During recent weeks, the current president of the United States has insisted in demonstrating that the crisis is abating as a result of his efforts to confront the serious problem that the United States and the world inherited from his predecessor. Almost every economic policy refers to the economic crisis that began in October of 1929. The one has been wrapped at the end of the nineteenth century. One tendency that has become widespread among US politicians is that of believing that just as soon as the banks have enough money to grease the wheels of the production apparatus machinery, everything will march onwards to an idyllic and never dreamed of world. The differences between the so-called economic crisis of the 1930s and the world today are many, but I will focus only on one of the most important ones. From the close of World War I, the dollar, based on the gold standard, substituted the British pound sterling due to the huge quantities of gold that Great Britain had spent on the war. The great economic crisis emerged in the United States hardly 12 years after that war. Franklin D. Roosevelt, a Democrat, succeeded largely because he was aided by the crisis, just as Obama is today’s crisis. Following the Keynesian theory, Roosevelt pumped massive sums into circulation, launched public works programs, such as the building of highways, dams and other projects of undeniable benefits, which increased spending, demand for products, jobs and GNP rates for years. But he didn’t get the funds by printing more paper money; he got them through taxes and by using part of the money deposited in the banks. He sold US bonds with guaranteed interest, which made them very attractive for buyers. In 1929, the price of a troy ounce was 20 dollars and Roosevelt increased it to 35 dollars in a domestic guarantee for the US dollar bills. In July 1944, based on this physical gold guarantee, the Bretton Woods Agreement was reached, authorizing the powerful country the privilege of printing hard currency while the rest of the world was in bankruptcy. The US owned more than 80% of the world’s gold. I don’t have to remind you of what came next, from the atomic bombs dropped over Hiroshima and Nagasaki, we have just commemorated 64 years of that genocide — up to the coup that took place in Honduras and the seven military bases that the US government intends to set up in Colombia.

The fact is that in 1971, under the Nixon administration, the gold standard was suppressed and the unlimited printing of dollars became the greatest swindle of humanity. By virtue of the privilege granted by the Bretton Woods Agreement, the US unilaterally has increased its funds by selling Treasury bonds or printing paper money; instead they apply other formulas to protect their currencies and their markets, often times with great austerity for their peoples. The overwhelming majority of developing countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America is the one that pays the consequences, by supplying raw materials to the US and the rest of the world and the sweet and lives of their peoples.

NAFTA is the clearest example of what could happen to a developing country that falls into the jaws of the wolf: at the last Summit, Mexico could neither find a solution for its immigrants in the US nor get a visa waiver from Canada.

However, in the midst of the present crisis, the greatest FTA in the world acquires full validity: The World Trade Organization, which was founded to the tune of neoliberalism, at a time when the world finances and idiomatic dreams were in full swing. On the other hand, yesterday, August 11, BBC World reported that a thousand UN officials meeting in Bonn, Germany, declared that they were searching for a path to reach an agreement on climate change by December this year, but that time was running out. Jo de Boer, the top-ranking UN climate change official, said that there were only 119 days until the Summit and that they had an enormous number of diverging interests, little time for discussion, a complex document on the table (two hundred pages long) and funding problems. He further added that developing nations in the face of the greenhouse gases came from the industrialized world.

The development world has stated the necessity for financial aid in order to cope with climate change. UN Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon expressed that if urgent measures are not taken to combat climate change, this could lead to mass violence and upheavals throughout the planet. That climate change will intensify droughts, flooding and other natural disasters; that the water shortages will affect hundreds of millions of people and malnutrition will devastate a great number of developing countries. It is an article published by The New York Times on August 9 last, it was explained that: “Analyzes see climate change as a threat to national security.” “Such climate-induced crises — the articles go on — could topple governments, feed terrorist movements, and exacerbate the food shortages in regions, say the analysts and experts at the Pentagon and intelligence agencies.” For the first time, we are taking a serious look at the national security implications of climate change.” “It gets really complicated quickly,” said Amanda J. Dory, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Strategy, who is working with a Pentagon group assigned to incorporate climate change into national security strategy planning.” From The New York Times article, we can deduce that in the Senate not everyone is convinced that this is a real problem, totally ignored until now by the US government ever since it was approved in Kyoto ten years ago.

There are some who say that the economic crisis makes the end of imperialism; maybe we should wonder whether or not this is something we should care about. In my opinion, the best thing will always be to have a just cause to defend and the hope to continue moving forward.