

closes the FlintEast plant, (which currently employs 2,800, but once employed 14,000), what remains of the city and its once-proud workforce will be decimated. Flint's population has been cut in half since the 1950s, from 200,000-plus to about 100,000 today. In the 1980s GM still employed 80,000 there. More than 20,000 manufacturing jobs have been lost in the city in the last 10 years alone.

The "no future" hollowing-out of cities and states has not been limited to the auto industry center in Michigan. The band of formerly-industrial states from western New York across the upper Midwest to Illinois and Missouri are in an accelerating demographic decline, most marked by the loss of their younger population to the Southeast and West, and to centers of the lower-skill, lower-wage "service economy."

**Table 1** shows that the healthy overall population growth which characterized these states in the post-War period through the 1960s, virtually stopped in the 1970s—when the national policy paradigm-shift actually occurred that has been killing off U.S. industrial strength—and has not revived since. That this is not simply a matter of the Baby Boom generation's own raising of a baby bust, is made clear by the fact that the loss of population growth is of 35 years duration and still intensifying.

More seriously, this demographic hollowing-out of the formerly industrial states is *specifically the loss of young people*, and that loss is accelerating now. **Table 2** shows this loss of youth over three and one-half decades—with the most rapid loss, and greatest contrast with the rest of the nation, occurring since the year 2000 and continuing now. Each five-year period since 1975 has found, on average, nearly 500,000 fewer young people, between the ages of 15 and 29, residing in these former industrial-powerhouse states, and the past half-decade has seen a much worse drop than that, of more than 800,000 youth.

The same states have shown a net outmigration (more residents leaving than new residents coming in) during the same decades, of more than 5 million. It is clear that the driving force of that outmigration is the departure of just those young people who could represent the future of physical-economic reconstruction in the region and the nation.

**HOTLINE**

LaRouche and EIR Staff  
Recorded Briefings  
—24 Hours Daily  
**918-222-7201, Box 595**

---

## Lyndon LaRouche in Germany

---

# Nuclear Power Is Crucial for Survival

*At a meeting of the LaRouche movement in Europe on Dec. 29-30, Lyndon LaRouche was asked about the revival of the German economy, and its role in the survival of Europe. Here are excerpts from his replies. See EIR, Jan. 6, 2006, for his initial presentation.*

### European Recovery Depends on Germany

*A questioner asked about recent trade union demands for higher wages, and how the LaRouche movement should intervene. LaRouche stressed the global impact of developments in the United States, and went on to discuss the situation in Germany.*

... I think, in Germany, we're in the best situation, for the reason that the potentiality for the recovery of Europe as a whole, western continental Europe as a whole, depends *absolutely* on the German economy. Without the German economy, a general economic revival of the economy of Continental Europe is impossible.

The German economy's collaboration with Russia is crucial. A Russia-Germany collaboration in economics is absolutely crucial. The future of the entire region, depends upon a division of labor, a cooperative division of labor, throughout continental Eurasia. And the road to cooperation in continental Eurasia is through Germany—now from Berlin, to Moscow, to China, to India, and similar places. That's the possibility. It's a 50-year perspective: We're talking about projects which require a 50-year lifespan of investment: in infrastructure, in developing new technologies and so forth. Of taking the waste areas of Central Asia and making them habitable. Developing new kinds of resources. Developing more efficient mass-transit systems. Eliminating dependency upon the automobile in the form of gasoline or diesel combustion; to new forms, which are now about to emerge and become actual. If the society continues, for example, we are going to have a hydrogen-based vehicle, soon—a new type, absolutely new type. It's coming. Ford is working on it, others are working on it. We have the capability of developing it.

It can not develop, however, without a return to nuclear energy! Windmills, out! Nuclear energy, in! And a development of massive nuclear energy: Which means as many as possible, mass-produced, or semi-mass-produced, pressure vessels of the Jülich type for example, are absolutely necessary to be able to generate the hydrogen for this change in technology. This change in technology must mean, therefore, hydrogen generation by nuclear means, *all throughout the*



*“The key problem in Germany,” said LaRouche “is this damned thing of the Greenies, this nuclear power question. Because without nuclear power, it’s almost impossible, to have a sustainable development of European culture—and particularly in Germany.” Shown here is the nuclear plant at Grafenrheinfeld, Germany.*

GNU Free Documentation License

*territory of Eurasia.*

Because, this means producing locally, fuel, hydrogen fuels, or hydrogen-based fuels, in every part of the continent. Because you must have fuel, in every part of the continent. Instead of hauling kerosene, petroleum products, all over the continent, at great expense—a low-grade product at high expense—you now will produce hydrogen-based fuels, in local areas, whose principal waste product is called “water.” It’s not exactly a pollutant.

So, that’s one of the kinds of things. And therefore, that means a fundamental change in the way we organize. This is a 50-year investment program. And it must be *conceived* as a 50-year investment program. It means that capital budgets, in terms of credit of states, in the order of magnitude of 25- to 50-year terms on credit, for the installation of large-scale infrastructure systems, which will probably be 50-60% of the total investment in the economy throughout Eurasia, in the coming 50 years.

So, the image is there. And these little leaks, of moves in a positive direction, are merely the stepping stones for having the real discussion. If they want to save jobs, how are they going to save jobs? One thing we’re going to have to do in Europe, as we’re doing in the United States, we’re going to have to go to hydrogen-based fuels: that means, nuclear power. That means, Don Quixote can go to work on the windmills. . . .

## **A Period of Transition**

*To a question on the priorities for the LaRouche Youth Movement, LaRouche explained how the situation in Ger-*

*many has changed, since the Sept. 18 election.*

. . . You have a situation where the German government, at present, the coalition government is highly unstable—despite all the horse manure, it’s unstable. So, under these conditions, there will be a change in government. A change is inevitable.

What happened was, that Schröder and the Red-Green coalition reached the point that it was impossible for that government to govern Germany, under a Red-Green coalition. As long as the Greenies were in, there was no solution for Germany. Hartz IV [austerity plan] was actually created by the Greenies, by implication. Because all of the things that *should* have been done, and *should* have been proposed, were not proposed, because they would require things like nuclear energy, things that the Greenies wouldn’t stand for. That would mean, for example, go back to agriculture, instead of what was done by the Greenies; stop the windmills, build real power plants.

So therefore, they had to go outside the Red-Green coalition. And if the Schröder candidacy could not win a majority, or a dominant position in the coalition, they had to accept that risk, because Germany could not survive under a Red-Green coalition.

Therefore, you’re now in a period of transition, where you’re trying to group—as we are in the United States, with this bipartisan tendency around our work—you’re trying to regroup the *anti*-Green forces, who are for rebuilding the economy in some kind of a coalition. The present Merkel coalition can’t do that. It’s only a preparatory step. Only a smashing step, from the United States, could create

the situation in Germany, in which an early change in the character of government, and the policies of government can occur.

*They've got to break free from the euro!* Without breaking free from the euro, except as a currency of account, there's no possibility that Germany will survive. If you're for the euro, you're against the existence of Germany: It's that simple.

So therefore, you need a process, a political process, which is oriented toward the reality that the world situation, in Europe in particular, is being determined in the United States, by what does, or does not happen inside the United States, with a positive development. This means, that you're in a race against time, to try to get Germany *out from under the ECB [European Central Bank]!* Because, there's no survival of Germany unless you get it out from under the ECB. The political process in Germany is controlled by the ECB! German firms are being gobbled up by these parasites, who are coming in and grabbing them up. That can be stopped by government, but you've got to have a government that can *do that!*

So therefore, you've got to *stop* the takeovers, you've got to *stop* the destruction, the looting, the parasites. It's a race against time. So therefore, the government of Germany, if Germany's going to survive, is going to change. It's going to change, not because somebody's going to go out and kill somebody, to change the government. But, because it's *necessary* to shift the composition of government, in a way that Schröder actually started.

Schröder was faced with an impossible situation: The government was ungovernable—as long as the Greens remained in. Therefore, he had to get rid of the Greens. That involved a problem. And the enemy went out, and they went to Lafontaine, and they went to the poor, old ex-Communists, as a coalition, to try to stop, and defeat, Schröder. Which they probably did, in the sense of defeating what his intention might have been, or his ambition might have been.

But the process goes on. The question still arises: *You've got to have the authority of the German government to create debt capital, long-term debt capital, to refinance the building of industry, to get people back to work, and to say "screw you" to the British and the French, "we're going to rebuild around Berlin!"* And AEG's going to stay in Berlin!

But, you have to have the political power. Therefore, we, in the United States, are concerned, for the sake of Europe as a whole, that *Germany reach the condition where it has a government, which is truly capable of governing, and governing with the effects of getting rid of the euro, and going back to becoming a real nation again, and telling the French and British they made a big mistake, and they should go and wash their underwear, instead of bothering us!*

So therefore, we in the United States *depend*, strategically, on the success of Germany in this direction, toward a Eurasian orientation. . . .

## Germans Rediscover Nuclear Power

by Rainer Apel

With the defeat of the "red-green" coalition (Social Democrats and Greens) in the Sept. 18, 2005 elections in Germany, there was hope among many that this also meant the end to an entire era of radical ecologism, which among other things had led to a foul government-industry deal in 2000, to phase out nuclear power by 2020. Many hoped that the Social Democrats, after the divorce from the Greens and their new Grand Coalition marriage with the Christian Democrats, would now begin to argue for a return to nuclear power.

One indication of this hope was a newspaper ad which appeared in numerous news dailies at the end of October, by the two labor unions Ver.di (services) and IGBCE (mining, energy), and the four leading power-producing firms E.ON, EnBW, RWE, and Vattenfall, which cautiously that to secure power supplies for the future, "no source of energy should be excluded," and stated that existing nuclear power plants should receive permits to run as long as safety standards are met, implying they could run for 40, 50, even 60 years, instead of the 30 years set as a limit by the red-green decree. The ad did not call for any new nuclear power plant to be built, but it was a remarkable step, because for the first time in years, labor unions said something positive on nuclear technology.

However, these hopes for a return of the atom were betrayed, as the Grand Coalition signed a rotten compromise agenda, which kept the red-green anti-nuclear power decree intact. The only positive aspect in the new government's energy policy was a commitment to continue, and eventually upgrade, funding of nuclear research.

### Power Outages

The broad public outcry over the power blackouts which kept 250,000 citizens of the Münsterland region in western Germany without any electricity for days, at the end of November, and announcements by Germany's power suppliers of price increases for electricity and household gas, during the first two weeks of December, provided new arguments for the pro-nuclear lobby. Breaking profile, on Dec. 22 two state governors, Christian Wulff (Lower Saxony) and Günther Öttinger (Baden-Württemberg), in interviews pointed to the rising expenses for energy and the need to secure energy supply for industry and consumers. "We will not be able to keep the timetable for the turning-off of modern nuclear power plants. . . . Because of rising energy prices, a mix of energy sources is required," Wulff said, leaving it open whether he was only