

Leder, 28. oktober 2015: Briterne er totalt bankerotte: Tiden er inde til at dumpe Obama, Schäuble og Wall Street

Den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinpings besøg i Storbritannien fandt sted på et tidspunkt, hvor den britiske økonomi er totalt kollapsed, de britiske banker totalt bankerotte, det britiske monarki i en tilstand af opløsning og hele det globale, anglo-hollandske system på randen af total disintegration. Kineserne er udmærket klar over alle disse kendsgerninger, og handler i overensstemmelse hermed.

Ud fra Vestens standpunkt er tiden inde til en grundig hovedrengøring, før de britisk-ejede desperadoer, såsom præsident Obama, starter den verdenskrig, som de har prøvet på at fremprovokere, siden afsættelsen og mordet på Libyens Gaddafi i slutningen af 2011. Drivkraften bag deres fremstød for krig er deres bankerotte tilstand og deres umiddelbart forestående tab af magten. Det afgørende spørgsmål er nu, om verden, med begyndelse i den transatlantiske sektor, vil styrte ud i kaos, eller om der i tide kan ske en reguleret afslutning på det britiske system gennem en genoplivning, med begyndelse i USA, af Hamiltons økonomiske principper.

Den amerikanske Kongres er dysfunktionel, som det er blevet bevist af den kendsgerning, at Kongressen ikke har foretaget sig noget for at imødegå Obamas politik med Dronedrab, selv uger efter, at *The Intercept* har udgivet »Drone-papirerne« (den tyske Forbundsrag har allerede afholdt høringer med

whistleblowers, der er fhv. amerikanske dronepiloter). Kongressen er gennemgribende korrump, især republikanerne, med ganske få undtagelser. Wall Streets blotte eksistens sikrer fortsættelsen af denne korrupsion. Udslet Wall Street, der allerede er håbløst bankerot, og så vil Kongressen kunne føres tilbage til sit forfatningsmæssige mandat. Udslet Wall Street, og Obama er væk.

I Europa er den tyske finansminister Wolfgang Schäuble hovedpersonen bag promoveringen af nedskæringspolitikken, der fører til folkemord, og som i Tyskland går under betegnelsen »det sorte nul«. Tysklands næststørste tabloidavis, *Welt am Sonntag*, kom i sin søndagsudgave med et åbent krav om, at den tyske kansler Angela Merkel skulle dumpes pga. sin bløde holdning til flygtningepolitikken og i stedet erstattes med Schäuble. Hvis Europa skal overleve, må Schäuble, ligesom Obama, omgående afsættes.

Selve USA's økonomi er, efter 15 år med britisk-ejede præsidenter, i en tilstand af fysisk-økonomisk sammenbrud. Sammenbruddet i den amerikanske, produktive økonomi accelererer enormt, som det ses af de seneste rapporter om den voksende fattigdom, samt af ti måneders konsekutiv nedgang i den industrielle produktion. Vitale sektorer, som boliger, konstruktion, transport og maskinværktøj følger en accelererende, nedadgående kurve. Dette har Obama ansvaret for. Han ødelagde med overlæg den amerikanske økonomi på vegne af Wall Street og London – og med størstedelen af Kongressen som medskyldig. Kongressen bør modtage en betinget opsigelse: Før I dumper Obama og nedlukker Wall Street, få I ingen løn. I fortjener ingen løn. Find jer en produktiv beskæftigelse andetsteds, eller, hvad der er bedre, gør jeres arbejde ved at afsætte Obama og gøre en ende på Wall Streets elendighed, gennem vedtagelse af Glass-Steagall og en genoplivning af statskredit i traditionen efter Alexander Hamilton (Det unge USA's første finansminister, -red.), for en genoplivning af arbejdskraftens produktive evne, gennem investeringer i

infrastruktur og programmer, der drives frem af nye videnskabelige opdagelser.

Foto: Den tyske finansminister, Wolfgang 'det sorte nul' Schäuble

USA: Økonomisk udvikling og Den nye Silkevej rammer Washington, D.C. (incl. video and english transcript): EIR Forum: Ending Permanent Warfare and Financial Panic

27. oktober 2015 – **EIR** leverede et nødvendigt chok til Washington, D.C. i dag på National Press Club, under titlen: »En afslutning på permanent krig og finansiel panik: Glass-Steagall og den Globale Silkevej«. Blandt mange andre gæster hørte og debatterede 35 personer fra ambassadestabe fra lande i hele verden præsentationer ved Schiller Instituttets stifter Helga Zepp-LaRouche og fhv. senator til den amerikanske Kongres Mike Gravel fra delstaten Alaska.

Missionen var at præsentere det umiddelbart tilgængelige, håndgribelige alternativ til krisen i den transatlantiske verden med økonomisk forfald og endeløse krige. Dette i en

amerikansk hovedstad, der lider under økonomisk nedtrykthed og krigslede, og som skal vedtage nedskæringer af pensions- og sundhedsydelse samtidig med, at beskatningen af en befolkning, der er ved at gå under økonomisk, skal øges. Zepp-LaRouche og senator Gravel gjorde det klart, at, med genindførelsen af Glass-Steagall i den transatlantiske sektor, sammen med en opkobling til den udviklingspolitik, som repræsenteres af Den nye Silkevej, samt en afslutning af Barack Obamas katastrofale rolle som præsident, kan krisen i USA og Europa vendes til en økonomisk genrejsning.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche er hovedperson bag og forfatter til *EIR's* udførlige specialrapport, »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen«, der har fået opbakning fra mange økonomiske institutioner i Kina og nu er udgivet som kinesisk bog, der nyder bred cirkulation i Kina.

Mike Gravel var den senator, der brød Washington-reglen, da han i 1971 i Kongressen oplæste de såkaldte »Pentagon-papirer« om Vietnamkrigen (og således sikrede, at disse oplysninger blev optaget i Senatets journal, -red.), og som i 2007, under en præsidentkandidatdebat, udfordrede Barack Obama ved, med stor forudseenhed, at kalde denne for en kandidat for krig, inklusive atomkrig.

Gravel udfordrer sine kolleger i den aktuelle søvngænger-Kongres til at åbne op for Obamas hemmelige dronekrige, hans uautoriserede, evindelige krige i Mellemøsten og Nordafrika, samt krigskonfrontationer rettet mod Rusland og Kina. Han sagde til forsamlingen, at han samarbejder med Lyndon og Helga LaRouche, fordi han støtter konceptet med Silkevejens globale infrastrukturudvikling og den måde, hvorpå LaRouche-parret organiserer til fordel for dette. Han sagde:

»Vi befinder os i en 'Augusts Kanoner'-situation: Vi må have en fremgangsmåde over for Den nye Silkevej, som med en Marshall-plan.«

Med en beskrivelse af den forværende flygtningekrise i Europa, som er skabt af Obama som det direkte resultat af hans krige, kaldte Helga Zepp-LaRouche dette for »de brændende skjorters tid«, [1] hvor ledernes skjorter brænder pga. krise, og hvor »en ny æra for menneskehedens fælles mål« kan initieres.

Under den timelange diskussion og debat fik gæsterne EIR-specialrapporter og tegnede abonnementer på EIR Alert-service. Zepp-LaRouche, Gravel samt Lyndon LaRouche blev interviewet af amerikanske og udenlandske medier.

I en senere diskussion efter forummets afslutning fokuserede Lyndon LaRouche på forummets centrale betydning som værende missionsorienteret. Han sagde:

»Hvad gør du for at skabe et højere udviklingsniveau for de levende og for dem, der følger efter? – Det er målestokken for din moralitet.«

»Wall Street er i færd med at ødelægge USA's befolkning. Det påtvinger den amerikanske befolkning mere og mere fattigdom – ikke blot år for år, og sæson efter sæson! Det er en gift; skaf jer af med det. Obama er en morder af uskyldige civile, en krigsmager og en tyv. Hvad vil du gøre for at redde menneskeheden fra disse udyr?«

»Forsøm ikke, af mangel på lidenskab, at bringe i orden, hvad du burde have bragt i orden i din levetid.«

[1] Fra gr. Mytologi; den forgiftede skjorte, der brændte Herakles og fik ham til at kaste sig på ligbålet; en 'destruktiv kraft eller sonings-indflydelse'.

Her følger det engelske udskrift af hovedtaler v/ Helga Zepp-LaRouche og Mike Gravel: (en dansk oversættelse af Helgas tale kommer snarest):

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Leder, 27. oktober 2015: Ruslands og Kinas verdenslederskab er afgørende nu, hvor Det britiske Imperium står for fald

En nyligt deklassificeret rapport fra 1990, der blev udfærdiget af Præsidentens Efterretnings-Råd (eng.: PFIAB) viste, at truslen om en atomkrig i 1983, ud fra et sovjetisk perspektiv, var blevet drastisk undervurderet af den amerikanske efterretningstjeneste, hvilket skabte en meget reel fare for atomkrig på daværende tidspunkt. Lyndon LaRouche henviste til denne rapport som værende en afgørende markør for det amerikanske lederskabs forfald efter dette tidspunkt, baseret på LaRouches eget kendskab til den situation, som rapporten omhandler – selv om der ikke blev henvist til disse kendsgerninger i selve PFIAB-rapporten.

Kendsgerningen er, at daværende præsident Ronald Reagan den

23. marts 1983 havde vedtaget det forslag, som LaRouche havde udarbejdet, om et fælles udviklingsprojekt mellem USA og Sovjetunionen om at bygge et rumbaseret, anti-missilsystem, baseret på nye, videnskabelige principper (partikelstråle- og laserstrålesystemer), som ville have gjort en ende på den ekstreme fare, der hidrørte fra politikken med »Gensidigt Garanteret Ødelæggelse« (Mutually Assured Destruction, MAD), en politik, der er baseret på at fastholde verden opdelt i Øst og Vest, og hvor begge sider retter massive arsenaler af atomvåben, der kan udløses ved mindste varsel, mod hinanden.

Mordforsøget på Ronald Reagan, der blev udført af en bekendt af Bush-familien kort tid efter Reagans indsættelse, havde nær afsluttet dette historiske samarbejde mellem Reagan og LaRouche, men Reagan overlevede og annoncerede programmet under navnet Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) (Strategisk Forsvarsinitiativ). Men britiske interesser i både USSR og USA saboterede indsatsen – en proces, der reflekteres i PFIAB's indrømmelse af efterretningsfiaskoen fra 1983 vedr. truslen om atomkrig.

Siden denne sabotage af SDI og Reagans erstatning med den forræderiske Bush-familie i tre embedsperioder og Obama i to perioder, har der i USA været et udtalt forfald ned i økonomisk og strategisk vanvid, der har muliggjort Wall Streets og City of Londons bankinteressers dominans over regeringen, og som har lanceret den ene krig efter den anden i kolonialistisk stil over hele planeten og drevet den vestlige verden ud i kaos, som det nu reflekteres i flygtningekatastrofen i Sydvestasien og Europa.

SE »den fulde historie om SDI«

Med skabelsen af BRIKS og dets nye finansinstitutioner, der er helliget international infrastrukturudvikling, samt præsident Putins fremragende flankoperation i Syrien, er verden nu i en position, hvor Det britiske Imperium langt om længe kan blive stedt til hvile. Obama, og Hillary Clinton

(der underkastede sig Obamas ondskab), er blevet afsløret som støtter af terrorisme med det formål at opnå »regimeskift« over for nationer, der nægter at underkaste sig, og som beskyttere af de morderiske finansyrster på Wall Street ved at afvise den nødvendige genindførelse af Glass-Steagall, der skal underkaste Wall Street en konkursbehandling.

De interventioner, som talsfolk fra LaRouchePAC i løbet af de seneste uger på Manhattan og andre steder i hele USA har gennemført, har fået repræsentanter fra Imperiet til at søge dækning med den voksende bevidsthed om sandheden af deres forbrydelser, der er blevet offentligt udtalt og har ødelagt deres evne til at hjernevaske og tvinge godtroende amerikanere. Tiden er inde til at lukke Wall Street ned, fjerne Obama og til, at solen endeligt må gå ned over Det britiske Imperium.

Se: En kort gennemgang af historien om LaRouches Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ, fra LPAC (Jeff Steinberg)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r0pVhtVdS7A>

Leder: USA: En revolution finder sted i dette land

22. oktober 2015 – En revolution finder sted i dette land. Det kan læses ud af de markante ændringer under de successive ugentlige lørdagsdialoger på Manhattan med Lyndon LaRouche, der i realiteten er spydhovedet for det hele, og som LaRouche indledte for kun et år siden, da han begyndte Manhattan-processen. Mødet sidste lørdag 17. oktober fremviste en hidtil uset intellektuel dynamik hos stort set alle talerne på Manhattan-mødet. De første, indledende rapporter fra onsdagens Aktionsdag i Washington D.C. viser, at vælgere og aktivister fra hele Østkysten tilslutter sig LaRouchePAC-delegationer til Kongressen i stadig større antal, og at vælgere, der bliver hjemme, udøver større pres end nogen sinde – pr. telefon – for at kræve Obamas fjernelse fra embedet og for at kræve, at den amerikanske regering lukker Wall Street ned.

Hvad vigtigere er: de fleste af de aktivister, der kom til Washington, deltog aktivt i uddannelsen af deres kongresmedlemmer – OG gjorde det effektivt.

En faktor, der har givet denne revolution et vigtigt skub fremad, har været den svindelagtige, såkaldte demokratiske »debat« den 13. okt., sammen med LaRouches omgående fordømmelse af samme – hvilket faktisk gik forud for selve debatten. Som LaRouche, i en erklæring den 20. okt., bemærkede, så blev han nærmest helt på en nat, da han omgående fordømte denne såkaldte debat som en stinkende farce og en svindel. Hele denne proces – den såkaldte debat og LaRouches omgående og dødeligt præcise svar – udløste en form for selvrealisation blandt mange amerikanere, der pludselig forstod, at det stadigt dalende niveau af intellekt og moralitet, der demonstreres af den »praktiske« manden-på-gaden og hans nyheds- og underholdningsmedier, ikke førte nogen vegne hen, undtagen til døden. Og at den radikalt modsatte standard, der

længe er blevet forfægtet af LaRouche, i virkeligheden er deres eneste redning – hvilket det også er.

Under forløbet af Hillary Clintons høring i dag for Husets Benghazi-komite var flere af spørgsmålene en nøjagtig gentagelse af det, LaRouche har sagt. Hun blev afsløret i, at hun udmærket forstod og skrev, at angrebet på den diplomatiske mission i Benghazi var en terrormission af al-Qaeda, alt imens hun samtidig fastholdt den løgn, at missionen var udtryk for en protest mod en video. »Jeg tror, De kendte sandheden«, sagde kongresmedlem Jordan fra Ohio.

Hun blev konfronteret med den kendsgerning, at en amerikansk embedsmand mødtes med en lokal al-Qaeda-leder (fra Ansar el-Sharia, der angiveligt skulle yde sikkerhed til den amerikanske mission) kort tid før angrebet.

Det nærmeste, nogen kom til at konfrontere Hillary direkte med den kendsgerning, at hun gik med på Obamas ordre om at lyve, som det dokumenteres af Ed Klein i bogen *Blood Feud* og bekræftes og uddybes af LaRouche, var et kvindeligt kongresmedlem, der spurgte Hillary, om hun havde talt med Obama aftenen for angrebet. Hillary bekræftede, at det havde hun, men nægtede at besvare det følgende spørgsmål: »Hvad sagde han til Dem?«

Dette bekræfter, hvad LaRouche har sagt – dette ville fremme den revolution, der er i gang i USA.

I mellemtiden, som LaRouche også har sagt, så arbejder de medlemmer af Barack Obamas regering, der i realiteten er de ledende regeringsmedlemmer, uden om ham og ignorerer ham faktisk, for at forhindre den krig, som Obama har forsøgt at lancere. Udenrigsminister Kerry skal mødes fredag med den russiske udenrigsminister Lavrov, samt den tyrkiske og saudiske udenrigsminister. I dag talte præsident Putin til Valdai Debatgruppen i Sotji, Rusland, hvor han sad på podiet sammen med fhv. amerikansk ambassadør til Moskva, Jack

Matlock, formanden for det iranske Majlis, Ali Larijani, samt fhv. tjekkisk præsident Vaclav Klaus. Der er grund til at forbinde disse to udviklinger.

Obama kan fjernes nu, og han må fjernes.

I sin erklæring fra 20. okt. sagde LaRouche:

»Den enkle sandhed er, at en ærlig vurdering af det katastrofale kollaps af reel produktivitet i den amerikanske økonomi er, at et stort og stadigt voksende flertal af vore medborgere står over for at miste deres arbejde, sult, sammenbrud af den almene sundhedssektor, ødelæggelsen af uddannelsessystemet og en generel opløsning af basal infrastruktur.«

Nylige statistikker, som det rapporteres af Administrationen for Social Sikkerhed (i USA, folkepensioner, invalidepensioner m.m., -red.), viser, at, alt imens det statslige fattigdomsniveau for en familie på fem ligger på 28.410 dollars om året, så har næsten 40 % af alle amerikanske arbejdere ikke engang en indtægt på 20.000 dollars om året. Der er 7,9 mio. amerikanere i den arbejdsdygtige alder, der er »officielt arbejdsløse«, og yderligere 94,7 mio., der anses for ikke at være en del af arbejdsstyrken, som vi har rapporteret – kombiner de to tal, og man får et tal på 102,6 mio. amerikanere i den arbejdsdygtige alder, der ikke har noget arbejde. »Som nation er vi ruinerede, og de fleste af os lever fra løncheck til løncheck«, skrev en bidragyder til Zero Hedge-websiden. Det skønnes at koste 50.000 dollars om året at forsørge en middelklassefamilie på fire, og dog har 71 % af alle arbejdere mindre end det, hvilket gør det umuligt for en familie at overleve med kun en forsørger.

LaRouche kræver en nedlukning af Wall Street under Glass-Steagall og udstedelse af

»statskredit til genoplivelse af den produktive økonomi gennem anlægsinvesteringer i infrastruktur og andre vitale

programmer«.

Samtidig refererede Putin i dag, i sin Valdai-tale – i en passende sammenhæng med Obamas krigspolitik, som han fordømte – til flygtningekrisen i Europa og sagde:

»Desværre hører vi ordene krig og konflikt stadig hyppigere, når vi taler om relationer mellem folk fra forskellige kulturer, religioner og etnicitet. I dag forsøger hundrede tusinder af migranter at integrere sig i et andet samfund, uden en profession og uden noget som helst kendskab til sprog, tradition og kultur i de lande, de flytter til.«

Det eneste svar kommer fra Helga Zepp-LaRouche, som hun udtrykker det i sin artikel fra 20. september, **»Flygtningekrisen kan kun løses gennem et fundamentalt skift i den økonomiske politik«**.

Hun indleder med de inciterende ord:

»I disse, verdenspolitikens stormfulde dage, ser vi to, grundlæggende forskellige typer af politiske og finanspolitiske beslutningstagere: de, der ud fra et optimistisk menneskesyn fremlægger en klar vision for menneskehedens fremtid, og de, hvis kræmmersjæl slet ikke lader nogen plads tilbage til noget som helst menneskesyn, men kun med tilbagevirkende kraft søger at opretholde deres magt og gæld fra fortiden, selv om disse for længst er ophørt med at være erholdelige. I de dramatiske ændringer, der vil finde sted i de kommende uger, vil vi kun kunne løse de problemer, vi står overfor, hvis det lykkes at vinde de europæiske nationer og USA for det nye paradigme, som BRIKS-nationernes økonomiske politik og Kinas »win-win«-politik med den Nye Silkevej repræsenterer.«

Indstilling til lovforslag om bankopdeling i Svenske Rigsdag for femte år i træk – hvornår kommer der lovforslag om bankopdeling i Danmark?

Fra vores søsterorganisation, LaRouche-rörelsen i Sverige, har vi modtaget følgende rapport:

Stockholm, 6. oktober 2015 – For femte år i træk er en indstilling til et lovforslag, der kræver en bankopdeling, fremstillet i den Svenske Rigsdag. I år har en gruppe, bestående af medlemmer af Venstrepartiet under anførsel af deres økonomiske talskvinde Ulla Andersson, fremstillet lovforslaget. Forslaget kræver, at Rigsdagen pålægger »regeringen omgående at indlede en undersøgelse af opgaven at forberede en lov, der adskiller traditionel bankaktivitet fra såkaldt investeringsbankaktivitet«.

Begrundelsen for loven er udvidet i sammenligning med de lovforslag, de har fremstillet i de foregående år, idet den først og fremmest påpeger »statens implicitte garanti for, at man ikke vil tillade store, finansielle institutioner at gå bankerot. Dette er årsagen til, at banker er blevet 'for-store-til-at-lade-gå-ned', og udgør kernen i det strukturelle incitament for de store, finansielle institutioner, der var hovedårsagen til den finansielle krise«.

Dette lovforslag påpeger værdien af den statslige garanti, der beløber sig til 26 mia. SEK om året i perioden 1998-2014 [hvilket tegner sig for omkring en tredjedel til en fjerdedel

af bankernes årlige profit]. Der refereres til de forskellige forslag om bankopdeling i U.K., USA og EU for at vise, at der også i Sverige er behov for en undersøgelse. Med hensyn til USA nævner de også »debatten om en total bankopdeling. Total bankopdeling vil sige, at investerings- og handelsaktiviteter ikke er tilladt i det samme forretningsforetagende eller den samme forretningsgruppe, der er aktiv inden for traditionel, kommerciel bankvirksomhed.«

»De tekniske løsninger ser forskellige ud, men formålet er det samme. Tab, der opstår i investeringsbankaktiviteter, må ikke spille over i den mere traditionelle bankaktivitet og i værste tilfælde true en banks eksistens eller udsætte skatteborgerne for den risiko, at de er tvunget til at betale for aktiviteter, der ikke kan betragtes som samfundsnyttige ('Too big to fail'-problemet).« Med en antydning af risikoen peger lovforslaget på den britiske bankundersøgelses skøn, der siger, at så meget som fire til fem sjettedele af britiske bankers overskud kommer fra investeringsbankaktiviteter. »Taget i betragtning, hvor stor den svenske banksektor er sammenlignet med landets BNP, er det sandsynligt, at de svenske bankers investeringsbankaktiviteter er betydelige.« [Pr. person overgås de svenske banker kun af Schweiz] Lovforslaget siger, at bankgarantien i sin nuværende form er fuldstændig absurd, eftersom bankerne kan bruge den som statstilskud til spekulation i intern handel mellem bankerne med diverse finansielle instrumenter. Det er ikke let at forstå, hvorfor staten skulle yde tilskud til finansspekulation i den private forretningsverden. For slet ikke at tale om at gå ind og redde disse forretninger, hvis de risikerer bankerot. Udelukkende kun traditionel bankvirksomhed bør være omfattet af den implicitte statsgaranti.«

Sluttelig peger lovforslaget på interessekonflikter, når bankerne både varetager investering for kunder og samtidig handler på egne vegne.

Medlemmerne af Rigsdagen, der står bag lovforslag 2015/16:370

er: Ulla Andersson, Ali Esbati, Christina Høj Larsen, Wiwi-Anne Johansson, Daniel Riazat, Daniel Sestrajcic (Alle fra Venstrepartiet).

I tidligere år har også Miljøpartiets rigsdagsmedlemmer fremstillet lovforslag, men der fremstilles sædvanligvis ikke lovforslag i Rigsdagen fra et parti, der er i regering. Miljøpartiet er i regering sammen med Socialdemokraterne, og minister med ansvar for finansmarkederne, Per Bolund, fra Miljøpartiet, har i Rigsdagen været en stærk fortaler for bankopdeling, før han blev minister i 2014. Han vil være den ansvarlige minister, der skal håndtere bankopdeling i regeringen, hvis Rigsdagen foreslår en undersøgelse.

Lovforslaget kan ses her:
<http://data.riksdagen.se/fil/5DB165B6-3C25-4273-901E-D7C701F34C73>

DOKUMENTATION

Motion 2015/16:370

Bankdelningslag

- Motion 2015/16:370 (pdf, 76 kbyte, nytt fönster)

av *Ulla Andersson, Ali Esbati, Christina Høj Larsen, Wiwi-Anne Johansson, Daniel Riazat, Daniel Sestrajcic (alla V)*

Förslag till riksdagsbeslut

1. Rigsdagen ställer sig bakom det som anförs i motionen om att regeringen skyndsamt bör tillsätta en utredning i syfte att utarbeta ett lagförslag som separerar traditionell bankverksamhet från s.k. investmentverksamhet och tillkännager detta för regeringen.

Motivering

I de flesta länder finns en implicit garanti från statens sida att man inte kommer att låta stora finansiella institut att gå i konkurs. Denna försäkran är en förklaring till varför vissa bolag kunnat växa sig så stora att de blivit "too big to fail", samt utgör den bärande bjälken i en incitamentsstruktur bland de stora finansiella företagen som var en av huvudorsakerna till finanskrisen.

Implicita eller uttalade statliga garantier innebär en kraftig subvention av storbankernas upplåningskostnader. Garantierna innebär också att det inte finns någon större anledning för storbankernas kreditgivare att ta reda på bankernas finansiella situation. Finansinspektionen har försökt uppskatta värdet på den svenska implicita garantin. Deras bedömning är att den i genomsnitt har uppgått till 26 miljarder kronor per år för de fyra storbankerna under tidsperioden 1998-2014.^[1] Motsvarande studier i andra länder har kommit fram till liknande resultat.^[2]

I finanskrisens kölvatten har en rad olika utredningar tillsatts. En brittisk bankutredning visade bl.a. att när den brittiska staten gav olika former av stöd till bankerna under finanskrisen visade det sig vara svårt att separera traditionell samhällsviktig verksamhet från investmentverksamhet. Detta innebar att hela banker fick räddas, även de delar som inte ansågs samhällsviktiga, vilket blev mycket kostsamt. Bland annat mot denna bakgrund föreslog utredningen en slags separation (ringfencing) av bankernas verksamhet i dels traditionell bankverksamhet (affärsverksamhet), dels investmentverksamhet. Storbritannien har ännu inte infört bestämmelser om att banker måste separera investmentverksamhet från affärsverksamhet. Men arbetet pågår och enligt Bank of England börjar banker redan nu förbereda sig för en dylik separation, eller mer korrekt "ringfencing". Planen är att "bankseparationen" ska vara på plats den 1 januari 2019.^[3]

Även inom EU och i USA pågår arbete med strukturella

bankreformer. Under januari 2014 föreslog Europeiska kommissionen nytt regelverk för att hindra de största bankerna från att använda bankens egna kapital för riskfyllda aktiviteter (s.k. proprietary trading). Kommissionens förslag baseras mycket på Liikanenrapporten (en rapport framtagen av "High-level Expert Group on reforming the structure of the EU banking sector"). Även kommissionen förespråkar ett slags "ringfencing" av investmentverksamhet från traditionell affärsverksamhet.

I USA diskuterar man total bankseparation. Med total separation skulle inte investment/tradingverksamhet få förekomma inom samma företagsgrupp som sysslar med mer traditionell affärsverksamhet. Konkret har USA i övrigt hunnit ungefär till arbetet med utkast för preliminära regler som till stora delar förbjuder affärsbanker att ägna sig åt tradingverksamhet (spekulativ handel med bankens egna kapital) och ålägger banker restriktioner för handel med hedgefonder mm. [4]

Sammanfattningsvis pågår alltså arbete i Storbritannien, USA och inom EU med olika typer av bankdelningslagar. De tekniska lösningarna ser olika ut, men syftet är detsamma; att resultat från bankernas investmentverksamheter inte ska spilla över på resultatet för den mer traditionella affärsverksamheten, och i värsta fall hota bankens hela existens eller riskera att skattebetalarna får betala för verksamhet som inte anses samhällsnyttig (det s.k. To-Big-To-Fail- problemet).

Den ovan nämnda brittiska utredningen uppskattar att så mycket som fyra till fem sjättedelar av de brittiska bankernas sammanlagda balansomslutning härrör från det som definieras som "investmentverksamhet", vilket motsvarar 40-50 biljoner kronor. Det finns i dagsläget inga beräkningar över storlekarna på investmentdelarna i de svenska bankerna. Dessa är förmodligen lägre jämfört med vad som är fallet i Storbritannien. Men med tanke på hur stor den svenska banksektorn är i förhållande till BNP så är det troligt att

även de svenska bankernas investmentverksamhet är betydande.

Ett annat skäl till att en bankdelningslag borde införas har sin grund i den ovan nämnda implicita bankgarantin. Den implicita bankgarantin innebär en kraftig subvention av storbankernas verksamhet. Garantin i sin nuvarande utformning blir helt absurd i och med att bankerna kan använda subventionen till att spekulera med egna pengar i olika finansiella instrument. Det är inte helt enkelt att förstå varför staten ska subventionera privata företags finansiella spekulation. Och sedan dessutom gå in och rädda företagen om de riskerar att gå i konkurs som ett resultat av denna spekulation. Endast bankernas traditionella verksamhet ska omfattas av den implicita garantin.

En lag om bankdelning bör också införas för att minska risken för intressekonflikter. Bankernas nuvarande affärsmodeller där de dels placerar pengar för kundernas räkning, dels handlar för egen räkning kan leda till betydande intressekonflikter. Bankerna kan dra nytta av privatpersoners insättningar, som delvis är försäkrade genom den statliga insättningsgarantin, för att ägna sig åt mycket stora och riskabla finansiella spekulationer. Detta leder till betydande intressekonflikter och bidrar till att öka instabiliteten i det finansiella systemet.

Mot bakgrund av vad som anförts ovan bör regeringen skyndsamt tillsätta en utredning i syfte att utarbeta ett lagförslag som separerar traditionell bankverksamhet från s.k. investmentverksamhet. Detta bör riksdagen ställa sig bakom och tillkännage för regeringen.

[1] Finansinspektionen (2015), "Den implicita statliga garantin till systemviktiga banker".

[2] Sveriges Riksbank (2011), "Lämplig kapitalnivå i svenska storbanker – en samhällsekonomisk analys".

[3] RUT, Dnr 2015:1026

[4] Ibid.

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 15. oktober 2015

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**Leder, 15. oktober 2015:
TV-debatten mellem kandidaterne var en farce;
Vi har ansvaret for at skabe standarden for lederskabet i USA's præsidentskab**

Tirsdag eftermiddag fremlagde Lyndon LaRouche den amerikanske præsidentvalgkampagnes farlige tilstand på et møde med sine medarbejdere. Han advarede om, at Det britiske Imperium er i færd med at orkestrere ødelæggelsen af den igangværende

præsidentvalgkampagne i USA. Det Republikanske Parti er mislykket. Det Demokratiske Parti er mislykket. LaRouche krævede, at der skabes et grundlag for et nyt præsidentskab i USA, der vil erklære Wall Street bankerot, reorganisere den amerikanske økonomi og håndtere den aktuelle krise på et internationalt grundlag.

LaRouche ramte plet. Hans vurdering blev til fulde virkeliggjort i den rædselsfulde forestilling, der fandt sted senere samme aften i den såkaldte Demokraternes partidebat.

»Det var en fornedrelse. En farce. Et falskneri. Dette var et cirkus. En af de mest frastødende, mest rådne ting, der nogen sinde er udført i henseende til en politisk kampagne i USA. Dette var korrupt. Folk blev trukket med af det. Deres sjæle blev taget fra dem. De blev reduceret til de blotte marionetter. Man behøver bare at fjerne kandidaternes ansigter og give dem dyreansigter i stedet. De bar alle en dyremaske. Og der var disse horder af idioter, der skreg op. Og de såkaldte kandidater var simpelt hen lakajer for dette stykke tortur.«

Det hele var orkestreret af Obamas kredse. Men Obama er blot Det britiske Imperiums instrument. Det var britiske operatører, der kom til USA og orkestrerede det hele. USA står på spil, grundlæggende set pga. Obamas indflydelse. Obama er en slags billigudgave af en Satan-skikkelse. Den har ingen ære, ingen moral, intet.

I modstrid med vurderingen fra medierne og de politiske orakler, blev Hillary Clinton debattens største taber. »Hun er en tabt sag«, sagde LaRouche til LPAC's Komite for Politisk Strategi, »det var hende, det kom til at handle om i demonstrationen i går aftes. Hun var den største fiasko af dem alle. Hun var arkitekten til den største fiaskofaktor i den periode. Hun var den dumme person, der tabte prisen.«

LaRouche advarede mod at fokusere på de spørgsmål, der blev

diskuteret i debatten. Hvor var diskussionen om fremtiden? Hvor var diskussionen om, hvordan man skulle reorganisere USA's økonomi?

Det afhænger således af LaRouche og LPAC for at definere de fremtidige udsigter til at skabe et kompetent, amerikansk præsidentskab. »Kuren er at præstere standarden for lederskab, konceptet for lederskab, missionen for et lederskab. Det er vores ansvar. Hvis man forsøger at udlede det fra iagttagelse af såkaldte kendsgerninger, og ved at antage, at disse såkaldte kendsgerninger vil give dig en fornemmelse af tryghed, så er det tåbernes paradys. Vi bliver nødt til at skabe vores eget paradys. Hvilket vil sige, ingen af de ovennævnte«, sagde Larouche.

Leder, 13. oktober 2015: Et britisk trick? Dette er ikke den Bernie Sanders, han har givet sig ud for at være

Søndag, 11. okt., netop, som Barack Obama på showet »60 Minutes« atter blev fremvist som den aggressive, buldrende, men svage, »britiske krigspræsident«, han har vist sig at være, blev han overøst med ros fra Bernie Sanders på programmet »Meet the Press«.

Dette skal angiveligt være den samme Bernie Sanders, der ønskede en kandidat, som kunne udfordre den »dybt skuffende« Obama, der stillede op til genvalg for tre år siden. Den

Bernie Sanders, der dengang, på Thom Hartman Tv-show, sagde:

Der er millioner af amerikanere, der er dybt skuffede over præsidenten, og som mener, at han med hensyn til social sikkerhed (i USA, primært folkepensioner og invalidepensioner o. lign., -red.) samt flere andre spørgsmål, sagde en ting som kandidat og nu, som præsident, gør noget ganske andet; der ikke kan fatte, at han har været så svag – hvad årsagen så har været – mht. forhandlinger med republikanerne. Og der er dyb skuffelse. En af årsagerne til, at præsidenten har kunnet bevæge sig så langt mod højre, er, at der ikke er nogen hovedopposition til ham. Og jeg mener virkelig, at det ville være godt for dette land, hvis folk begyndte at tænke på nogle kandidater derude, der kan begynde at opstille en kontrast med en progressiv dagsorden, i modsætning til det, Obama gør.

Så kandidat Sanders er altså på det seneste vendt på en tallerken, hvilket vil skade mht. til et valg, nøjagtig, som Hillary Clinton er blevet skadet ved at fremstå som talerør for Obama. Det bør bemærkes, at Bernie Sanders' online fundraising køres af de samme, ledende folk, som kørte ditto for Obama i 2007-08, og af hvilke to har arbejdet for Det Hvide Hus lige siden; og denne Obama-fundraising-operation har øget Sanders' fundraising op til Hillary Clintons niveau. Men hvad der er vigtigere er spørgsmålet, om Bernie Sanders er blevet en del af et større, britisk trick for at korrumpere de demokratiske primærvalg, og som i realiteten gør det muligt for Obama at udpege vinderen og undertrykke den fremherskende dynamik, der på det seneste er set hos kandidater, der støtter en genindførelse af Glass-Steagall, samt skubbe andre kandidater i samme retning.

Obama har været en agent for interesserne på Wall Street/City of London, og for britiske krige, i hele sit præsidentskab. Wall Street og London, konfronteret med et nyt finanskollaps, ønsker frem for alt at knuse Glass/Steagall-dynamikken ud af valgkampagnen.

Den samme slags tricks blev kørt under Obamas første præsidentvalgkampagne og under andre valgkampagner i amerikansk historie, og således har forfalsket dem.

Er Bernie Sanders pålidelig? Hvorfor undlod han den 11. okt. at nævne sin hidtidige støtte til genindførelsen af Glass-Steagall? Hvor er hans tanker nu; hvor vil de være i morgen?

Schiller Instituttet indtager Folketinget under Kulturnatten 2015

Schiller Instituttets delegation med seks aktivister, alle udstyret med T-shirts med vores slogan: "Win-win med BRIKS, ikke kollaps og krig", diskuterede vores politik med mange ministre og folketingsmedlemmer. Det blev til samtaler med alt fra Lars Løkke Rasmussen og tre andre ministre, til fire partiformænd og ca. 15 andre folketingsmedlemmer.

Hovedpunkterne var nødvendigheden af en Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling og udvidelsen af Kinas infrastrukturprojekt "Den nye Silkevej" til ind i Mellemøsten og videre til Afrika for at skabe den økonomiske udvikling, der er helt nødvendig for at fjerne grobunden for terrorbevægelserne og dæmme op for de mange tusinde flygtninge, der i øjeblikket søger til Europa for et bedre liv.

Vi gav medlemmerne vores publikationer om disse emner og viste dem også EIR's Specialrapport "The New Silk Road becomes the World Land-bridge". Det er en drejebog for skabelse af økonomisk udvikling i disse områder, og i hele verden. Flere

af medlemmerne ville gerne læse en pdf-version af rapporten, som er blevet sendt til dem.

Europa: Glass-Steagall fremlagt i EU- parlamentsdebatten om kapitalmarkedsunion

9. oktober 2014 – Under en debat i salen, der var stærkt kritisk over for EU's plan om en Kapitalmarkedsunion, talte EU-parlamentsmedlem Zanni til fordel for en Glass-Steagall-reform den 7. oktober. Som vi har rapporteret, er Kapitalmarkedsunionen et angreb mod lokalbankers andelskassesystem og kreditforeningsbaserede system, som i mange europæiske lande, især Tyskland og Italien, er eneste kilde til kredit for små og mellemstore virksomheder. I Italien, f.eks., har andelskasse- eller sparekassesystemet øget deres kreditgivning i de senere år, mens store banker derimod har reduceret deres kreditgivning til økonomien.

Zanni sagde, at forslagets endegyldige mål var noget andet end dets erklærede formål. »Forslagets endemål er i realiteten en ny, finansiel deregulering efter samme linje som de umoralske beslutninger, der er truffet i denne sektor i løbet af de seneste 20 år. Jeg er ikke overrasket over, at det er Lord Hill, der fremlægger dette forslag: Han er udtryk for City of Londons finanslobby.

»Det er ikke ved at få småsparere til at investere i finansielle produkter, at problemerne løses; om noget, så skaber vi nye problemer, som det allerede skete i 2008. Vi er

dog enige på ét punkt – nemlig i den kendsgerning, at der er et virkeligt problem med at få kredit, især for små og mellemstore virksomheder.

For vores vedkommende, så er der kun én løsning, og det er; banker skal vende tilbage til at udøve deres traditionelle rolle med at modtage indskud og udstede kredit, og dette kan kun lade sig gøre gennem en bankopdeling efter den amerikanske Glass/Steagall-model. Kun på denne måde kan vi skelne mellem dem, der ønsker at beskæftige sig med fri spekulationsvirksomhed og dem, der må have en langt mere betydningsfuld rolle, nemlig at finansiere realøkonomien.«

Zanni offentliggjorde videoen med sin intervention på sin hjemmeside under overskriften »Nej til Kapitalmarkedsunionen for Finansiell Deregulering; Ja til Bankopdeling«. Videoen, <http://www.marcozanni.eu/articolo.php?id=55>

ledsages af en invitation til at se en tidligere video med en forklaring på Glass-Steagall af Zanni og hans kollega Marco Valli.

Fabio De Masi (GUE/NGL)[1], der også er tilhænger af Glass-Steagall, angreb også planen for en Kapitalmarkedsunion. Både Den internationale Betalingsbank, (BIS) og Alan Greenspan har advaret om nye, finansielle kriser. »EU-kommissionen vil genåbne spillebuden med Kapitalmarkedsunionen. Banker og forsikringselskaber bør investere i infrastrukturen. Omkostningerne bør betales af skatteborgerne. Sikkerhedsværdipapirsindustrien – dvs. samlingen af junk-lån i pakker – bør genoplives, denne gang i stedet for amerikanske ejendoms lån, måske med europæiske billån. Volkswagen giver os en lærestreg.

Europa har brug for seriøse banker i stedet for spillebuler, der er for-store-til-at-lade-gå-ned. Vi bør derfor endeligt gøre vores hjemmearbejde i spørgsmålet om reformer af bankstrukturer, såvel som af statslige

investeringsprogrammer.«

Molly Scott Cato, et Grønt MEP fra U.K., sagde: »For de af os, der endnu ikke er klar til at tilgive og glemme finanskrisen i 2008, sætter dette alarmklokkerne i gang. Med sikkerheds-værdipapirspakkerne skabte markedshandlerne et farligt spil med at give sorteper videre, hvor igen kunne være sikker på, hvem det var, der fik pakken med de giftige værdipapirer. Sikkerhedspakkerne er et forsøg på at foregive, at, at skjule risiciene er det samme som at reducere dem, hvilket det aldeles ikke er.«

På lignende måde sagde den spanske MEP Miguel Urbán Crespo fra Podemos-partiet, at Kapitalmarkedsunionen ikke måtte være en mekanisme for skabelse af en »kasinoøkonomi, hvor banken altid vinder«.

Stærk kritik af Kapitalmarkedsunionen kom også fra konservative kredse, især fra tyske MEP'er som Werner Langen og Markus Ferber, som understregede, at små og mellemstore virksomheder er godt tjent med lokale banker, og at kapitalmarkedsomkostningerne ville blive for høje. Joachim Starbatty, et medlem af anti-euro-partiet Alternativ for Tyskland (AfD), sagde, at EU-planen forudser en eneste Indskudsgarantifond ud af mange nationale, forskelligt finansierede planer. Dette må afvises, sagde han, og insisterede på, mht. euroen: »Euroen deler Europa og giver næring til konflikter. Den må opløses.«

Han kollega Beatrix von Storch talte imidlertid til fordel for ideen om deregulering på basis af konceptet med Kapitalmarkedsunionen.

[1] Forenede Europæiske Venstrefløj/Nordisk Grønne Venstre (GUE/NGL) er en konføderal politisk gruppe i Europa-Parlamentet. Gruppen består af de to europæiske partier Europæisk Venstreparti (*European Left*) og Nordisk Grønne Venstre Alliance.

USA: Antallet af amerikanere, der lever for 2 dollars om dagen, mere end fordoblet siden 1996

September 1, 2015 – Efter nok en standard er Amerika i færd med at glide over i en status som et Tredjeverdensland: Antallet af amerikanske borgere, der forsøger at klare sig for kun 2 dollars om dagen (!), er mere end fordoblet siden 1996, til nu 1,5 mio. husstande, og 3 millioner børn. Disse tal rapporteres i bogen: »2 dollars om dagen: At leve af næsten ingenting i Amerika«, der i dag blev udgivet fra forlaget Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, iflg. CBS News.

Blandt andre problemer er disse familier blevet skadet af »velfærdsreformen« fra 1990'erne, da Amerikas sociale sikkerhedsnet blev yderligere udsat for sparekniven, og Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) (Midlertidig hjælp til nødlidende familier) blev skabt. Den skal angiveligt give midlertidig pengehjælp til fattige familier med børn.

Men TANF fungerer ikke, sagde forfatterne Luke Shaefer og Kathryn Edin. Siden programmet blev skabt i 1996 for at erstatte et 60 år gammelt velfærdssystem, er antallet af familier, der lever for under 2 dollars om dagen, mere end fordoblet. I 2012 modtog kun en fjerdedel af fattige familier TANF-tilskud, hvilket er en nedgang fra mere end to tredjedele i 1996, iflg. Center for Budget and Policy Priorities. Ifølge bogen »2 dollars om dagen« nåede velfærdsprogrammet ud til flere end 14,2 mio. amerikanere i 1994, men i 2014 fik kun 3,8 mio. amerikanere hjælp fra TANF.

Ud over at rekonstruere TANF foreslår Shaefer og Edin, at man indleder beskæftigelses- og uddannelsesprogrammer i stil med Franklin Roosevelts New Deal.[1]

[1] Se Tema-artikel: [»Glass-Steagall 1933: Franklin D. Roosevelts 100-dages program – Med hans egne ord«](#)

Foto: En teltlejr for hjemløse i Seattle, USA.

USA: Fhv. arbejdsminister Robert Reich: »Wall Street er på vej ud i en ny krise«, og den eneste løsning er Glass-Steagall

10. oktober 2015 – I en klumme fra 9. okt. med titlen »Hillary, Bernie og Bankerne«, kommer fhv. arbejdsminister i Clinton-regeringen Robert Reich med en direkte advarsel om, at »Wall Street er på vej ud i en ny krise«, og den eneste løsning er at genoplive Glass-Steagall.

Reich lægger ud med at sige, »gigantiske Wall Street-banker truer fortsat millioner af amerikaneres velfærd«. Han bemærker Bernie Sanders' støtte til Glass-Steagall, Hillarys spilindsats og republikanernes »ingen grund til bekymring«-holdning.

»Der er tydeligvis grund til bekymring«, fortsætter han og bemærker stigningen i Wall Streets ejerskab af over 45 % af bankaktiver, og »den skjulte statsgaranti«, som de forlader sig på, og som han siger, er over »80 mia. dollar værd om året for de store banker«. De forventer at få en bailout (bankredning), hvis de får vanskeligheder, og »de vil næsten med sikkerhed få vanskeligheder igen, hvis der ikke gøres noget dramatisk for at stoppe dem.«

»Wall Street er på vej ud i en ny krise«, og det ville »kræve en høj pris« – af den amerikanske befolkning.

Han piller dernæst Hillarys forslag fra denne uge fra hinanden og siger, at det ikke er andet end en invitation til »mere udvanding og fiflerier« à la **Dodd/Frank-loven**.

Konklusion: »Den eneste måde at kontrollere Streets udskejelser på, er gennem reformer så store, dristige og offentlige, at de ikke kan udvandes – at bryde de største banker op og genoplive Glass-Steagall.«

I mellemtiden havde *Los Angeles Times* den 9. okt. et indlæg af Michael Hiltzik, der kom med et genopkog af den gamle løgn fra Barney Frank[1] (og mange andre) om, at Glass-Steagall ikke ville forhindre en krise i stil med den i 2008. »At bringe Glass-Steagall tilbage er ikke det universal middel, man tror, det er«, skriver Hiltzik og priser Barney Frank og promoverer en anden snedig plan for at komme uden om det.

Wall Streets linje er klar: Hvad som helst, blot ikke Glass-Steagall, for det er, hvad de frygter.

[1] Formand for finansudvalget i Repræsentanternes Hus siden 2007. **Se også LPAC-TV featurefilm: The Takedown of Glass-Steagall.**

Foto: Fhv. arbejdsminister Robert Reich

USA; Hele verden: LPAC's Landsdækkende aktionsuge: Vedtag Glass-Steagall nu. LPAC-TV: The Takedown of Glass-Steagall

Over hele USA, men især i NYC, mobiliserer LPAC i højeste gear for en omgående vedtagelse af Glass-Steagall, før det uafvendelige Wall Street-krak indtræffer og kaster ikke blot USA, men hele verden ud i kaos. De kæmper ikke blot for USA 'lokalt', men også for os her i Europa. Kontakt os og tag kampen op: Glass-Steagall, ikke kaos!

Schiller Instituttets Aktionscenter DK

Følg med i LPAC's afgørende kamp i USA her:

Lyndon LaRouches opråb til en fuldt optrappet indsats for at komme Wall St.'s krak i forkøbet med Glass-Steagall, 5. okt. 2015

Kend hele historien:

LPACTV: The Takedown of Glass-Steagall – Feature Film:

LPAC Fredags-webcast 9. oktober 2015: Skrid til forebyggende handling nu: Glass-Steagall ind, Obama ud. v/Jeffrey Steinberg m.fl.

Jeff Steinberg om Lyndon LaRouches vurdering af udviklingen omkring situationen med Rusland, Syrien, Obama og bombningen af Læger uden Grænser-hospitalet i Kunduz, ud fra et standpunkt om de nødvendige kulturelle ændringer, der skal til for at vende forandringerne i det 20. Århundrede omkring. Engelsk udskrift.

TAKE PRE-EMPTIVE ACTION NOW:

GLASS STEAGALL IN, OBAMA OUT

TRANSCRIPT

MATT OGDEN: Good evening.

You're joining us for LaRouche PAC weekly webcast for October 9, 2015. My name is Matthew Ogden, and I will be your host tonight. I'm joined in the studio by Jeffrey Steinberg of Executive Intelligence Review, and by Jason Ross of the LaRouche PAC Science Team, and we, together with a number of

others, had the opportunity to meet with both Lyndon and Helga LaRouche briefly before filming this recorded webcast.

What I would like to begin with is just to make the point: that this has been a week of mobilization by the LaRouche PAC and the LaRouche movement across the country, both with our continuing intervention into New York City, and with the deployment of a number of activists into Washington, D.C., including a number of activists from the Manhattan area, who descended onto Capitol hill on Wednesday of this week, to saturate Congress with Mr. LaRouche's newest statement on the urgent necessity for the immediate action to shut down Wall Street with the reinstatement of Glass-Steagall.

This statement had quite a substantial impact on Congress, which is, itself, in the midst of total chaos in the wake of the resignation of John Boehner, and now with the surprise withdrawal of Kevin McCarthy from the Speaker's race, who was the nominated, or assumed heir apparent, of John Boehner to replace him as Speaker of the House. This has thrown the entire Congress into chaos, and they were desperately in need of the leadership that LaRouche PAC was there to provide.

The text of this statement is the following, and I think it's very short, and very concise, and it's worth beginning our broadcast tonight by just reading this in full. It's titled "For the Urgent Attention of Congressmen, Senators, and Other Members of the United States Government":

Oct. 5—Key responsible Congressmen and Senators (and there are some), and other U.S. government representatives must meet at once, to issue Findings of Fact and Statements of Commitment roughly as follows, for immediate enactment into law, and into immediate effect.

1. There is now an acute emergency which threatens to kill millions of Americans, primarily, and also citizens of other countries.

2. This is due immediately to the bankruptcy of Wall Street. Wall Street is totally and irremediably bankrupt. The successive Bush and Obama bailouts and the rounds of "quantitative easing," have only succeeded in making all of Wall Street's values valueless, and finalizing its bankruptcy.
3. If Wall Street is permitted to blow out again on its own terms, as now appears imminent, the result will be the worst panic in history, which will close down everything that remains of the U.S. economy. We will have mass death, on the order of the Black Plague which wiped out one-third of the population of Europe. Another Wall Street bailout, which Obama will demand if he is permitted to remain in office, would trigger a hyper-inflation just as deadly.
4. Hence, Wall Street must be closed down pre-emptively by U.S. Government action, in the spirit of what Franklin Roosevelt would do if he were alive today. (Although the crisis he faced was far milder.) Only activities compatible with a strict Glass-Steagall standard must be allowed to continue.
5. The Federal Government must issue U.S. dollars as credit to preserve the lives of the population and employ all the employable, in the spirit of Roosevelt's kindred actions with Harry Hopkins.
6. Over the slightly longer term, U.S. Federal credit must be used to rapidly raise the level of productivity of U.S. labor, through increased energy-flux density with scientific and technological progress.
7. Finally removing Barack Obama from office would be an excellent starting-point for these urgent reforms.

So that went out all over Capitol Hill this week, and also across the country, with rallies from San Francisco to Manhattan, and elsewhere in between. And Obama is increasingly being isolated and abandoned by members of his own cabinet, vis-a-vis the Russian intervention into Syria; the split by

Hillary on the TPP, distancing herself now, officially, from Obama on that, and also, with the dramatic announcement by Doctors Without Borders that they will be pursuing an independent investigation into whether *war crimes* were committed with regards to the sustained bombing, for over one hour, of the Afghan hospital. And that's something that we will get into later in this broadcast.

So, in that context, I'd like to begin tonight's broadcast by asking Jeff to respond with Mr. LaRouche's remarks on the institutional question for this week, which I'll read as follows:

"Mr. LaRouche. There are strong rumors that Vice President Biden will enter the race. Some observers believe key individuals associated with President Obama are supportive of Biden's nomination. Some Obama campaign veterans are successfully helping Sanders' fundraising campaign. In your view, is there a concerted effort at the White House to find an alternative to Hillary Clinton?"

So, I'll let Jeff give Mr. LaRouche's response to that.

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Thanks, Matt.

I think the reality of the situation goes way, way, way beyond the question of whether or not the Team Obama, the core group of advisors plus the President himself, have it out for Hillary Clinton, because there's ample evidence that that's absolutely the case. And, in fact, it's been the case since the moment that President Obama offered Hillary Clinton the job of Secretary of State, which she unfortunately, very foolishly accepted. And so, is there animus between the Obama and Clinton machines, and family? No question about it. But we're in a different universe. We're almost on a different planet right now from the standpoint of the upcoming Presidential elections and events that are much more immediately at hand.

President Obama and the entire inner circles at the White House are in an absolutely frantic state of mind, and under those kinds of circumstances, one can expect that this President will make the kinds of colossal blunders, dangerous blunders, which could lead to general war,—and in fact, there are many indications of exacting that trajectory—and alternatively, will result in the kind of meltdown that will finally catalyze the long, long overdue drive to get him out of office.

Recently, when President Obama spoke at the United Nations General Assembly, there was a state of total shock and disbelief among the diplomats present, when they realized that Obama's words were full of nothing but lies and hypocrisy. The United States was engaged in a bombing campaign in Syria, which was in violation of the most fundamental concepts of national security, of national sovereignty. The Syrian government did not invite the United States in. There was no United Nations Security Council action, and in fact, there has been no action by the United States Congress giving the President any authorization to carry out any military operations overseas.

So, in effect, the President's behavior is completely lawless, completely irrational, and generally speaking, sociopathological. And this is nothing new. Back in April of 2009, Lyndon LaRouche, in a nationwide and internationally telecast webcast, warned that the President had a severe narcissist personality disorder, and that the danger was that if he were allowed to continue in office unchecked, this would lead to a complete breakdown, and to a state of general war that could lead to a thermonuclear war of extinction.

Now we're on the very edge of exactly that process. As Matt mentioned, we had a large delegation up on Capitol Hill several days ago, and in that discussion process that occurred with many, many members of Congress—around an outdoor rally and around a lot of private discussions—the striking shift in

mood, particularly among Democrats, was that when we said: Obama must be removed from office, we can't wait out the clock and run out the duration of his Presidency, Wall Street is bankrupt, the system is about to blow, and we are on the verge of thermonuclear war—the general response was no longer “Oh, c'mon, that's impossible. It'll never happen.” Now people wanted to stop and talk, and the question was not *should* it be done, but the question was *how* do we do it.

So, you've got an Obama White House that is increasingly being isolated from the rest of the world. You've had in the past days a pattern of response to the actions taken by Russian President Putin in Syria, where, instead of this pattern of permanent war, never-ending conflict, with no effort whatsoever to actually solve anything in a decisive way—the Russians have come in and are prepared to use military force, combined with diplomacy, to wipe out the Islamic State, and any other allied Salafist, jihadist forces, and this is a different mode of action.

What President Obama represents is the fact that, for the entirety of the Twentieth Century, we've been operating under a continuous degeneration of culture, and of intellectual and moral depth. We're now at the point that we're one and a half decades into the Twenty-First Century, and the disastrous course of the Twentieth Century has not yet been reversed.

You go back to the beginning of the Twentieth Century, the beginning of a century of perpetual war and economic breakdown, a collapse of productivity, and you see that mathematics replaced morality and physics and other science, as the basis for all major policy decisions. Clearly you had moments of exception: the Franklin Roosevelt Presidency in its entirety was a dramatic exception to this. But from the moment that Franklin Roosevelt died, we have been on a downward trajectory. We've lost the ability to expand productivity in the real economy. The levels of morality have gone downward with every successive generation, and now we've reached the

bottom of the barrel, with both the Obama Presidency and with the level of overall cultural morality here in the United States.

Now, in our discussion with Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche,—and I should say, by the way, that this is now Thursday late afternoon, and we've prerecorded this broadcast, so there may be events over the next 24 hours before you're viewing this broadcast that change things rather dramatically; it's the nature of the period that we're in, that things are changing on an hourly and daily basis.

But Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche recounted the fact that they were watching a show on German television on Wednesday evening, which was a kind of interview/interrogation of German Angela Merkel. Now as those of you who've been regularly following these broadcasts, and have followed the LaRouche movement over the years, are aware, we've been harshly critical of Frau Merkel: that she's not been an effective Chancellor. She's presided over some of the most disastrous decisions that have been made in Germany in the entire postwar period, such as the complete dismantling of Germany's nuclear power sector.

But, she made the right decision under enormous public pressure, to not go into a xenophobic attack against the urgent needs of the refugees flooding into Europe from North Africa and from the Middle East, escaping the devastating wars that President Obama, and before him President George W. Bush, were absolutely responsible for.

So, Merkel was under vicious attack from some of the interviews on the question of why she was tolerating the flow of these Middle East refugees into Germany. And why didn't they just simply create refugee camps on the outskirts of Europe in the Middle East; virtually concentration camps? And so Merkel, in her own quiet way, held her ground; and Mr. LaRouche's comment was that basically she steadfastly maintained the view of the majority of Germans. If you didn't

have Putin taking the actions that he has taken in Syria and elsewhere, and if you didn't have a majority of the population in Germany sticking with the view that it's time to open your arms and help out these refugees who are fleeing from wars that are not of their own making, but came from the disastrous policies of the West – particularly from Britain and the United States – we would be on the very edge of war; if not already in a general warfare situation at this moment.

You've got a stark contrast in personal experience and personal morality between President Obama and President Putin. Obama was brutalized as a very young child by his Indonesian stepfather; who was by all accounts himself a killer, and who brutalized both Obama's mother and himself to the point that eventually the mother decided to get him out of there and send him back to Hawaii. These kinds of experiences can run very deep in your psyche; and can produce the kinds of socio-pathological behavior that we've seen. The case of the bombing of the hospital in Afghanistan, which we'll take up a bit later, is but one example of this.

So, we're faced with a degenerate culture; we're faced with a Wall Street that is thoroughly and completely bankrupt; and must be put through bankruptcy elimination. It's got to be completely shut down. And we've got the problem, that, on the Republican Party side, you have a sick spectacle of candidates running for office. And on the Democratic Party side, while you have individuals who have certain credibility and talent – Martin O'Malley quite clearly is aware of the immediate urgency of Glass-Steagall and the need to put Wall Street in its place; but there is an enormous gap – Mr. LaRouche emphasized this, that there is no one candidate who can be counted on to actually do the job. To present a comprehensive solution to the gravest crises, that this nation and the world have faced in memory. And therefore, what you need is an array of candidates who bring a certain kind of view and talent to the table; so that we can establish a Presidency

under very grave circumstances that assembles the kind of necessary talent to be able to do the job.

Now in fact, certain things must happen immediately; and cannot wait for the Presidential primary elections, the conventions, and the elections in November of 2016. What we need immediately – right now – as preemptively action before Wall Street blows out; we need to reinstate Glass-Steagall. Glass-Steagall is by no means the total solution; but it is the indispensable first step. Glass-Steagall reinstated; full and complete bank separation will accomplish two things immediately. It will wipe out Wall Street, because once you separate out legitimate commercial banking activity from all of the gambling activity, and make it clear gambling debts will no longer be bailed out by taxpayers; at that moment, that entire Wall Street gambling bubble will evaporate. It'll be clear that nobody is going to bail it out; that it could never, ever be bailed out. It would be an act of moral horror to bail it out; and therefore, it will just disappear. And under those circumstances, it will almost certainly mean the immediate demise of Obama. Either Obama signs Glass-Steagall into law, which is highly unlikely; or his effort to block it on behalf of a Wall Street that's already dead, will mean that he will be drummed out of office. He will cause such an enormous backlash, that's been building and building and building for so long already; that he'll be gone. So, Glass-Steagall as a first step towards adopting the entire array of Franklin Roosevelt American System solutions to this crisis, is absolutely indispensable in the short term.

And the mood in the country is shifting, particularly among certain patriotic institutions. The Pentagon is well aware that President Obama represents an horrific danger of war confrontation with Russia. And now the center of gravity of that danger has shifted from eastern Ukraine to Syria; but the danger remains the same. Secretary of State Kerry is trying to do certain things with the Russians to maintain a certain

war prevention, war avoidance dynamic. And he has institutional backing for those actions; otherwise, I doubt he would be simply taking them on his own. But all of these measures, as useful as they are, are simply holding back the tide. Wall Street must be put out of its misery; Obama must be removed from office. The 25th Amendment, which provides for the means to remove a President who is no longer mentally fit to serve, is the most efficient means to carry this out.

But we are talking about events and actions that are going to have to be taken right away; immediately in the coming days ahead. Because if those measures are not taken, and if the holding line actions being taken by people like Angela Merkel, with all of her flaws and weaknesses, in Germany; if there were to be a pushback against what President Putin is doing in Syria right now, then we'd go over the edge. And the driving factor in all of this, again, is that Wall Street is finished; it's bankrupt, it's doomed, it can never be put back together again. And either Wall Street is put out of its misery, or we're headed for a moment of total and absolute chaos. You had, for example, in Thursday's *Washington Post*, an article by none other than Larry Summers – who was the architect of the end of Glass-Steagall; and he has an article called "The Global Economy in Peril". In the article, he says that the whole policy of QE [quantitative easing] can't be done again; interest rates are at zero, the Fed has no ability to do anything. The only option is to begin investing in capital investment in the real economy. Now, Larry Summers is a numbskull; and the idea that he's even acknowledging the desperation of the present situation, tells you where things really stand right now. So, we need Glass-Steagall immediately; that will bring about the end of the Obama tyranny, the Obama Presidency. And nothing short of those measures is going to even remotely come close to solving the problems that are staring us right in the face.

ROSS: Well, let's take up the bombing of the hospital in

Afghanistan. As I'm sure everyone is aware, on Saturday, the U.S. military struck a hospital that was run by Doctors without Borders; commonly known by its French acronym MSF (Medecins sans Frontieres), in Kunduz, Afghanistan. Destroying part of it, killing 10 staff members, 10 patients, including 3 children, and injuring 37. This is a hospital that the coordinates of it had been communicated by MSF repeatedly to the U.S. military, Afghanistan, NATO – including only a short period before the attack. After the bombing started, MSF tried to alert the U.S. military and yet the bombing continued for another 30 minutes. So, I wanted to read some portions of a speech that was given by Dr. Joanne Liu, the President of Doctors without Borders, and ask Jeff to comment; put this into context for us. So, Dr. Liu said:

“On Saturday morning, MSF patients and staff killed in Kunduz joined the countless number of people who have been killed around the world in conflict zones and referred to as ‘collateral damage’ or as an ‘inevitable consequence of war’. International humanitarian law is not about ‘mistakes’. It is about intention, facts and why.

“The U.S. attack on the MSF hospital in Kunduz was the biggest loss of life for our organization in an airstrike. Tens of thousands of people in Kunduz can no longer receive medical care now when they need it most. Today we say: Enough. Even war has rules.”

Dr. Liu said, “This was not just an attack on our hospital – it was an attack on the Geneva Conventions. This cannot be tolerated. These Conventions govern the rules of war and were established to protect civilians in conflicts – including patients, medical workers, and facilities. They bring some humanity into what is otherwise an inhumane situation.”

She said, “It is precisely because attacking hospitals in war zones is prohibited that we expected to be protected. And yet, 10 patients including 3 children, and 12 MSF staff were killed

in the aerial raids.

“The facts and circumstances of this attack must be investigated independently and impartially, particularly given the inconsistencies in the U.S. and Afghan accounts of what happened over recent days. We cannot rely on only internal military investigations by the U.S., NATO, and Afghan forces.”

She said, “Today we announce that we are seeking an investigation into the Kunduz attack by the International Humanitarian Fact-Finding Commission. This Commission was established in the Additional Protocols of the Geneva Conventions and is the only permanent body set up specifically to investigate violations of international humanitarian law.”

So, I'd like to ask Jeff to put this into context, and let us know how to think about this.

STEINBERG: First of all, Mr. LaRouche completely endorses the need for the kind of investigation that will presumably be carried out by this body under the Geneva Convention; because it would be a terrible tragic mistake to carry out an investigation that works from the bottom up. This was a policy action, and ultimately it was a policy action of the Obama administration; and as Mr. LaRouche put it, it is characteristic of the state of mind of the President himself. I don't have to remind regular viewers of this broadcast about the Tuesday kill list sessions; or about the fact that at least four American citizens have been willfully put on those kill lists and murdered without any due process whatsoever. These are crimes against the U.S. Constitution, crimes against humanity.

So, that's the character of what we're dealing with. Remember the decision that was consciously made by President Obama, Prime Minister Cameron, and former French President Sarkozy, when they had Muammar Qaddafi actually ready to be detained; and the decision instead was made to kill him. To have him

murdered in cold blood in order to accelerate the kind of chaos that ensued; and particularly the targeting of Russia and China that followed off of that. So, these are important contextual factors to take into account, that cry for a full-scale actual independent investigation.

Now, one that I think must be factored in, as this serious investigation goes forward, is that there's a recent prehistory of relations between President Obama and Doctors without Borders. Back six months ago, during an earlier phase of the negotiations around the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), Doctors without Borders put out a policy statement in which they said that unless the entire TPP agenda relating to pharmaceuticals was changed, they would campaign aggressively against it; because the agreements that were under discussion – some of which were leaked by Wikileaks, and that's about the only transparent public revelation about what this treaty actually says – but in the section relating to pharmaceutical patents, effectively they shut out the ability of generic drug manufacturers to actually do their job. And the Doctors without Borders estimate was that one-half billion people would be shut out of access to vital, lifesaving generic drugs under the terms of TPP. To my knowledge, there's been no change in that aspect of the treaty, which the Obama administration rammed through earlier in the week. So, you've got a context here, where what happened with Doctors without Borders, issuing a clarion call to defeat one of President Obama's signature legacy efforts cannot be ignored when you have to deal with taking into account the psychology of this President.

Now, I think it's also very important to once again look at the events that are going on, the backdrop – the psychological context – for understanding this brutal attack in Kunduz. Because look, the initial comments coming out of the administration; they made no attempt whatsoever to deny what happened. They just simply tried to issue a blanket statement

that the Taliban took over Kunduz, and therefore, everyone living in that city could be presumed to be a terrorist. Now, I mean, that kind of madness is, again, unfortunately typical of the kinds of squirming logic that are used by this White House, this President to justify actions that do belong before the International Court of Justice for War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity.

So, then in contrast to that, you've got the actions that the Russians have taken in Syria. They've been invited in officially by the Syrian government; they have formed a treaty agreement, in effect; a Memorandum of Understanding among Syria, Russia, Iran, and Iraq, to decisively go after and wipe out the Islamic State, the Army of Conquest, the al-Nusra Front – all of the groups that share a radical Salafist, jihadist commitment. And so, whereas the United States and the so-called coalition of 60 countries has been playing both sides of the fence; carrying out minor little incidental attacks against the Islamic State, supporting the Kurds here a little bit, doing certain other things. Those same countries have been instrumental in actually going after and supporting the Islamic State, because as President Bush said way back in the summer of 2011, "Assad must go." The Saudis are behind the Army of Conquest; they created it, they've poured money and weapons into it. They're part of the so-called coalition against the Islamic State; but the core of the Army of Conquest – backed by the Saudis – is the al-Nusra Front, which is al-Qaeda. So, in other words, the United States is part of a coalition which has absolutely no intention whatsoever of eliminating the threat to humanity posed by the Islamic State.

You have members of Congress – most recently Tulsi Gabbard – who said, look you might not like everything that Russia does, but back in World War II, there was an agreement that the threat to mankind represented by Hitler and the Axis powers was so great, that the only viable option was to work with the Soviet Union, to work with Stalin, to defeat Hitler and defeat

the Nazi cause. And as Mr. LaRouche emphasized, it was in fact the Soviet involvement that was decisive in defeating Hitler. If it were not for the suffering of the Russian people – 22 million killed, for starters – and if it were not for the kinds of actions at places like Stalingrad, the outcome of World War II would probably have been very different; even despite Roosevelt's Arsenal of Democracy.

So, now you've got Russia moving into Syria. And very clearly, if you study the 2nd Chechen war, which took place soon after Putin became President, if you look at the 2008 Georgia war, you know that the Russians aren't going in there to fight to a stalemate. They are going in there for a total victory; whereas the United States has not even entertained the concept of total victory in the period following the death of Franklin Roosevelt. We had a total victory concept in World War II; we abandoned it. Vietnam was the new Rand Corporation conflict resolution, systems analysis mode of warfare; where mathematics are the dominant factor. Never a concept of victory. The real crisis going on right now between the United States and Russia in Syria has nothing to do with no-fly zones, or areas of operation, or anything like that. The difference is that Russia is going in for absolute, decisive victory over the terrorists; and as Lavrov said pointblank in his discussions with Secretary of State Kerry very recently, he said, "If it walks like a terrorist, if it quacks like a terrorist, then it is a terrorist; and we're going to treat it that way." So, these shades of gray differences between al-Nusra, the Army of Conquest, and ISIS, are outside the Russian concept of war.

So, Putin is going in for the kill. Over the last 48 hours, Russia – in conjunction with Syrian military, as well as Iraq and Iran – has launched an air-land-sea total offensive against the terrorist infrastructure in Syria. It's changed the rules decisively; it's changed the likely outcome of the entire situation. And since the Obama administration and

President Obama personally never abandoned the idea that the first priority is to get rid of President Assad and worry later about the consequences, what the Russians have done has stolen the moment completely. In warfare, victory is very often measured by the ability to anticipate and know what the other command is thinking and doing; and to move on a flanking basis way out ahead of them and catch them by surprise. That's what happened this week. The fact that the Russians have launched cruise missile strikes on terrorist targets inside Syria from 900 miles away, from four ships in the middle of the Caspian Sea accessing Iranian and Iraqi airspace *en route* into Syria, indicates that there is a serious military operation here. Yesterday, the *New York Times* finally acknowledged that the Russian war plan in Syria has been mapped out in partnership with Iran and Iraq and Syria, and probably with Hezbollah, for at least the past four to six months. The United States was blindsided by and large to these developments, because President Obama – in his supreme arrogance – presumed that the “coalition” was the only game in town.

So, now the Russians have stolen the march, and are committed to a dynamically different policy; and there is a very strong possibility that the Russians will succeed, because they're committed to victory. Whereas, the policies coming from the Obama administration and the Bush administration before that, were simply a commitment to perpetual wars; wars that ultimately get measured in the body count. How many people are killed? How long is the war sustained? How much infrastructure and economic capacity can be permanently destroyed? Already, much of the middle class of Syria, which was a modern secular large middle class country, have been driven out. So that the brain drain on Syria is in itself another major kind of crisis. These are the kinds of calculations that have dominated the thinking of the 20th Century: population wars; Malthusian methods of reducing population in absolute terms; breaking down any prospects for

genuine scientific and technological progress and advancement; no increase – in fact a net collapse – of real productivity. That's been going on pretty much nonstop since the death of Roosevelt.

So, Obama is carrying out a policy that's doomed to fail; and could very well bring the world to the very brink of thermonuclear war. The Russians are carrying out a strategic and military flanking operation with a large element of diplomacy thrown in as well. Turkey has already worked out de-confliction agreements with Russia; and the acting Prime Minister of Turkey, Davutoglu, said yesterday that Russian/Turkish relations are perfectly fine. Syria will not interfere with the Russian and Turkish neighborly cooperation. There was a high-level military delegation from Russia in Israel, talking about the fact that Israel no longer has carte blanche to carry out bombing attacks inside Syrian territory against Hezbollah targets. So, you've got Iraq now saying that they want Russia to come in as the primary ally in the war against the Islamic State.

The former head of the Defense Intelligence Agency [DIA], Gen. Michael Flynn – whom we've talked about on a number of our recent shows – who came out and blew the whistle on the fact that Obama supported the growth of al-Qaeda in Iraq, and ultimately the Islamic State, and refused to take DIA warnings seriously because it interfered with his plans of overthrowing Assad; even if it meant being in bed with the very people who did the 9/11 attacks in 2001, and then did the Benghazi. So, General Flynn was interviewed several days ago on Russia Today; and he said pointblank "We must be working with Russia. Russia has more strategic interests in defeating the Islamic State in Syria than the United States does by far." There are thousands – an estimate of 2500 to 5000 – Chechen and other Russian Muslims who've been recruited into the Islamic State, the al-Nusra Front, and are now fighting in Iraq and Syria. And if they are not defeated right there in

the Middle East, they will go back to Russia; and Russia will be facing an absolute hellish situation. So Putin, whose parents suffered greatly during the 2nd World War, as almost all Russians did; Putin, who lost a brother in the 2nd World War, has that kind of sense of morality to be willing to wage a total war to defeat an enemy that is clearly the enemy of humanity.

So, if you put all of those elements together, and then go back to the question of the investigation, and the need for an investigation, into the hospital bombing in Kunduz; I think it's very clear that the findings of that investigation, if they are allowed to consider the full top-down implications, will be extremely important and will be extremely bad news for President Obama.

OGDEN: Well, with that said, I want to bring a conclusion to this evening's broadcast. I want to thank both Jeff and Jason for joining me here in the studio. And I think we can proceed with a substantial amount of clarity as to the dramatic nature of the current situation, and how important the intervention that LaRouche PAC and the LaRouche movement nationally have at this present time. So, the mobilization that we initiated this week I think will continue into this following week; and if you haven't yet, please take the statement that I read at the beginning of the broadcast tonight – the Urgent Message to Congressmen and Other National Leaders – and circulate it as widely as you can. We need to continue to spread this as widely as is possible; and take the proceedings of also the Fireside Chat that Mr. LaRouche continues to do on Thursday nights and his discussion with the group up in Manhattan on Saturdays. And make sure that you are getting as many people as you can to study this in dept and to join our mobilization.

So, with that, I'd like to thank you all for listening; and stay tuned to larouchepac.com. Good night.

USA: Larry Summers kræver massiv, global, finansiel 'kvantitativ lempelse' for at afværge international finansiel nedsmeltning

8. oktober 2015 – Larry Summers, der spillede en central rolle i ødelæggelsen af Glass-Steagall fra sine stillinger i USA's Finansministerium fra 1995-2001, har skrevet en lang kronik, der er publiceret i dagens *Financial Times*, *Washington Post* og andre publikationer, og hvor han udsteder et presserende krav om »substantielle ændringer i verdens økonomiske strategi« for at håndtere den fremstormende nedsmeltning.

For altid en fortaler for aggressiv kvantitativ lempelse ('pengetrykning'), lægger Summers nu stemme til den udprægede panik, der fejer hen over finansskredse, ved at sige, at en sådan »traditionel kvantitativ lempelse« i den monetære politik ikke længere ville have nogen virkning på krisen. Han kræver udløsningen af, hvad der svarer til en finansiel, udvidet kvantitativ lempelse og opfordrer indtrængende regeringer på begge sider Atlanten, og især de såkaldte fremvoksende økonomier, til at påtage sig rene bjerge af ny gæld ved, at de selv og deres centralbanker direkte opkøber junk-obligationer i halsbrækkende tempo. Man skal ikke bekymre sig om gæld-til-BNP på 60 % og mere, erklærer han; »et langt højere tal er bestemt passende i dag«.

Man bør erindre sig, at Summers, der var USA's vicefinansminister under Robert Rubin fra 1995-1999, og

dernæst selv finansminister fra 1999-2001, da Glass-Steagall formelt blev ophævet, i dag er en af Hillary Clintons vigtigste rådgivere i økonomisk politik. Hans artikel opfordrer til, at hans klinisk hysteriske forslag diskuteres på det årlige IMF-møde med verdens finansministre og centralbanker, der vil finde sted den 9. okt. i Lima, Peru.

Lyndon LaRouche: Der eksisterer nu en AKUT NØDTILSTAND: 7 punkter til omgående behandling af kongresmedlemmer, senatorer og andre medlemmer af USA's regering

5. oktober 2015:

1) En akut nødtilstand eksisterer nu, der truer med at dræbe millioner af amerikanere, primært, og også borgere i andre lande.

2) Dette skyldes umiddelbart Wall Streets bankerot. ..

3) Hvis Wall Street får lov til atter at nedsmelte ... vil resultatet blive historiens værste panik ... Vi vil få massive tabstal, på samme skala som den Sorte Død, der udslettede en tredjedel af Europas befolkning. Endnu en bailout af Wall Street, som Obama vil kræve, hvis han får lov til at blive i embedet, ville udløse en hyperinflation med samme, dødbringende virkning...

Download (PDF, Unknown)

NYHEDSORIENTERING OKTOBER:

Løsninger til flygtningekrisen og det truende finanskrak

Den voksende europæiske flygtningekrise havde fundet vej til statsminister Lars Løkke-Rasmussens åbningstale til Folketinget den 6. oktober, men ellers var den totalt forandrede internationale situation, der er afgørende for Danmarks fremtid, ikke på dagsordenen: Wall Street og verdens finansmarkeder er bankerot, og spekulanterne kræver en hjælpepakke, der er endnu større end i 2008, for at overleve.

En sådan hjælpepakke vil dræbe det, der er tilbage af realøkonomien og befolkningens levestandard i USA og mange andre steder. Derfor skal der omgående gennemføres en lang række økonomiske tiltag, begyndende med en genindførelse af en Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling og en ordnet afvikling af Wall Street og den globale finansspekulation.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Leder, 8. oktober 2015: Fyr omgående Obama!

Rusland har nu lanceret en dynamisk luft-, land- og vandoffensiv i Syrien, sammen med den Syriske Hær, og med opbakning fra Hezbollah og IRGC-styrker (Den iranske Revolutionshær). De primære mål er Islamisk Stat og Erobringshæren, der er en saudisk skabelse domineret af al-Qaeda (Nusra Front). I går mødtes præsident Putin med forsvarsminister Shoigu, og deres møde blev delvist vist i fjernsynet. Shoigu meddelte, at den Russiske Flåde havde sluttet sig til kampen mod ISIS, med fire, russiske flåde fartøjer i det Kaspiske Hav, der affyrede 26 krydsermissiler på en afstand af 900 mil mod ISIS-mål i det nordlige Syrien.

Irak har indikeret, at det vil bede Rusland om at påbegynde bombeoperationer imod ISIS inde på irakisk jord. Tyrkiet har, i modstrid med NATO's og Obamaregeringens højtravende snak, meddelt, at relationerne med Rusland er fine, og at man har etableret en militær kanal for at sikre, at der ikke opstår nogen hændelser mellem russiske og tyrkiske fly i området langs den syriske grænse. Fungerende premierminister Davutoglu

sagde til reportere onsdag, at russisk-tyrkiske relationer er venskabelige og udviser godt naboskab, og at der ikke vil komme nogen tyrkisk-russisk konflikt ud af situationen i Syrien.

Obama er blevet grundigt udmanøvreret og trængt op i en krog af de russiske handlinger, der har udløst et betydningsfuldt brud væk fra Obama af traditionelle amerikanske nøgleallierede i Europa og Mellemøsten. For at føje spot til skade, så kom fhv. udenrigsminister Hillary Clinton, under sin valgkampagne i Iowa, i onsdags med en udtalelse om, at hun var imod Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP). Det betyder, at alle de tre, vigtigste, demokratiske præsidentkandidater har brudt med Obama over TPP.

Obama er blevet overgivet af alle sine »gamle venner«, med saudierne som eneste undtagelse.

Alt imens Obama fejrede TPP-aftalen i weekenden, så bliver det mere og mere sandsynligt, at det vil slå tilbage mod ham som en boomerang og kunne katalysere alle hans fjender til en enkelt styrke, der slår ham ned over TPP.

Lyndon LaRouche har understreget, at det er tydeligt, at Obama nu overgives af alle sine tidligere venner, inklusive Hillary Clinton. Han kan, og må, fjernes fra embedet, i dette øjeblik, hvor spørgsmålet om krig of fred ligger på vippen. Fra Rusland lyder der advarsler om, at Obama totalt kunne flippe ud over Putins diplomatiske successer i de seneste uger og kunne forsøge at starte nye krigsprovokationer med 'farvede revolutioner' imod Rusland. Disse provokationer kunne komme i det østlige Ukraine, i Moldova, i enklaven Transnistrien, eller i det armensk-aserbajdsjanske område omkring det Kaspiske Hav.

Obama sidder i kviksand op til navlen, men han er stadig en trussel, og intet mindre end hans fjernelse fra embedet vil fuldt ud løse krisen.

Timing er af afgørende betydning. Wall Street og London er irreversibelt bankerot, og en hvilken som helst udløser, kunne detonere hele systemets nedsmeltning. Glass-Steagall må vedtages, *før* denne nedsmeltning. Federal Reserve står magtesløs og hænger på en regnskabsopgørelse på 5,2 billioner dollars, takket være bailout (bankredning) via kvantitativ lempelse og en nulrentepolitik, der yderligere har næret boblen.

Obamas fjernelse, gerne under det 25. forfatningstillæg, samtidig med vedtagelse af en lovgivning, der genindfører Glass-Steagall, repræsenterer den eneste, fornuftige mulighed. Putins flankoperationer i Syrien har skabt den nødvendige åbning for at bringe hele dette Obama-rod til fald. Gå ikke glip af denne historiske chance. Den kommer måske ikke igen.

Leder, 7. oktober 2015: LaRouche mobiliserer for at lukke Wall Street ned, mens bankierer hylér, »Systemet bryder sammen«

Mens du læser denne rapport, er en stærk delegation af LaRouchePAC-aktivister fra New York City – garvede veteraner fra Lyndon LaRouches »Manhattan-projekt« – ankommet til Washington, D.C. for at lede dagens mobilisering og lobbyvirksomhed på Capitol Hill den 7. okt., for indtrængende at opfordre ansvarlige nøglepersoner blandt kongresmedlemmerne

og senatorerne til omgående at tage skridt til at lukke Wall Street ned og gennemtvinge Glass-Steagall. Som det specificeres i LPAC's 7-punktserklæring, **»Til kongresmedlemmer, senatorer og andre medlemmer af USA's regering, til omgående handling«:**

»En akut nødtilstand eksisterer nu, der truer med at dræbe millioner af amerikanere, primært, og også borgere i andre lande,«

hvilket kræver handling nu, i denne uge.

Panikken blandt bankierer på Wall Street og i City of London er mærkbar, lige under overfladen. Lederen i 3. okt.-udgaven af *The Economist*, medieflagskibet for City of Londons finansinteresser, advarer om, at »systemet er ved at bryde sammen« og kræver en massiv indsats for at understøtte boblen med nye bølger af kvantitativ lempelse – nøjagtig, som Lyndon LaRouche har advaret om, at deres plan går ud på. På samme måde klynker magasinet *Forbes*, at »der er for over 600 billioner dollar i udestående OTC-derivater (over-the-counter; 'over disken') på storbankernes regnskaber (selv om det virkelige tal sandsynligvis er det dobbelte), som kunne sprænge hele systemet i stykker, når et stormløb først tager fat.

»For sådanne som JP Morgan, Bank of Amerika, Citigroup, Goldman Sachs og Morgan Stanley er disse ting fortsat et spørgsmål om liv og død.«

Det britiske Imperium er også i panik, fordi deres bydreng Barack Obama er ved at synke, og det hurtigt, både internt i USA og internationalt. Virkningen af FN's Generalforsamling og den russiske præsidents dristige handlinger i Syrien ruller kloden rundt, og folk er ved at vågne op til den kendsgerning, at et ny, international orden er mulig. De har set på, mens Putin hængte Obama til tørre i Syrien, og ikke alene overlevede til at fortælle historien, men er i fin form, mens

Obama smøler frustreret omkring. Ideen om, at

»vi måske ikke behøver at tolerere Obama mere; måske ikke længere behøver underkaste os Wall Street og se på, at vore nationer dør«,

er en voksende kraft over hele planeten.

Dette er et historisk øjeblik, der er svangert med potentiale, har Helga Zepp-LaRouche understreget. Det er et øjeblik, hvor vi ikke alene kan sænke Wall Street og genindføre Glass-Steagall, men også skifte radikalt over til en politik med Verdenslandbroen og global genopbygning. Det faktum, at ledende, akademiske lærde, folk fra tænketanke og andre i Kina offentligt har støtte LaRouche-parrets Landbro-politik; at verdens andenstørste økonomi grundlæggende set har vedtaget denne politik, er af dramatisk, global betydning. Nu, hvor **den kinesiske udgave af EIR's bog, »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen«**, er blevet udgivet med så magtfuld opbakning, vil vi bringe dette budskab med tilbage til USA, med et stort oplag af Specialrapporten til en pris, der muliggør bred cirkulation i hele landet.

Lyndon LaRouche erklærede, hvad der står på spil her, den 5. okt. i sin ugentlige webcast med LPAC's Komite for Politisk Strategi:

»Vi kan ikke længere tolerere de risici, der er involveret med en fornyelse af Wall Streets betingelser. Vi må derfor, af denne grund, lukke Wall Street ned for at beskytte USA's befolkning ... Vi må handle forebyggende. Det, vi har gjort, og det, som jeg har presset på for, er at få en omgående beslutning fra relevante medlemmer af Kongressen om at afholde et møde og håndtere situationen som sådan. Denne situation påbyder at lukke Wall Street, uden at de får en indsats for en bailout (bankredning). For, at give endnu en mulighed for en bailout til Wall Street ville næsten med sikkerhed garantere en stor katastrofe for befolkningen i

USA.«

»Vi må derfor beskytte befolkningen. Vi må annullere Wall Street. Og vi må fortsætte fremefter med at omstrukturere organiseringen af vores beskæftigelse med den hensigt at rent faktisk få produktive processer sat i gang, grundlæggende set, et krav, der er mere presserende end det, Franklin Roosevelt gjorde. Men det, som Franklin Roosevelt udstod, og måtte konfrontere og håndtere, er ubetydeligt, sammenlignet med de vilkår, der hersker i USA netop nu.«

Supplerende dokumentation:

Wall Street bankierer diskuterer åbenlyst det kommende krak:

»Systemet er ved at bryde sammen«

Samtidig med, at LaRouche-bevægelsen skifter til højeste gear for at lukke Wall Street ned og vende tilbage til Glass-Steagall, før krakket slår til, diskuterer bankierer på Wall Street og i City of London nu åbenlyst det kommende krak ... og er i stille panik over, hvordan de skal håndtere det.

Lederen i 3. oktober-udgaven af *The Economist*, medieflagskibet for City of Londons finansinteresser, advarer om, at »systemet er ved at bryde sammen« og kræver en massiv indsats for at understøtte boblen med nye bølger af såkaldt kvantitativ lempelse – nøjagtig, som Lyndon LaRouche har advaret om, at deres plan går ud på. Artiklen klynker imidlertid, at denne hyperinflationsskabende bailout-politik muligvis ikke vil virke, som den gjorde i 2008, fordi Den amerikanske Kongres måske i stedet vil gå ind for mere regulering af bankerne – selv om artiklen omhyggeligt undgår at nævne de frygtede ord,

»Glass-Steagall«.

Et stort problem i dag, skriver *The Economist*,

»er manglen på en opbakning til det oversøiske dollarsystem, hvis det står over for en krise. I 2008-09 kom Federal Reserve modvilligt til hjælp og optrådte som den sidste lånemulighed ved at tilbyde dollarlikviditet til 1 billion til udenlandske banker og centralbanker. De summer, der vil være involveret i en fremtidig krise, ville være langt højere. Den oversøiske dollarverden er omtrent dobbelt så stor, som den var i 2007. I år 2020 kunne den være lige så stor som Amerikas bankindustri. Siden 2008-09 er Kongressen blevet forsigtig med Feds nødlån. I den næste krise kan Feds planer om at udstede udstrakte swaplinjer muligvis blive mødt med modstand fra lovgivning og Kongres.«

Artiklen i *The Economist* slutter:

»Der er ting, som Amerika kan gøre for at påtage sig mere ansvar – f.eks. ved at etablere større nød-swaplinjer til flere centralbanker. En splittelse af systemet er mere sandsynlig, med andre lande, der vælger at isolere sig fra Feds beslutninger ved at indføre begrænsninger på finanstransaktioner. Dollaren har ingen ligemand. Men det system, som det forankrer, er ved at bryde sammen.«

På samme måde skrev magasinet *Forbes'* Antoine Gara den 2. okt. om faren for en ny nedsmeltning, og indrømmer som noget usædvanligt, at det underliggende problem er den gigantiske bunke af derivater, der yderligere er knyttet til utallige nominelle gældsbobler. Gara forsøger at lade, som om alt er i skønneste orden, og fremfører, at »Glencores opløsning ikke vil udvikle sig til det næste Lehman Brothers-tilfælde«. Han siger, at det skyldes, at Glencore ikke har den samme eksponering til derivater, som Lehman havde.

Men, indrømmer han,

»hvis Goldman Sachs, Morgan Stanley eller en anden, stor investeringsbank skulle blive kastet ud i de samme vanskeligheder, som Glencore nu befinder sig i, ville der være god grund til at være bekymret for en Lehman 2. Der er over 600 billioner dollar i udestående OTC-derivater (faktisk er der nok det dobbelte, -red.), et beløb, der er større end før krisen, og mange af disse kontrakter fortsætter med at handle bilateralt mellem banker og forbinder firmaer.

Gara slutter:

»For sådanne som JP Morgan, Bank of Amerika, Citigroup, Goldman Sachs og Morgan Stanley er disse ting fortsat et spørgsmål om liv og død. I sidste kvartal viste hvert selskab for billioner, hvis ikke et titals billioner af udestående OTC-derivatkontrakter. Ingen mængde af rejst, tilbageholdt kapital ville beskytte disse selskaber, hvis der kom en grim, Lehman-lignende bankerot.«

**Leder, 6. oktober 2015:
Til omgående behandling af
kongresmedlemmer,
senatorer og andre medlemmer
af USA's regering**

1) En akut nødtilstand eksisterer nu, der truer med at dræbe millioner af amerikanere, primært, og også borgere i andre lande.

2) Dette skyldes umiddelbart Wall Streets bankerot. ..

3) Hvis Wall Street får lov til atter at nedsmelte ... vil resultatet blive historiens værste panik ... Vi vil få massive tabstal, på samme skala som den Sorte Død, der udslettede en tredjedel af Europas befolkning. Endnu en bailout af Wall Street, som Obama vil kræve, hvis han får lov til at blive i embedet, ville udløse en hyperinflation med samme, dødbringende virkning...

Ansvarlige hovedpersoner blandt kongresmedlemmer og senatorer (og sådanne findes), samt andre repræsentanter for den amerikanske regering, må omgående afholde et møde for at udstede faktiske konstateringer og hensigtserklæringer, som i store træk følger nedenstående, til omgående vedtagelse som lov og omgående ikrafttræden.

1) En akut nødtilstand eksisterer nu, der truer med at dræbe millioner af amerikanere, primært, og også borgere i andre lande.

2) Dette skyldes umiddelbart Wall Streets bankerot. Wall

Street er totalt og uigenkaldeligt bankerot. Bush- og Obamaregeringernes successive bailouts – bankredninger – samt runderne med »kvantitative lempelser« har blot haft held til at gøre Wall Streets værdier værdiløse og gøre dets bankerot endegyldig.

3) Hvis Wall Street får lov til atter at nedsmelte på sine egne betingelser, hvilket nu synes at være umiddelbart forestående, vil resultatet blive historiens værste panik, som vil lukke alt, hvad der er tilbage af USA's økonomi, ned. Vi vil få massive tabstal, på samme skala som den Sorte Død, der udslettede en tredjedel af Europas befolkning. Endnu en bailout af Wall Street, som Obama vil kræve, hvis han får lov til at blive i embedet, ville udløse en hyperinflation med samme, dødbringende virkning.

4) Det følger heraf, at Wall Street må nedlukkes som en forebyggende foranstaltning gennem en handling fra den amerikanske regering, i samme ånd som det, Franklin Roosevelt ville have gjort, havde han levet i dag. (Selv om den krise, han stod overfor, var langt mildere.) Udelukkende kun aktiviteter, der er i overensstemmelse med en Glass/Steagall-standard, må få lov at fortsætte.

5) USA's regering må udstede amerikanske dollars som kredit for at bevare befolkningens liv og skaffe beskæftigelse til alle, der kan arbejde, i samme ånd, som Roosevelts og Harry Hopkins' beslægtede handlinger.

6) Hen over et lidt længere tidforløb må statskredit anvendes til en hurtig hævelse af den amerikanske arbejdskrafts produktivitet, gennem en forøget energigennemstrømningstæthed med teknologiske og videnskabelige fremskridt.

7) Den endelige fjernelse af Barack Obama fra embedet ville udgøre et fremragende udgangspunkt for disse presserende nødvendige reformer.

RADIO SCHILLER den 5. oktober 2015: Et nyt lederskab for en ny verdensorden: Putin inden for strategi, Xi Jinping inden for økonomisk udvikling

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Leder, 5. oktober 2015: Putins handlinger i Syrien kan sænke Obama nu – Hastemobilisering for en omgående genindførelse af Glass- Steagall

Udelukkende kun en hurtig mobilisering, som en del af en plan for sejr, kan ændre situationen. Glass-Steagall må omgående genindføres. En folkelig mobilisering for de eneste, farbare

løsninger, på dette fremskredne tidspunkt, haster som højeste prioritet. ... At vente på, at katastrofen skal ramme, er en opskrift på total død og ødelæggelse.

Den russiske præsident Putins flankoperationer i Syrien har ikke alene allerede leveret et dødbringende slag mod jihadisterne i ISIS og Nusra. De har på afgørende vis demonstreret, at USA's præsident Obama er en egomaniker, der er ude af stand til strategisk tænkning eller planlægning.

Obamas sindssyge er en af faktorerne i den amerikanske regerings totale disintegration. De nye medlemmer af Kongressen, både i Repræsentanternes Hus og Senatet, er for det meste også af en tilsvarende, lav kvalitet således, at nationens styrelse befinder sig i en tilstand af disintegration.

Den største, umiddelbare fare som følge af denne disintegration i Washington, er, at det håbløst bankerotte Wall Street vil implodere – før de korrekte forholdsregler, med genindførelsen af Glass-Steagall(1) som den første forholdsregel, kan gennemføres. Dette er en alvorlig fare. Wall Street er allerede død. Den afgørende faktor er, at det amerikanske folk må mobiliseres til at gennemtvinge en radikal ændring i politikken, før systemet evaporerer og fører til kaos, massiv panik og den totale disintegration af det, der er tilbage af USA's økonomi.

Det betyder nu – ikke i næste uge, ikke i næste måned, men Nu!

Hvis man ikke **genindfører Glass-Steagall** og får smidt Obama ud, før systemet ryger, bliver der total katastrofe. Det er den mest umiddelbare og alvorlige udfordring, der konfronterer os alle. Wall Street er en død institution og må nedlukkes totalt. Det er super-bankerot. En fremgangsmåde som den, Franklin D. Roosevelt anvendte, er, hvad vi omgående har brug for. Det begynder med at genindføre Glass-Steagall, der omgående vil gøre en ende på Wall Streets elendighed. Det

amerikanske folk er blevet kollektivt demoraliseret af de seneste 15 års vanrøgtede lederskab og fraværet af enhver strategi for en reel, økonomisk genrejsning.

Den umiddelbare fare er, at USA's almene befolkning hænger på den yderste kant, og de kan knækkes. Obama er ansvarlig for denne katastrofe. Det amerikanske folk er i umiddelbar, overhængende fare. Hele den amerikanske økonomi befinder sig i en tilstand af fremskreden sårbarhed.

Udelukkende kun en hurtig mobilisering, som en del af en plan for sejr, kan ændre situationen. Glass-Steagall må omgående genindføres. En folkelig mobilisering for de eneste, farbare løsninger, på dette fremskredne tidspunkt, haster som højeste prioritet. Opbyg det amerikanske folks mod ved at give dem en retning for sejr. At vente på, at katastrofen skal ramme, er en opskrift på total død og ødelæggelse.

Se på, hvad det var, Putin gjorde med sin deployering i Syrien. Dette har skabt betingelserne for et dramatisk skift i Europa, anført af Tyskland, og som hastigt kan ændre den globale situation.

Obama er et produkt af sin brutale, indonesiske stedfader, der var en regulær morder, og som forvandlede Obama til en ego-drevet, sindssyg dræber. Se blot på Obamas løgnagtige opførsel, hvor han forsøger at benægte, at USA bombede et hospital under Læger uden Grænser i det nordlige Afghanistan og dræbte et dusin mennesker fra det lægelige personale. Bombningen fortsatte en halv time *efter* hektiske opkald til USA's og NATO's kommandører om at stoppe. Hospitalet blev forvandlet til en ruinhob, og Obama unddrog sig blot ansvaret, »indtil undersøgelsen af hændelsen er fuldført«.

Stik denne grusomhed lige op i Obamas ansigt. Knæk ham nu, og tag omgående initiativ til en økonomisk genrejsning, modelleret efter Franklin Roosevelts politik. Der eksisterer ingen anden mulighed, hvis det amerikanske folk skal reddes

fra undergang.

(1) Se også LPAC's Glass-Steagall-page

**Ja, jeg er parat til at hjælpe med
kampagnen for vedtagelse af
Glass/Steagall-bankopdelingsloven i
Danmark!**

**Kontakt: tlf. 35 43 00 33, eller e-
mail: si@schillerinstitut.dk**

**LPAC Fredags-webcast 2.
OKTOBER 2015:
Verden er et bedre og
tryggere sted uden Wall
Street**

Helga Zepp-LaRouche-pressekonference i Kina: "Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen" udgivet på kinesisk. Wall Street er dømt til snarlig undergang, færdig; Indfør omgående Glass-Steagall, forebyggende! LaRouche om koalitionen mod ISIS: Gør det! Der er en global, strategisk alliance: En Geneve III-

politisk løsning på krisen i Syrien vil nu være mulig. Engelsk udskift.

LaRouche PAC Webcast, October 2, 2015

[proofed against the audio]

The World Is a Better and Safer Place Without Wall Street:
Dump Wall Street, Get Glass-Steagall, Bring Back Hamilton

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening. It's October 2, 2015. My name is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us for our weekly webcast here

from larouchepac.com. We are recording here a few hours before live show time, just to let you know, in case anything drastic changes, but we are fresh from a discussion which we had with Mr.

LaRouche earlier today. I'm joined in the studio by Jeffrey Steinberg from {Executive Intelligence Review}, and Benjamin Deniston from the LaRouche PAC Scientific Team.

Obviously, we're convening here at a very momentous time in history. This is a week which began with the events at the United

Nations General Assembly meeting, most significantly, the speeches on Monday by both Vladimir Putin and President Xi Jinping of China. Now that was happening on the inside of the United Nations building. On the outside, and in the entire general area of Manhattan, the LaRouche movement was making a very significant intervention which had a significant impact on

the proceedings of the United Nations, and the discussions around

that. And those of you who listened to, or had the opportunity to

listen to the 20th Fireside Chat with Mr. LaRouche that occurred

last night, Thursday night, you heard a short report by one of the LaRouchePAC activists about what those interventions have been. [<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=imkd4v0hiiY>]

Now, simultaneous with the United Nations General Assembly meeting in New York City, another significant leader of the LaRouche movement, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, was in China. She was participating in a series of meetings, and very significantly, got to participate in a press conference announcing the publication of the {Executive Intelligence Review} Special Report, "The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge," which was now published in Chinese, and is available in the Chinese language, and we can be sure is already beginning to circulate widely in China.

[<https://larouchepac.com/20150930/eirs-silk-road-report-chinese-presented-beijing-press-conference>]

In the days subsequent to the beginning of this week, we've seen a very significant, dramatic shift in world events, and I know this is something which will be elaborated a little bit later in our broadcast. But obviously we've seen the Russian air strikes against ISIS in Syria, and this has created really a chasm, a schism, inside the United States, where Obama himself is finding himself completely edged out, and isolated, whereas significant leadership inside the senior leadership of the United States, including John Kerry and others, and also other members of Obama's own Democratic Party—Congressman Tulsi Gabbard is one significant example of this—have distanced themselves, and distinguished themselves, from Obama, and have said, this is a necessary action on the part of Vladimir Putin, and one that should be supported.

Mr. LaRouche was also clear to point out that Europe is beginning to realign itself as well vis-à-vis these actions by Russia.

Now, the primary point that Mr. LaRouche wanted us to begin

tonight's broadcast with, was the implosion of the Wall Street-based financial system. And this is what I'm going to ask

Jeffrey Steinberg to elaborate on, to begin our broadcast here tonight.

Let me just paraphrase a little bit of what Mr. LaRouche had to say in our meeting earlier, before I ask Jeff to come to the

podium. What Mr. LaRouche emphatically stated was that this financial system is on the verge of a total implosion. It's not

just a crash, but the entire thing is about to cease to exist. And that means the entire system must be changed. What do we say?

Dump Wall Street! We need a total reorganization of this entire

bankrupt system, because we're experiencing a general breakdown

of both the U.S. and the European financial systems. Therefore,

action must be taken to shut this thing down. Nothing can be done

to save it, he said.

The United States, as a nation, isn't bankrupt, but Wall Street is, and there's no solution within the current form of this financial system. The entire system must be put into receivership. He said, either way, Wall Street is finished. Either finished on its own accord, or finished because of a decisive action that's taken by patriots within the United States

government. It's intrinsically bankrupt, according to any rational physical economic standard of measurement, and all you

have to do is look at the facts. It's happening now, and that's

not a bad thing. It's actually good, and we should make the point

that Wall Street disappearing is good for the future of the American people. It should have happened a long time ago; it just needs to be cleaned up. The garbage has to be taken out, so

that we can get our people back to productive work.

So that was a short paraphrase of what Mr. LaRouche had to say. I'm going to ask Jeff to come to the podium, elaborate a little bit more on the context of this, to begin our broadcast here tonight.

JEFF STEINBERG: Last week a number of leading figures in both Wall Street and the City of London were bracing themselves, waiting to see whether the Federal Open Market Committee at the Fed was going to begin the process of normalizing interest rates, by raising them for the first time in seven or eight years by one-quarter of 1%. There was {absolute} panic and pandemonium over the prospect of that taking place, and statements were issued from the City of London, the IMF Managing Director Christine Lagarde, saying that if the Fed raises rates, it may very well trigger a blowout of the entire system, and then the Fed will be holding the bag, taking the blame for a financial blowout.

Well, the simple fact of the matter is that the Wall Street system is bankrupt, and by Wall Street system, I mean the extended system of gambling that exists on Wall Street, that dominates the City of London. You would get around the globe. You've got Frankfurt. You've got Paris. You've got Dubai in the Middle East. You've got Macao and Hong Kong in the Pacific region.

These are all centers in which there is virtually no connection

any more between the activities in the real economy, and the gambling and churning of gambling money that's going on in the

financial sector.

So there is nothing that can be done to avoid the fact that at some point very soon, there will be a trigger incident. It could be virtually anything. And it could be the beginning of a

very rapid, total evaporation of this entire mountain of debt, and what Mr. LaRouche has also been emphasizing, is that the danger in this situation is that if there is not immediate pre-emptive action, before that blowout occurs, then what you're

likely to see is a period of total chaos, in which the bankruptcy

of the financial bubble creates a system of chaos in the real economy, where you wind up with very destructive developments, with social chaos, in which the real people of the United States

and other parts of the world become once again, but on a much more dangerous scale, the victims of this kind of chaos.

So the point is very simple. There's got to be pre-emptive action now to put Wall Street in its entirety out of its misery.

And the simple first step to be taken in that direction is to reinstate Glass-Steagall. By reinstating Glass-Steagall, and making it clear, that this mountain of gambling debt will never

again be bailed out by taxpayers' funds.

The simple fact of stating that means, that the entire Wall Street system will immediately blow out. Someone is going to panic; someone is going to make a margin call, because so much of

this gambling debt, is built on borrowed money that the whole thing will evaporate. But the crucial thing is that you've got

to first create a clean and total separation between commercial

banking, which does impact on the real economy and this gambling

debt; this mountain of gambling debt that's sitting there as a parasite on the real economy. If you make that separation by passing Glass-Steagall in the United States, this will be the basis for immediate action in other parts of the world. So in

effect, by acting here in the United States, we will create the

conditions for a global Glass-Steagall separation, and then all

of this gambling debt can just evaporate.

Now, an illustrative case of this: Back in 1998, when you had the beginnings of a whole sequence of debt blow-outs, in Japan, you had a large number of Japanese banks that were basically bankrupt and were going to have to be put through bankruptcy reorganization. Under those conditions, those banks

posed a systemic risk, not just in Japan, but globally. There were some people in the Japanese Finance Ministry who understood,

and still had a memory of the difference between productive investment, legitimate commercial banking activity, and the gambling activities that had infected the whole international banking system.

And so, those banks were basically audited, and all of the derivative contracts, all of the international gambling contracts that those banks had were simply cancelled. The counterparties were contacted and given the option, of netting out those contracts; or facing the consequences of losing those

funds, those gambling debts that nobody had sufficient funds to

be able to even remotely cover. So, in the case of Japan, the gambling debts were cancelled, and then the banks were put through reorganization; there was no systemic risk.

At the same time, in the Summer of 1998, Alan Greenspan – who was in the final phases of the elimination of Glass-Steagall

as the chairman of the Federal Reserve, and formerly a senior partner at JP Morgan when the plan was hatched in the mid-'80s to

wipe out Glass-Steagall. Instead what Greenspan did was, he called in all of the counterparties of Long Term Capital Management [LTCM], a relatively small, offshore hedge fund located in the Dutch Antilles. But they had derivative contracts

tied to the Russian debt, which the Russians defaulted on, the famous GKO scandal of 1998.

And so, LCTM, rather than being put through an orderly reorganization by netting out those derivatives contracts; Greenspan called in all of the counterparties, and wouldn't let

them leave the room until they bailed out LTCM. So, on the one

hand, you had a cancellation of the derivatives; on the other hand, you had a hyperinflationary bail-out. Really just the beginning of a hyperinflationary process that went off the charts

a year later, when Glass-Steagall was repealed. And then it was

really off to the races; with everything invested in gambling and virtually nothing going into the real economy.

So now here we are, it's October of 2015. We had a shake-out of the bubble in 2008, and now it's back once again with a vengeance, because there was no change in policy. The Dodd-Frank bill with the Volcker Rule was a sick joke; it did nothing to change anything. So now, the too-big-to-fail banks have accrued a greater amount of gambling debt than they previously had. That debt cannot and will not ever be paid. So, by any scientific measurement, all of Wall Street is hopelessly bankrupt; and so long as you remain in the trap of the

current system, nothing can be done about that. And we're headed

very soon – perhaps in a matter of days or weeks or months –

to
a point where the entire system blows out; the entire
trans-Atlantic system evaporates, literally overnight. And
then
you've got social chaos on a very, very broad and dangerous
scale.

So, there is no money. Your money, your personal
investments in mutual funds or Wall Street stocks, or anything
like that; there's nothing there to protect. It can't be
protected; and in fact, what's going on right now on the eve
of

the annual Autumn meeting of the IMF, scheduled to take place
in

the next few weeks in Peru, are calls all over the place for a
new surge of hyperinflationary quantitative easing. You've
got

the European Central Bank about to extend its QE program
towards

the end of 2018; in other words, a massive hyperinflationary
bail-out that will further erode the real economy.

So, Wall Street is dead; the funeral should have already
taken place long ago. And now we're at a point where that
system

must be completely shut down. Cancel out all the derivatives;
separate the banks under Glass-Steagall, into commercial banks
and let everything fall off the edge of the cliff. Because
it's

unpayable, it's illegal, it's commingled with massive amounts
of

criminal money; it serves no purpose whatsoever. The world is
a

better and safer place without those Wall Street activities;
without the City of London, without the activities in
Frankfurt

and Paris and these other parasitical financial capitals.

Glass-Steagall right now, immediately. And we've got a
political context in which President Obama, although he is not

down all together, is greatly weakened. And you can put a
{fait
accompli} on his desk and force the signing of Glass-Steagall.
If he refuses to do that, then he's out under the 25th
Amendment;
because to not do it, in the face of this imminent blow-out of
Wall Street, would be an act of criminal insanity that
warrants
his removal from office.
So, that's the story. Wall Street is doomed. If you listen
to idiots like Christine Lagarde, or Ambrose Evans-Pritchard
over
at the London {Daily Telegraph}, they're saying, "Gee, we're
not
sure if this is a systemic crisis, or some minor cyclical
problem
that we can just weather by printing a bit more money."
They're
either idiots, or criminal liars, or both.
The fact of the matter is, Wall Street is dead; it's dead in
the water. Nothing can be done to save it. And the question
is,
do you want that doom to spread to the real economy; to the
real
population that's already suffering enough? Or, are you
prepared
to fight to insure that the right preemptive measures are
taken
now? Because a week from now may be too late; we don't know
how
close we are to the edge. Well-informed insiders from London
and
Wall Street thought that we were about to blow out a week and
a
half ago, had the Fed gone through the small step of simply
raising interest rates and shifting the directionality.
There's

a million and one potential small triggers out there, but the triggers are not the real issue. The real issue is that the entire system is doomed; and we've got to take the right remedial

action before the doom spreads into the real world of real people, and then it's too late.

Franklin Roosevelt had an understanding of the kinds of measures that have to be taken. On the one hand, the Glass-Steagall Act and other measures that secured depositors funds in the commercial banks; shut out the gambling debt.

But

then Franklin Roosevelt also moved on for massive credit emissions into the real economy. He did the TVA; he created a massive number of jobs through various public works programs, much of which became the kind of infrastructure-building projects, major dam projects, municipal buildings, roads; all the kinds of things that were the necessary preparations and foundations for what became the "arsenal of democracy," the enormous economic surge that occurred, when the United States was

on the verge of entering into war, against Nazi Germany and Japan. So, Roosevelt had the formula.

The situation today is far more dangerous, far more severe, than it was at the time of Roosevelt. But the principles, the American System principles, that Roosevelt understood and acted

on, are the recipe for success today. But the starting point is

to simply face the reality and act preemptively on the fact that

Wall Street's dead. Give it a decent funeral, but pay no respect

whatsoever to this quadrillions of dollars, of strictly gambling

debt that have been built up since the repeal of Glass-Steagall

in particular.

What Mr. LaRouche has emphasized, is that this process goes back—really the beginning of the decline in actual productivity

in the U.S. economy, started with the death of Franklin Roosevelt. It accelerated tremendously after the assassination of

John Kennedy, and particularly after Nixon took the world off the

Bretton Woods fixed- exchange-rate system. That was the era when

people like George H.W. Bush and his underlings began to come in

and greatly accelerated the process of take-down of the real economy.

So, we're at the point now: Wall Street's doomed; it's finished. So, let's do the right thing.

BENJAMIN DENISTON: Thanks, Jeff. Now for the second element of our show today, I'm going to shift to the dramatic and ongoing

change in the world strategic framework, specifically with the situation in and around Syria, as the major focal point for this shift.

Now, this is the subject of the institutional question which has been posed to Mr. LaRouche this week. But before posing that

question and asking Jeff to deliver Mr. LaRouche's response, I'd

like to add just a little bit of background.

Over the recent few weeks, we have been seeing the development of a very clear and decisive break with Barack Obama.

This has been coming from, really, around the entire world, coming from Russia, coming from China, coming from Europe, and as

Matthew mentioned in the opening, as well as from within institutions of the United States. And I think it's important to recall, that it was just a few months ago, in late July, that the former director of the U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency, Gen. Michael Flynn, in an interview with Al Jazeera, had said that for years President Obama has been willfully ignoring the DIA's warnings about the growing threat of radical jihadist-terrorist networks in Iraq and Syria, the forces which have subsequently become what we now call ISIS. General Flynn made it absolutely clear that this was not just negligence or a failure, but this has been the conscious policy of the Obama White House, in effect protecting and supporting the growth and the solidification of ISIS.

Now, at the same time, in this recent period, there's been an increasing recognition that this massive surge of refugees fleeing into Europe, are actually running from the effect of Obama's policies; that Obama's policies have been responsible for driving this refugee crisis.

In this context, just this past Wednesday at the United Nations Security Council, there was a meeting to discuss how to combat the growing threat of terrorism. And both the Chinese and Russian foreign ministers have made very clear, that in this fight against terrorism—what's happening in the Middle East—the sovereignty of the Syrian nation must be respected, obviously in direct contradiction and conflict with Obama's calls for regime change in Syria, and the removal of the government there.

Also this week, we saw more signs of support of this shift, also coming from Europe, with the Swiss foreign minister saying

that the Syrian government needs to be included in a broad dialogue to settle the conflict there, and the president of the

European Parliament calling for the inclusion of Russia and Iran

in an international coalition to resolve the conflict in Syria.

Perhaps most dramatic, as, again, Matthew referenced in the beginning, and as I'm sure all of you have seen, Russia has now

initiated a series of coordinated air campaigns and strategic bombings against ISIS and other terrorist elements which have been otherwise, frankly, operating under the protection of Obama's policies.

So, in this context of a whole array of moves indicating a shift in the world situation, around this pivot in Syria, the following institutional question was posed to Mr. LaRouche:

"At the special UN Security Council session on terrorism this week, China's Foreign Minister Wang Yi called for the convening of a Geneva III conference on Syria, with no preconditions, and with participation of all interested parties.

What are your thoughts on China's proposal at the UN Security Council?"

I'd like to invite Jeff to deliver Mr. LaRouche's response to this question.

STEINBERG: The short answer that Mr. LaRouche gave to the question, was two simple words: "Do it!" I'll elaborate a bit. You've had a policy, as Ben just indicated, of tolerance for the growth and expansion of the Islamic State, of the Nusra Front, of other similar jihadist-Salafist organizations; you've

got the so-called Army of Conquest, of which Nusra is now a

part—all of them operating inside Iraq and inside Syria. Despite the fact that there's a supposed coalition of 60 countries waging combat against these organizations, they seem to miraculously continue to expand their territorial holds. Despite the fact that they're under attack and under surveillance and scrutiny, they keep managing, somehow or other, to get new recruits slipping across the international borders, into Syria, into Iraq, to the point, that several months back, the CIA estimated that the Islamic State had 15,000 fighters total; and just in the last several weeks, they've revised that number up to at least 25,000, perhaps 30,000.

In other words, if you factor in the fact that some of them are being killed, through the bombings, through combat operations, — particularly the Kurds have been quite effective against ISIS—they've obviously been swelling their ranks, with very little to stand in the way.

Now, here you have a coalition. Some of the leading players in the, quote, "U.S.-led coalition," are Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Kuwait; and it's well-known, that the major entrée point for foreign fighters coming into Syria, is across the border from Turkey. There's a very lucrative black-market smuggling route, that runs between Turkey and Raqqa, which is the capital city of the ISIS area in northern Syria. The Turkish government, the ruling party, the AKP, and particularly, the immediate circles around President Erdogan, are making money hands-over-fist through these black-market dealings with the Nusra Front, with the Islamic State, and with these other Salafist terrorist networks.

So, a simple question is: What coalition against ISIS? It doesn't exist! It's been a fraud from the beginning.

So now the Russians have stepped in, and they've done it within the framework of international law. There was a formal authorization for the use of military force, that the Russian Federation Council voted up unanimously to President Putin.

So,

in other words, unlike President Obama, who never went to Congress, the Russian state structures have given authorization.

The Syrian government of Bashar Assad formally invited Russia to

participate. Russia has established an information-sharing center

that will be up and functioning within a matter of days or weeks

in Bagdad, with Syria, Iran, Iraq, and Russia participating.

So,

in other words, all the elements are being put in place for an actual serious assault against this terrorist infrastructure.

And

last night overnight, Russian bombers carried out 18 sorties against Raqqa, which is the province and the capital city of the

entire ISIS-controlled area inside northern Syria and Iraq.

So, in other words, you're seeing a serious military operation for the first time. And the Syrian armed forces have been depleted dramatically by four years, four and a half years,

of combat against a force that's been continuously beefed up, armed, supplied with new recruits, from an entire jihadist apparatus from around the world.

And the Russians know, by the way, that there are now an estimated 5,000 Chechen fighters in the ranks of the Islamic State, fighting inside Iraq and Syria. And so this poses an immediate serious, really grave security threat to Russia.

So Russia is not sitting back, is not running a phony war.

Russia is in there. They're serious, and this is a strategic game-changer.

The reason that the White House is hysterical over this is that there is this so-called coalition. The United States is protecting Saudi Arabia, and by extension, protecting the British-Saudi Arabian dirty deals that have created this jihadist

problem in the first place. Qatar, Turkey, all supposed members

of the Obama-led coalition, are all on the other side. They're all actively supporting the spreading of the Islamic State and the Nusra Front.

General David Petraeus, the so-called hero of the surge, who is now an official adviser to the Obama White House and the National Security Council, has called for the United States to openly support the Nusra Front. That's to say, openly support al-Qaeda, the same al-Qaeda that did 9/11; the same al-Qaeda that

in 2012 killed the U.S. Ambassador to Libya, and three other American diplomats. But fortunately, that noise, that policy from

the Obama White House, has been substantially suppressed.

There are other elements in the U.S. military that are prepared very much to work with the Russians. Secretary of State

John Kerry has become the point person for a different U.S. policy, a policy that he's been working out for months in coordination with the Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov, and back

during his meeting in the spring in Sochi, directly with President Putin. So Kerry in a CNN interview several days ago, made it clear: He said, there is a new policy. And the new policy

is, we are not insisting on instantaneous regime change. We're not going to go there. We're not going to do a Saddam Hussein. We're not going to do a Muammar Qaddafi. There's going to be a transition. The governing institutions are going to be

preserved.

We're going to be patient. We're not going to allow Syria to fall

into chaos, and we'll work with the Russians militarily.

So the Russians are making it clear. They're carrying out real combat operations, and they are out for blood. They're going

to wipe out the Islamic State, and increasingly, China, India, Germany, France, many of the countries in Europe that are now overwhelmed by the refugee flow from ISIS, from Nusra, they're onboard.

So you have a global strategic realignment, which means, yes, the prospects of a Geneva III political solution to the Syria crisis is now viable, and feasible. You've got China, Russia, India, Germany, France somewhat more reluctantly, all ready to go on this, and you're got Iran, Syria, and elements within the United States who have basically sidelined, but not yet eliminated the Obama presidency, who are ready to go with this.

Again, as Mr. LaRouche said very simply, "Do it!"

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Jeff. So with those two elements of the current strategic picture presented to you here,

before I conclude this webcast, I just want to go back and re-emphasize what Mr. LaRouche asked us to open this broadcast with. And I want to do so by reading a short passage from what Mr. LaRouche had to say last night on the National Activists' telephone call, the so-called Thursday night Fireside Chat. And

this is what Mr. LaRouche said about Wall Street:

"The United States economy is about to collapse, and it's a real collapse. All of Wall Street is bankrupt, and worthless. If

the United States were to try and go along, and try to do business with Wall Street, and Wall Street institutions, that would be a disaster. Because Wall Street would itself

collapse,
since it's already in a rate of collapse. If we let Wall Street

go ahead, and do its own collapsing, the result would be a disaster for most of the people of the United States on a very large scale.

"So we have to get rid of Wall Street, immediately. We have to junk it. Point out the fact that it's worthless, that it's only a complete fraud. It has no economic value whatsoever, except that of trash. And so therefore, we're going to have to get a radical change in the organization of the financial system

of the United States for two reasons: first of all, to maintain

an economy that will function for the United States population;

second of all, to protect the United States {against} the influence of Wall Street. Because if Wall Street goes on its own,

and takes the dive that it will take, automatically, under those

circumstances the people of the United States may be starving all

over the place. Because if the United States collapses, then the

U.S. economy will itself be in a disastrous condition. That is,

the financial system will collapse.

"And therefore, we have to get rid of the Wall Street system, and {we} have to collapse it in a controlled way. And then use that method of controlled action against Wall Street, in

order to make the kind of re-organization that Franklin Roosevelt

did in dealing with Wall Street in an earlier period. And that's

what has to happen."

So, with that said, I'd like to encourage everybody, if you haven't heard it yet, go back and listen to this discussion with

Mr. LaRouche last night. This is the 20th Fireside Chat. Mr. LaRouche will also be engaging in his weekly discussion with activists in New York City tomorrow, and the intervention of the

LaRouche movement on the streets of Manhattan is continuing, as

we come out of this week, and into the following.

So, I'd like to thank you for joining us here tonight, and please stay tuned to larouchepac.com.

Amerikansk senator Warren: Glass-Steagall »Er præcist det, vi burde gøre«

Senator Elizabeth Warren holdt den 28. september en tale i Edward M. Kennedy Instituttet i Boston, hvor hun svarede på et spørgsmål om at genindføre Glass-Steagall:

»Tilbage i 30'erne, da vi havde den store depression, skete der noget bemærkelsesværdigt i dette land... at, som et folk sagde vi, at vi ikke behøver at leve i en op- og nedturs-økonomi.«

»Og således gjorde vi tre ting. Vi gjorde det sikkert at sætte penge i banken. Det hedder FDIC [Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation] forsikring... Og vi satte en betjent til at holde øje. Det er SEC [Securities and Exchange Commission] for at sikre, at de ikke solgte falske aktier og sådan noget.

»Og det tredje var, at vi adskilte... lønkonti og opsparingskonti fra Wall-Streets høj-risiko, høj-profit, høj-tabs handelsverden; og det var Glass-Steagall.

”Bankerne hadede det, fordi de ville have profitten fra storhandelen. Du kan få de høje CEO lønninger og mere afkast til aktionærerne.«

»Og Wall-Street hadede det, fordi de ville have adgang til pengene på bedstemors opsparingskonto, fordi det er billige penge, og de kræver ikke samme slags afkast.«

Warren benævnte 1930’erne til 80’erne som perioden, hvor Glass-Steagall brandmuren var solid og 1980’erne til 90’erne som den periode, hvor der blev introduceret huller i den, indtil den blev slået ned. »Hvad der skete, var, at i de største finansielle institutioner blev der en større og større koncentration af penge og magt, og det var sådan vi endte op i 2008 med banker, der var for-store-til-at-lade-gå-ned, og \$700 milliarder i TARP bankredningen og bogstavelig talt billioner af dollars i bankredningspakker under bordet fra Federal Reserve.«

Mens hun hævdede, at Dodd-Frank siden da har »gjort en masse,« sagde Warren, at genindførelsen af Glass-Steagall vil gøre reguleringen af de store banker »meget lettere... Det ville nedbringe størrelsen på bankerne. Det ville gøre det finansielle system mere sikkert. Men det vil betyde, at de folk, der gerne vil handle med høj risiko, ikke kan få adgang til jeres opsparingskonti, og jeres banker vil ikke lave den slags profitter mere – hvis det er en af de store banker – som de ellers kan lave.«

»Og det er nøjagtigt, hvad vi skulle gøre. Så ja, Glass-Steagall for det 21. århundrede hele vejen. Hele vejen.«

Foto: Senator Elizabeth Warren

Tema-artikel: Begynd med Franklin Roosevelts helhedsidé.

FN for fælles, økonomisk opbygning af verden, ikke Det britiske Imperium

EIR, 22. september 2015 – Verden vil snart forsamles i Manhattan til den sidste uge i september til De Forenede Nationers Generalforsamling. Obama vil tale den 28. september, en måned før 70-års dagen for ratificeringen af FN's Charter i oktober 1945. Verden vil imidlertid ikke længere lytte til Obamas diktat, der fremsættes på vegne af hans herrer i Det britiske Imperium. I stedet vil verden samles, idet et nyt paradigme er i færd med at blive konsolideret, anført af BRIKS-udviklingen, der har et særdeles reelt potentiale for at lancere en Renæssance for hele menneskeheden, stedt over for Det britiske Imperiums smuldrende bygningsværk. Som Lyndon LaRouche for nyligt erklærede, så er den onde Bertrand Russells verdensøkonomiske system dømt til undergang.

Download (PDF, Unknown)