

**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 nedsmeltning, 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?

ZEPPE-LAROUCHE: Well, I think I would to 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 Mitterand 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-LAROUICHE: 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 a 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-LAROCHE: 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-LAROCHE: 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.