Dynamics Initiative, Asia Research Centre, and Copenhagen Business School.

Question by Tom Gillesberg, chairman of The Schiller Institute in Denmark at ??

Link til København Universitets side om mødet.

Historien udvikler sig til Ruslands og Kinas fordel, ikke Obamas

17. februar 2016 (*Leder fra LaRouchePAC*) – Efter endnu et fejlslaget »topmøde«-forsøg på at vende ASEAN-landene imod Kina, brugte Barack Obama sin pressekonference den 16. februar på at fordømme og forsøge at nedgøre Rusland, og i særdeleshed

den russiske præsident Putins succesrige forandring af situationen i Mellemøsten.

Obamaregeringen forsøger, gennem medierne, at hævde, at våbenhvilen i Syrien, som den amerikanske udenrigsminister John Kerry forhandlede igennem med den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov, vil mislykkes! Dette, fordi Obama ikke kan tolerere de succesrige økonomiske og politiske roller, som Rusland og Kina nu spiller i verden, og sine egne fiascoer.

Det, som Putins succesrige rolle repræsenterer, er overførslen af indflydelse over menneskelige anliggender fra det britiske imperiesystem – for hvilket Obama har været en villig faktor – og over til de fremvoksende eurasiske nationer.

Det repræsenterer også en næsten 20 år lang succesrig kamp imod al jihadisk terrorisme, både i Rusland og internationalt – et samarbejde, der uafbrudt er blevet tilbuddt USA siden 11. september [2001], og som altid er blevet afvist af Bush og Obama.

Kina og Rusland og Indien er blevet de primære agenter for en ændring af civilisationens fremtid. De europæiske nationer og USA er for en nedadgående kurs, og de vil gå ned, med mindre de radikalt ændrer deres politik for den krise, der omslutter deres banksystemer.

Siden præsident Franklin Roosevelt's død har USA befundet sig i en lang nedgangsperiode for økonomisk produktivitet; og siden mordene på JFK og RFK, for et accelererende tab af videnskabeligt og teknologisk fremskridt, og for de fleste af sine borgeres livsbetingelser.

Spørgsmålet drejer sig ikke om, hvad Obama siger; det drejer sig om, hvad man skal gøre med ham. Vil USA være intelligent nok til at gå sammen med Rusland og Kina om samarbejde om rumprogrammer, i internationale kreditbanker, i store infrastrukturprojekter, i overvindelsen af terrorisme, der er

fostret af briterne og saudierne? Hvis ikke, vil USA blive ødelagt som magt.

Præsident Putin udøver ikke stor magt, men effektiv magt, og han udøver den med intelligens. Rusland, Kina og Indien styrer i stigende grad planetens fremtidige historie.

Og USA har – Obama! Hvis han blev dumpet nu, så har USA en historisk afprøvet politik for økonomisk genrejsning, der kunne genoprette dets fremtid: FDR's politik. Luk Wall Streets kasino-banksystem, der er ved at få fallit, ned, og skab dernæst statslig kredit til genindførelse af produktivitet og produktiv beskæftigelse. Det er det eneste alternativ, og det vil ikke ske med Obama i embedet.

Foto: Præsidenterne Xi Jinping og Vladimir Putin mødes under G20-mødet i Tyrkiet i 2015.