

exactly what Russia offers to all our international partners, America in the first place,” he wrote. Referring to Britain, Lavrov said that Russia can still work with it internationally, even “if our bilateral relations with this or that country reach the freezing point. Something like this is now taking place in our relations with Britain. But the U.S. is not Britain.

“Can we afford or, to be more precise, can the world afford any further alienation between our countries, for which Alexis de Tocqueville predicted a great future? Should it be two separate futures or, perhaps, one common destiny? I profoundly believe in the latter. . . .

“Americans will have to stop ‘feeling lonely in their might,’” he wrote. “I would add that everyone needs the America of Franklin D. Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy, an America which is not afraid of change.”



LaRouche colleague Jacques Cheminade on France 24 TV: “The same people that are responsible for the mess in which we are, cannot be called upon to solve it.”

Europeans Look to LaRouche Allies on New Bretton Woods

Oct. 18—As the European heads of state were agreeing this week to hold a “New Bretton Woods” conference in New York in the near future, the associates of Lyndon LaRouche in France and Denmark were officially called upon to discuss the New Bretton Woods idea long associated with LaRouche.

On Oct. 17, the France 24 television station featured LaRouche associate Jacques Cheminade, head of the Solidarity and Progress organization, in an English-language broadcast of its “Face Off” program, on the topic of “a rethink of Bretton Woods.”¹ Cheminade “faced off” with Christian de Boissieu, president of the Economic Analysis Council which advises French President Nicolas Sarkozy, and in several respects, the two agreed: The New Bretton Woods is needed, the

United States needs it, it should involve many countries, and a new quality of regulation.

Cheminade minced no words on the point of regulation of the quadrillion-dollar derivatives market. “Either you apply triage on this illegitimate and unpayable debt, or you apply triage on the people and the economy; and that’s the choice.” He elaborated on what has to be done, by stating that “dirty word, *bankruptcy reorganization*.” “You can’t revive a corpse with electroshocks,” Cheminade said. “You have to rebuild something that works . . . regulate in a true way . . . check all the derivatives markets and throw away everything having to do with mere bets. . . . Derivatives based on insurance of tangible assets would be maintained, but all the rest should be thrown away.”

One difference with de Boissieu was on the issue of who would manage this new regulation. De Boissieu stressed co-management with the International Monetary Fund, while Cheminade bluntly stated, “The same people that are responsible for the mess in which we are, cannot be called upon to solve it. And I am very doubtful, when I see Alan Greenspan as a special advisor to Gordon Brown in England. . . .” When Cheminade said he was “really furious” that Henry Paulson was calling on his former associate at Goldman Sachs “to rule over the \$700 billion of the Paulson plan,” de Boissieu stated, to his credit, that he wanted to “avoid any kind of conflict of interest.”

When the moderator pressed Cheminade about

1. The full program can be seen on www.larouchepac.com.



Danish Schiller Institute head Tom Gillesberg on TV 2 News: As American economist Lyndon LaRouche, the standard bearer for a New Bretton Woods, has said, we must take the best parts of FDR's intentions.

who then should provide the oversight, Cheminade explained that his American friend LaRouche had denounced derivatives from the beginning. “The doctor that made the good diagnosis should be the one that should be in charge of curing the patient,” Cheminade concluded. And on that note, the show ended.

Gillesberg on Danish TV

In Denmark, the 24-hour national TV news station invited Tom Gillesberg, chairman of the Danish branch of the Schiller Institute, for a live interview Oct. 13. The Schiller Institute was founded by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, and exists in many countries.

In a wide-ranging discussion, Gillesberg developed the history of the financial crisis, and the LaRouche solution, taking “the best parts of Franklin D. Roosevelt’s intentions from the old system,” and also the distinction between a physical economy and the “huge speculation orgy” of derivatives. The interviewers asked the producer to continue after the allotted time. Specifically, they wanted Gillesberg to talk more about the solutions to the crisis.

Gillesberg and the Schiller Institute are known throughout the country for advocating a new, just world economic order, including a maglev railroad development program for Denmark, and for warning of the coming financial collapse. The interviewers, senior journalists Niels Brink and Lotte Mejlhede, reminded viewers of this at the outset, saying that Gillesberg ran

for office in 2005 “precisely with a program for a new financial system. And, unfortunately, it looks as though you were correct in your predictions, that we were getting close to a crash.”

“I’m glad that we can now begin to do something about this,” Gillesberg said. He counterposed the Congressional \$700 billion aid package, which he said was like a “snowball in Hell,” to LaRouche’s New Bretton Woods. “People have to simply get together and make a new financial system. Put the current one under bankruptcy reorganization,” Gillesberg said. He stressed that the important thing was to ensure “that the physical economy still functions. That is what puts food on the table. That’s what ensures our future.”

When asked how all of these countries could be persuaded to come together politically, Gillesberg noted that “for many years, [LaRouche] has been all around the world” discussing this, and that Russia’s leaders had said that they are ready to sit down with the United States to find a common solution to the financial crisis. Other nations—India, China—would do the same, he said. “We are right now in the middle of a crisis which is potentially so dangerous, that everyone knows that we have to do extraordinary things.”

The Empire Worries

The response to this LaRouche factor from the Anglo-Dutch financial empire, came from British Prime Minister Gordon Brown putting forward his own version of a New Bretton Woods—one that would specifically *not* have fixed exchange rates, he said in a press conference on Oct. 13, and would ensure that “for generations to come London and Britain remains home to global finance.” But so far, neither Sarkozy, who is pushing for a New Bretton Woods conference, nor Italy’s Economics Minister Giulio Tremonti (who is on record supporting LaRouche’s proposals) is going with the flow of this Brownian motion.

The Italian Senate, in fact, will soon debate a New Bretton Woods resolution that explicitly includes LaRouche’s proposal, while Tremonti has continued to push against the speculators. As for Sarkozy, he’s holding the middle ground.