

01-10. Sep '17

Nordic Anthology #09

Ya-mae / 야매

Bobrikova & de Carmen

NORDIC ANTHOLOGY

is an exhibition program by open call dedicated to recently graduated artists with a Nordic connection, presented at Fotogalleriet's newly established project space. With a two-weeks span per exhibition, **NORDIC ANTHOLOGY** aims to create a vibrant temporality within the larger anniversary program, allowing the natural differences between the formats to confront multiple curatorial researches and approaches raised by image-based art.

NORDIC ANTHOLOGY's name derives from the latin etymology of anthology – florilegium, a gathering of flowers – expanding on its notion of assembled high or exemplary excerpts from an existing pattern collection, and in a broader sense on its thematic compilation as the one of a publisher, a didactic writer, a prose and muse almanac – or of a curator.

Bobrikova & De Carmen's installation name 야매 / Ya-mae derives from the Korean language. The term is commonly used to describe the result of performing a work with a poor finish, for example with technical installations or reparation work. Commonly used, the term describes performing a work with a poor finish, for example in repairs and technical installations. Different kinds of 'ya-mae' are presented at Fotogalleriet's Nordic Anthology project space, showing artistic work that allows for diverse perceptions – proposing what can be identified as a wrongly executed work, as a disaster, a patch or a retouch. The concept and meaning of 'ya-mae' takes shape in the project by metaphorically relating it to politicians' superficial and poor methods of "fixing" our socio-political environment, including fluctuations in the market economies. 야매 / Ya-mae proposes to visualize the cracks, errors and failures resulting from poor policy making, here

particularly from within the European Union, USA and the Asia Pacific region that contributed the global economy's loss of stability.

야매 / Ya-mae is composed of five individual works, each one relating to specific historical events as they were made public by the media: 1. The threat of Brexit, with the work entitled "UK 10.10.2015 Chatham House, London", 2. The dismissal of the President of the Republic of South Korea, Park Geun Hye, with the with the work entitled "South Korea 12.04.2012 News Cheonji, Seoul", 3. The election of Donald Trump as US president, with the work entitled "USA 13.10.2016 West Palm Beach, Florida", 4. The resignation of Matteo Renzi in 2016 as prime minister of Italy, with the work entitled "Italy 12.03.2014 Ta1 News, Rome", 5. The devaluation of the Yuan, with the work entitled "China 04.03.2014 CCTV America, Washington DC / Chicago".

Each work is a juxtaposition of sound and image, which Bobrikova & De Carmen call a "sound-photograph": the image is a documentation of a poorly executed action within the exhibition space; the sound is a concrete recording from a historical act that had an influence on macro economy and global policy-making. Visitors are invited to draw similarities between the physical cracks and faults as presented in the photographs and the different political realities at play. Bobrikova & De Carmen's aesthetic approach to images relates to the seminal work Vegger (Walls) presented by Dag Alveng in 1979 at Fotogalleriet. Here Alveng exhibited photographs of the gallery's walls, thus working with the relationship between image and referent in the same space. In *야매* / Ya-mae the image is a mere copy of reality but at the same time proposes multiple realities. In 1979, Vegger was criticized for its minimalism, simplicity

and tediousness: many critics did not accept seeing the walls as an aesthetic object, and did not appreciate the artistic experience of the work. *야매* / Ya-mae's conceptual approach is common within the art world today, and is far from the fragile beginnings of conceptual photograph. *야매* / Ya-mae builds a framework outside the gallery space and aims to expand beyond its site-specificity, thus creating a referent beyond the gallery's walls.



(detail) South Korea 12.04.2012 News Cheonji, Seoul



(detail) Italy 12.03.2014 Ta1 News, Rome



overview of the installation



(detail) China 04.03.2014 CCTV America, Washington DC/Chicago



(detail) China 04.03.2014 CCTV America, Washington DC/Chicago

7



(detail) USA 13.10.2016 West Palm Beach, Florida



8



(detail) UK 10.10.2015 Chatham House, London

Martinka Bobrikova & Oscar de Carmen

have been working together as an artistic duo since 2005.

Central to their artistic practices are the notions of an open interaction within the art world beyond the confines of what is often considered acceptable artistic institutions. They view their artwork as embedded within lived experience, as a single space of coexistence and confluence.

They believe that this open dialogue between art and life is a productive context to emphasize the current interchange and flux in social life and to promote social transformation. Through this methodology, the artists critically investigate our roots and social habits, questioning the mechanisms and contexts which create these powerful current systems of values.

They have participated in several residencies such as Seoul Art Space_Geumcheon, HomeBase Saitama, KulturKontakt Austria, Nida art Colony or MeetFactory.

Their works have been presented in venues and projects such as the Agrikultura Triennial, Seoul Art Space Geumcheon (2017); the Saitama Triennial, Nitra Gallery, Akershus Kunstnersenter, Tranzit.sk (2016); the 2nd Tbilisi Triennial, Prague Quadrennial, Babel Art Space, Entrance Gallery (2015); Centre Contemporary Art in Singapore, Høstutstillingen, Kunstnerneshus, ANX/ Atelier Nord, Skånes Konstforening, City Gallery Bratislava (2014); Karlin Studio, Rake (2013); Museum of Contemporary Art Roskilde, KURANT, (2012); Singuhr (2011); Center of Contemporary Art – Tbilisi, Röda Sten, City Museum of Gothenburg, Space Gallery (2010).

We warmly thank and acknowledge all of our contributors, collaborators, and the institutions that helped make the installation of this project possible.

A special thanks is also owed to: SaeJin Choi, Bård E. Dahl, Soňa Džurošková Fabiánková, Silja Leifsdóttir, Ao Li, Mary-Claire Pappas, Martina Petrelli, Branislav Pružinec, Haemin Ryu, Ran Shao, Stephanie von Spreter, Jens Magnus Trevisan and Wang Chun-Chi.

Authors & Editors: Martinka Bobrikova & Oscar de Carmen

Design: Soňa Džurošková Fabiánková

Photo: Istvan Virag

Edition of 300 copies

www.bobrikovadecarmen.org

Oslo, 2017

UK 10.10.2015 Chatham House, London

Almost 3 years ago, I made a speech about Europe. I argued that the European Union needed to reform if it was to meet the challenges of the twenty-first century. I argued that Britain's best future lay within a reformed European Union, if the necessary changes could be agreed.

And I promised the British people that, if I was re-elected as prime minister, we would have an in-out referendum and the final say on whether our national and economic security is better protected by remaining in the European Union, or by leaving.

That promise is now being honoured. The law of the land will require that there must be a referendum on our EU membership by the end of 2017. The renegotiation is now entering its formal phase, following several rounds of technical discussions. Today I am writing to the president of the European Council setting out how I want to address the concerns of the British people and why I believe that the changes that Britain is seeking will benefit not just Britain, but the EU as a whole.

That will of course be for the negotiation itself to conclude the precise legal changes needed to bring about the reforms Britain needs. But today I want to explain in more detail why we want to make the changes we have set

out — and how they will make a difference. This is perhaps the most important decision the British people will have to take at the ballot box in our lifetimes.

So I want to set out for the British people why this referendum matters, and some of the issues we should weigh up very carefully as the arguments ebb and flow as we approach the referendum. And I want to explain to our European partners why we are holding this referendum what we are asking for and why.

Since I made that speech almost 3 years ago, the challenges facing the European Union have not diminished — indeed they have grown. The economic outlook may be somewhat brighter. But the legacy of the eurozone crisis endures. The threats to our security — and to the security of every European nation — have grown enormously in the last few years from the Russian invasion of eastern Ukraine, to the emergence of ISIL, and the migration flows triggered by the war in Syria. And across Europe, the rise of parties of protest demands a response. But nothing that has happened — nothing — has undermined or rendered obsolete the central argument I set out in my speech at Bloomberg. If anything it has reinforced it. The European Union needs to change. It needs to become more competitive to cope with the rise of economies like China and India. It needs to put relations between the countries inside the euro and those outside

it — like Britain — onto a stable, long-term basis. It needs greater democratic accountability to national parliaments. Above all, it needs, as I said at Bloomberg, to operate with the flexibility of a network, not the rigidity of a bloc.

Never forget that the European Union now comprises 28 ancient nations of Europe. That very diversity is Europe's greatest strength. Britain says let's celebrate that fact. Let's acknowledge that the answer to every problem is not always more Europe. Sometimes it is less Europe.

Let's accept that one size does not fit all. That flexibility is what I believe is best for Britain; and, as it happens, best for Europe too. Doing what is best for Britain drives everything I do as prime minister. That means taking the difficult decisions, and sometimes making arguments that people don't much want to hear. It is why we have taken the difficult, but necessary action to reduce the deficit. It is why we are seeing through our long-term economic plan. It is why we are reforming welfare and education. Because we know that the bedrock of our security is a strong economy — and that these are the things any nation must do to succeed in the twenty-first century. It is also why, despite all the pressures on public finances, we have guaranteed to spend 2 percent of our economy on defence and why we are spending 0.7 percent of our gross national income on overseas aid. With that money we are able to equip our armed forces

with 2 brand new aircraft carriers double our fleet of drones, buy new fighter aircraft and new submarines and invest in our special forces.

We are doing all of these things to protect our economic and national interest. And that is the prism through which I approach our membership of the European Union. Taking the tough decisions, making the difficult arguments, addressing the issues no one wants to talk about and protecting and advancing our economic and national security.

Like most British people, I come to this question with a frame of mind that is practical, not emotional. Head, not heart. I know some of our European partners may find that disappointing about Britain. But that is who we are. That is how we have always been as a nation. We are rigorously practical. We are obstinately down to earth. We are natural debunkers. We see the European Union as a means to an end, not an end in itself. 'Europe where necessary, national where possible', as our Dutch friends put it. An instrument to amplify our nation's power and prosperity — like NATO, like our membership of the UN Security Council or the IMF. We understand that there is a close relationship between the security and prosperity of the continent to which our island is tied geographically and our own security and prosperity.

In the week when we commemorate the end of the Great War and in the year when we have marked the seventieth anniversary

of the liberation of Europe, how could we not? Britain has contributed in full measure to the freedom that Europe's nations enjoy today. Across the continent, from Ypres to Monte Cassino, from Bayeux to Arnhem, in stone cold cemeteries lie the remains of British servicemen who crossed the Channel to help subjugated nations throw off the tyrant's yoke and return liberty to her rightful place on what Churchill called 'this noble continent'.

And today, we continue to play our full role in European security and in global security. Fighting Ebola in West Africa. Flying policing missions over the Baltic nations. Contributing to NATO operations in central and eastern Europe. Saving lives and busting the people smuggling rings in the central Mediterranean. Spending £1.1 billion on aid to the region of Syria, Lebanon and Jordan — more than any other European nation. Britain has always been an engaged nation, because we know that engagement is the best way to protect and advance our economic and our national security.

So today, as we confront fresh threats and dangers to our country I am in no doubt that for Britain the European question is not just a matter of economic security, but of national security too, not just a matter of jobs and trade, but of the safety and security of our nation.

Equally, when the European Union accounts for almost half of our trade it matters for our economic security that the European Union is competitive and succeeds

in promoting prosperity for its members. Just as it matters to us that — while we are not part of the Euro — and, in my view never will be — the eurozone is able to deal with its problems and succeed.

If it fails to do so, we will certainly not be immune from the side effects. That is why, almost 3 years ago, I set out the case for reform — reform that would benefit Britain, and in my view benefit the entire EU. I was clear that Britain gains advantages from her membership of the EU. But I was also clear that there are some major problems which need to be addressed.

Political leadership means confronting these problems, not wishing them away. If we ignore them, history teaches us that they will only get worse. Let me explain what I mean.

In my Bloomberg speech almost 3 years ago, I said that the European Union faced 3 major challenges. First, the problems in the eurozone: they need to be fixed — and that will require fundamental changes. Second, a crisis of European competitiveness, as other nations across the world soar ahead and Europe risks being left behind. And third, a gap between the EU and its citizens which has grown dramatically in recent years and which represents a lack of democratic accountability and consent that is felt particularly acutely in Britain. These 3 challenges are as critical now as they were when I first set them out. And today I would add a fourth. As we have seen so

spectacularly across Europe with the questions posed by the migration crisis countries need greater controls to manage the pressures of people coming in. And while in Britain we are not part of the Schengen open borders agreement and so we have been able to set our own approach by taking refugees direct from the camps we do need some additional measures to address wider abuses of the right to free movement within Europe and to reduce the very high flow of people coming to Britain from all across Europe.

So the changes we are arguing for are substantial. But they have a very clear purpose: to address these 4 key challenges which are vital to the success of the European Union and to maintain and advance the UK's economic and national security within it.

Let me explain each. First, it is in all our interests for the eurozone to have the right governance and structures to secure a successful currency for the long-term. Britain understands that, and we will not stand in the way of those developments, as long as we can be sure that there are mechanisms in place to ensure that our own interests are fully protected.

Let me explain what I mean. Today there are 2 sorts of members of the European Union. There are euro members and there are non-euro members. The changes which the eurozone will need to implement will have profound implications for both types of members.

So non-euro members like

Britain which are outside the eurozone need certain safeguards in order to protect the single market and our ability to decide its rules and to ensure that we face neither discrimination nor additional costs from the integration of the eurozone. Because the European Union and the eurozone are not the same thing. And those of us who are in the EU but outside the eurozone need that accepted.

We need a British model of membership that works for Britain and for any other non-euro members. And this should be perfectly possible. The European Union is a family of democratic nations whose original foundation was — and remains — a common market. There is no reason why the single currency and the single market should share the same boundary, any more than the single market and Schengen.

So the EU needs flexibility to accommodate both those inside and outside the eurozone both those who are contemplating much closer economic and political integration and those countries like Britain which will never embrace that goal. This is a matter of cardinal importance for the United Kingdom. Because if the European Union were to evolve into a single currency club, where those outside the single currency are pushed aside and over-ruled, then it would no longer be a club for us. We need this issue fixed — so that the UK is not obliged to fight a series of running battles which would only corrode trust among member states. And we

have to make sure that there is a point to being in the EU but not in the eurozone, and that that position does not turn a country into a rule-taker instead of a rule-maker. Now is the time to do that.

So as part of our renegotiation I am asking European leaders to agree clear and binding principles that protect Britain and other non-Euro countries and a safeguard mechanism to ensure these principles are respected and enforced.

These principles should include the following. Recognition that the EU is a Union with more than one currency. There should be no discrimination and no disadvantage for any business on the basis of the currency of their country. The integrity of the single market must be protected. As the eurozone moves ahead, any changes it decides to make — like the creation of a banking union — must be voluntary for non-euro countries, never compulsory. Taxpayers in non-euro countries should never bear the cost for operations to support the euro as a currency. Just as financial stability and supervision has become a key area of competence for eurozone institutions like the ECB so financial stability and supervision is a key area of competence for national institutions like the Bank of England for non-Euro members. And any issues that affect all member states must be discussed and decided by all member states.

Second, we want a European Union that adds to our competitiveness, not detracts from it. We

have already made progress since my speech at Bloomberg. Legislative proposals under the new commission have fallen by 80 percent with more regulations set to be repealed this year than in the whole of the previous commission. We have proposals for a capital markets union which will help get finance into the hands of entrepreneurs and growing businesses. The new plans to deepen the single market in services and digital will mean new opportunities for millions of British businesses to operate more easily anywhere in Europe. Changes we secured just last month will mean that British tourists will no longer incur roaming charges when they use mobile phones or have to pay extortionate credit card fees. And just last month the European Commission published a new trade strategy that reflects the agenda that Britain has been championing for years including pursuing massive trade deals with America, China, Japan and ASEAN.

We know the benefits free trade can bring. Recent deals including one with Korea are already saving UK consumers £5 billion every year and have helped UK car exports to Korea to increase five-fold. But there is much more we can do.

For all we have achieved in stemming the flow of new regulations the burden from existing regulation is still too high. Two years ago we secured the first ever real terms cut in the EU budget. It's now time to do the same with

EU regulation. So we need a target to cut the total burden on business and at the same time, we need to bring together all the different proposals, promises and agreements on the single market, on trade, and on cutting regulation into one clear commitment that writes competitiveness into the DNA of the whole European Union.

Third, we need to deal with the disillusionment that many of Europe's citizens feel towards the European Union as an institution. These concerns are not just in Britain. But they are perhaps greater here than anywhere else in the European Union today. We have already passed a law to guarantee that no powers can transfer from Britain to Brussels ever again without the explicit consent of the British people in a referendum. But if Britain is to remain in the EU, we need to do more. And really it boils down to this. We are a proud, independent nation. We intend to stay that way. So we need to be honest about this. The commitment in the treaty to an ever closer union is not a commitment that should apply any longer to Britain. We do not believe in it. We do not subscribe to it. We have a different vision for Europe.

We believe in a flexible union of free member states who share treaties and institutions, working together in a spirit of co-operation to advance our shared prosperity and to protect our people from threats to our security whether they come from at home or abroad. And

continuing, in time and only with unanimous agreement, to welcome new countries into the EU.

This vision of flexibility and co-operation is not the same as those who want to build an ever closer political union — but it is just as valid. And if we can't persuade our European partners to share this vision for all we certainly need to find a way to allow this vision to shape Britain's membership.

So I can tell you today, that as part of our renegotiation I am asking European leaders for a clear, legally binding and irreversible agreement to end Britain's obligation to work towards an ever closer union. That will mean that Britain can never be entangled in a political union against our will or be drawn into any kind of United States of Europe.

We also need to ensure that — while the European Parliament plays an important role there is a more significant role for national parliaments, including our own Parliament right here at Westminster. It is national parliaments, which are, and will remain, the main source of real democratic legitimacy and accountability in the EU. It is to the British Parliament that I must account on the EU budget negotiations, or on the safeguarding of our place in the single market. Those are the parliaments which instil respect — even fear — into national leaders. So it is time to give these national parliaments a greater say over EU law-making.

We are not suggesting a veto

for every single national parliament. We acknowledge that in a European Union of 28, that would mean gridlock. But we want to see a new arrangement where groups of national parliaments can come together and reject European laws which are not in their national interest.

We also need to address the issue of subsidiarity — the question of what is best decided in Brussels and what is best dealt with in European capitals. We believe that if powers don't need to reside in Brussels, they should be returned to Westminster. So we want to see the EU's commitments to subsidiarity fully implemented, with clear proposals to achieve that.

In addition, the UK will need confirmation that the EU institutions will fully respect the purpose behind the justice and home affairs protocols in any future proposals dealing with justice and home affairs matters in particular to preserve the UK's ability to choose to participate.

In addition national security is — and must remain — the sole responsibility of member states while recognising the benefits of working together on issues that affect the security of us all.

Finally, in this area, people are also frustrated by some legal judgments made in Europe that impact on life in Britain. Of course, this relates as much to the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) as the European Union. Which is why we need to act on both fronts. So we will reform

our relationship with the ECHR by scrapping Labour's Human Rights Act and introducing a new British Bill of Rights.

We will — of course — consult on how to make this big constitutional change. The consultation we will publish will set out our plan to remain consistent with the founding principles of the convention, whilst restoring the proper role of UK courts and our Parliament. And as we reform the relationship between our courts and Strasbourg, it is right that we also consider the role of the European Court of Justice (ECJ) and the Charter of Fundamental Rights. So — as was agreed at the time of the Lisbon Treaty — we will enshrine in our domestic law that the EU Charter of Fundamental rights does not create any new rights. We will make it explicit to our courts that they cannot use the EU Charter as the basis for any new legal challenge citing spurious new human rights grounds. We will also examine whether we can go one step further. We need to examine the way that Germany and other EU nations uphold their constitution and sovereignty. For example, the Constitutional Court in Germany retains the right to review whether essential constitutional freedoms are respected when powers are transferred to Europe. And it also reserves the right to review legal acts by European institutions and courts to check that they remain within the scope of the EU's powers, or whether they have overstepped the mark. We will consider how this

could be done in the UK.

Fourth, we believe in an open economy. But we've got to be able to cope with all the pressures that free movement can bring — on our schools, our hospitals and our public services. Right now the pressures are too great. I appreciate that at a time when other European countries are facing huge pressure from migration from outside the EU, this may be hard for some other EU countries to understand. But in a way these pressures are an example of exactly the point the UK has been making in recent years.

For us, it is not a question of race or background or ethnicity — Britain is one of the most open and cosmopolitan countries on the face of the earth. People from all over the world can find a community of their own right here in Britain.

The issue is one of scale and speed, and the pressures on communities that brings, at a time when public finances are already under severe strain as a consequence of the financial crisis. This was a matter of enormous concern in our recent general election campaign and it remains so today.

Unlike some other member states, Britain's population is already expanding. Our population is set to reach over 70 million in the next decades and we are forecast to become the most populous country in the EU by 2050. At the same time, our net migration is running at over 300,000 a year. That is not sustainable.

We have taken lots of steps to

control immigration from outside the EU. But we need to be able to exert greater control on arrivals from inside the EU too. The principle of the free movement of labour is a basic treaty right and it is a key part of the single market. Over a million Brits benefit from their right to live and work anywhere in the EU. We do not want to destroy that principle, which indeed many Brits take for granted. But freedom of movement has never been an unqualified right, and we now need to allow it to operate on a more sustainable basis in the light of the experience of recent years. Britain has always been an open, trading nation, and we do not want to change that. But we do want to find arrangements to allow a member state like the UK to restore a sense of fairness to our immigration system and to reduce the current very high level of migration from within the EU into the UK. That means first of all correcting the mistakes of the past by ensuring that when new countries are admitted to the EU in the future free movement will not apply to those new members until their economies have converged much more closely with existing member states.

Next, we need to create the toughest possible system for dealing with abuse of free movement. That includes tougher and longer re-entry bans for fraudsters and people who collude in sham marriages. It means addressing the fact that it is easier for an EU citizen to bring a non-EU spouse to Britain than

it is for a British citizen to do the same. It means stronger powers to deport criminals and stop them coming back, as well as preventing entry in the first place. And it means addressing ECJ judgments that have widened the scope of free movement in a way that has made it more difficult to tackle this kind of abuse.

But ultimately, if we are going to reduce the numbers coming here we need action that gives greater control of migration from the EU. As I have said previously, we can do this by reducing the draw that our welfare system can exert across Europe. To those who say that this won't make a difference. I say look at the figures. We now know that, at any one time, around 40 percent of all recent European Economic Area migrants are supported by the UK benefits system with each family claiming on average around £6,000 a year of in work benefits alone and over 10,000 recently-arrived families claiming over £10,000 a year.

We need to restore a sense of fairness, and reduce this pull factor subsidised by the taxpayer. So I promised 4 actions at the election. Two have already been achieved. EU migrants will not be able to claim Universal Credit while looking for work. And if those coming from the EU haven't found work within 6 months, they can be required to leave. But we need to go further to reduce the numbers coming here. So we have proposed that people coming to Britain from the EU must

live here and contribute for 4 years before they qualify for in work benefits or social housing. And that we should end the practice of sending child benefit overseas.

Now, I understand how difficult some of these welfare issues are for other member states. And I am open to different ways of dealing with this issue. But we do need to secure arrangements that deliver on the objective set out in the Conservative Party manifesto to control migration from the European Union.

So these are the 4 objectives at the heart of our renegotiation.

Objective 1: protect the single market for Britain and others outside the eurozone. What I mean by that is a set of binding principles that guarantee fairness between euro and non-euro countries.

Objective 2: write competitiveness into the DNA of the whole European Union. And this includes cutting the total burden on business.

Objective 3: exempt Britain from an 'ever closer union' and bolster national parliaments. Not through warm words but through legally binding and irreversible changes.

And objective 4: tackle abuses of the right to free movement, and enable us to control migration from the European Union, in line with our manifesto. The precise form all these changes will take will be a matter for the renegotiation. But I want to be very clear: if we are able to reach agreement, it must be on a basis that is legally-binding

and irreversible and where necessary has force in the treaties.

Now there will be some in Britain who say that what we are asking for is far too little. And there will be some in European capitals who say that what we are asking for is far too much. I say that what I am asking for is what is needed to fix the problems in Britain's relationship with the European Union. And that these measures, if adopted, will benefit the European Union as whole.

I have been prime minister for five and a half years. I have sat in 39 European Council meetings with my fellow European leaders. I have seen this relationship operating at close quarters; I see how much Britain can gain from its membership of the EU. And I have seen where the problems lie.

I have thought very carefully about what is needed to fix those problems, and I have come up with a carefully-designed package to do so. It is not outlandish or absurd. It is right, and it is reasonable. But I must be very, very clear. I don't want this reasonable approach to be misunderstood.

Reasonable does not mean lacking in resolve. I understand, of course that every negotiation must involve just that — negotiation. But Britain is the second biggest economy in the EU. We are the second biggest contributor to the EU budget. Along with France, we are its foremost military power. We gain from the union, but we bring a lot to it. We believe very strongly

that if a major member state has major concerns — concerns which it has been voicing in a measured and constructive fashion over a number of years — then it is entitled to expect those concerns to be addressed.

At the heart of this negotiation is actually a very simple question: is the European Union flexible enough to accommodate the concerns of its very different member states? The answer to that question must be yes, if the EU is to survive and prosper in the future — not just for Britain today, but for other member states, large and small, north and south, or the east or the west. The European Union has reached a decisive moment.

Now is the moment to ensure that membership of the European Union works for euro and non-euro members alike. I think most people would find that an eminently reasonable proposition. Already there have been productive rounds of talks with every European leader with the presidents of the European Council and parliament and of course with the president of the European Commission who has made this issue a priority and pledged his support for a fair deal for Britain. So I have every confidence that we will achieve an agreement that works for Britain and works for our European partners. And if and when we do so, as I said 3 years ago, I will campaign to keep Britain inside a reformed European Union, I'll campaign for it with all my heart and all my soul, because that will be unambiguously in our national

interest.

But if we can't reach such an agreement, and if Britain's concerns were to be met with a deaf ear, which I do not believe will happen then we will have to think again about whether this European Union is right for us. As I have said before — I rule nothing out.

And to the British people I say this. We have a long history of engaging with the best parts of what membership of the European Union has to offer the parts that work for Britain, and our own history and traditions. Already, we have ensured that as British people, we can travel freely around Europe, but at the same time we have maintained our own border controls. We have kept our own currency while having complete access to the single market. We cut the EU budget for the first time ever, while protecting the British rebate. We successfully took Britain out of the eurozone bailout mechanism — the first ever return of powers from Brussels to Westminster. Through our opt-out from justice and home affairs matters, we have achieved the largest repatriation of powers to Britain since we joined the EU. And when we have had to, we have used our veto — as I did to block a treaty that wasn't in Britain's national interest. In other words, we have shown before that it is possible for Britain to find a way that works for us.

And I believe that we can do so again and that through this renegotiation we can have the best of both

worlds. We do not need to choose between being a marginalised voice within Europe or an isolated voice outside it.

Let me explain what I mean. Those who believe we should stay in the EU at all costs need to explain why Britain should accept the status quo. I am clear that there are real problems for Britain with the status quo. There are some economic risks, if we allow a situation where eurozone countries could potentially spend our money or where European regulations hold back our ability to trade and create jobs. And there are also significant risks if we allow our sovereignty to be eroded by ever closer union or sit by and do nothing about the unsustainable rate of migration into our country. But just as those who are advocating staying in the EU at all costs have to answer serious questions so those who think Britain should just leave now also need to think hard about the implications of their arguments — and the possible risks of the course they advocate. What would being outside the European Union mean for our economic security? And what would it mean for our national security?

Let me briefly take these questions in turn.

First, our economic security. Those who believe we should leave the EU, mostly argue that we would still seek a relationship with the single market and that we would still build trade deals with the rest of the world.

So the question is how exactly

would this work? On the single market, some have suggested that we could be like Switzerland or Norway. These countries are great friends of ours — but they are also very different from us. Switzerland has had to negotiate access to the single market sector by sector. Norway is part of the single market but has no say in setting its rules: it just has to implement its directives. 10,000 rules and regulations in the last 20 years, 5 for every day the Norwegian Parliament has been sitting. So the irony is that if we followed the model of Norway, Europe's political interference in our country could actually grow, rather than shrink. Because here's the rub. The single market has rules. We will not always get what we want from those rules. But we have more influence over them from inside the EU, where those rules are actually made.

And on trade, those who advocate Britain leaving need to explain how the league of 1 will compare with the league of 28. Negotiating as part of an economy with 500 million people gives us more power as a country, not less. Our membership of the European Union gives us free trade agreements with more than 50 countries around the world. Trying to recreate all of these deals from scratch on our own would not be a quick or easy process. So we should be clear that leaving the EU is not some automatic fast track to a land of milk and honey.

Just as there are difficult questions for our future prosper-

ity outside the EU so there are also important questions for our future security too. In 2015, our membership of the European Union is not just a matter of trade and commerce, of pounds and pence. It is about our national security as well as our economic security. The world is undoubtedly a more dangerous place than when I made my speech at Bloomberg 3 years ago. Then, ISIL didn't exist. Now it controls substantial territory in Iraq and Syria and directly threatens our country. Then, Ukraine was at peace. Now it is in crisis, after Russia invaded Crimea and Eastern Ukraine. And of course the war in Syria has unleashed a wave of migration towards Europe which we see night after night on our television screens. Britain has never joined the Schengen border-free zone, so we retain our border controls. This, and our geographical status as an island, means we are less directly affected than other European countries by this crisis.

Our agreement with France, as a fellow EU member, means that our main border control with continental Europe effectively operates now at Calais, not Dover. And our decision to admit 20,000 Syrian refugees from the camps was a British national sovereign decision. But our membership of the EU does matter for our national security and for the security of our allies which is one reason why our friends in the world strongly urge us to remain in the EU. It is not just a question of strength in numbers,

important though that is. The EU, like NATO and our membership of the UN Security Council, is a tool that a British prime minister uses to get things done in the world, and protect our country.

When Russia invaded Ukraine, and European leaders met, it was Britain that pushed through sanctions to penalise Russia and ensure a robust response. On Iran, it was Britain that helped impose the tough sanctions which got Iran to the negotiating table. These things were done through the EU.

The point I am making is this — if the British prime minister was no longer present at European summits, we would lose that voice and therefore permanently change our ability to get things done in the world. We have every right to do that as a sovereign nation. But we should do so with our eyes open.

I am not saying for one moment that Britain couldn't survive outside the European Union. Of course we could. We are a great country. The fifth largest economy in the world. The fastest growing economy in the G7 last year. The biggest destination for foreign direct investment in the EU. Our capital city a global icon. The world, literally, speaks our language. Last month the president of China spent a week in this country. This week the prime minister of India will visit. They see a great future for this country that we all love. No one doubts that Britain is a proud, successful thriving country. A nation that has turned round its fortunes through its own

efforts. A far cry from the 'sick man of Europe' at the time we entered the European Economic Community 4 decades ago.

Whether we could be successful outside the European Union — that's not the question. The question is whether we would be more successful in than out? Whether being in the European Union adds to our economic security or detracts from it? Whether being in the European Union makes us safer or less safe? That is a matter of judgment. And ultimately it will be the judgment of the British people in the referendum that I promised and that I will deliver. You will have to judge what is best for you and your family, for your children and grandchildren, for our country, for our future. It will be your decision whether to remain in the EU on the basis of the reforms we secure, or whether we leave. Your decision. Nobody else's. Not politicians'. Not parliament's. Not lobby groups'. Not mine. Just you. You, the British people, will decide. At that moment, you will hold this country's destiny in your hands.

This is a huge decision for our country, perhaps the biggest we will make in our lifetimes. And it will be the final decision. So to those who suggest that a decision in the referendum to leave would merely produce another stronger renegotiation and then a second referendum in which Britain would stay I say think again. The renegotiation is happening right now. And the referendum that follows will be a once in a generation choice. An in-

or out referendum. When the British people speak, their voice will be respected — not ignored. If we vote to leave, then we will leave. There will not be another renegotiation and another referendum. So I say to my European counterparts with whom I am negotiating. This is our only chance to get this right — for Britain and for the whole European Union. I say to those who are thinking about voting to leave. Think very carefully, because this choice cannot be undone.

And to those who are campaigning to leave but actually hoping for a second referendum — I say decide what you believe in. If you think we should leave — and leave means leave — then campaign for that and vote for it. But if you are actually arguing for a better relationship between Britain and the European Union, then don't campaign to get out. Work with me to get that better deal for Britain.

And so? I have set out today the changes I want to see, and which Britain needs to see. There will be those who say — here and elsewhere in the EU — that we are embarked on 'mission impossible'. I say: why? I do not deny that seeking changes which require the agreement of 27 other democracies, all with their own concerns, is a big task. But an impossible one? I do not believe so for a minute. When you look at the challenges facing European leaders today, the changes that Britain is seeking do not fall in the box marked 'impossible'. They are eminently resolvable, with the

requisite political will and political imagination. The European Union has a record of solving intractable problems. It can solve this one too. Let us therefore resolve to do so. Because the prize is a big one. A new kind of European Union.

A European Union which could lead the world in competitiveness, be a magnet for start-ups, a beacon of jobs and growth. A European Union in which those countries inside and outside the euro could both have their interests fully protected. A European Union, which could recognize the different visions of its members, and celebrate their diversity as a source of strength. A European Union in which those who wished to proceed towards a political union could continue to do so but where it would have been clearly accepted that Britain would not take part in such an endeavour. A European Union in which the United Kingdom could exert greater control over the numbers coming to our country.

In other words, a European Union with the flexibility needed to ensure that all its members felt their particular membership worked well for them and our British model of membership worked well for us. I have no doubt that with patience, with goodwill, with ingenuity, it can be done. And that in doing so we can make Britain and the whole of Europe safer and more prosperous for generations to come.

South Korea 12.04.2012 News Cheonji, Seoul

The chairman, Geunhye Park made the first public speech after pulling the victory for the general election. "Thank you sincerely for your support for our party, Saenuri, despite of our past diverse mistakes. We understand this victory as the last opportunity given from you."

This morning, the chief-campaigner Geunhye Park held a press conference to promise to keep her party's election pledges. "We will keep our campaign promises at all cost." She emphasized the importance of the unity of people against the widespread conflict and disunity. "We will make the 100% Korea. We will gather every generation and class to walk hand in hand" Moreover, she pledged to normalize the party by reorganise the party leadership. Having rescued her party from the crisis by acquiring the majority, She is gaining the momentum for the upcoming presidential election.

USA 13.10.2016 West Palm Beach, Florida

Thank you folks, it's great to be right here in Florida, which we love. In 26 days, we are going to win this great great state and we are going to win the White House. Our movement is about replacing a failed and corrupt and when I say corrupt, I'm talking about totally

corrupt political establishment with a new government controlled by you, the American people. There is nothing the political establishment will not do, no lie that they won't tell to hold their prestige and power at your expense and that's what's been happening. The Washington establishment and the financial and media corporations, that fund it exists for only one reason, to protect and enrich itself. The establishment has trillions of dollars at stake in this election. As an example, just one single trade deal, they'd like to pass involves trillions of dollars controlled by many countries corporations and lobbyists. For those who control the levers of power in Washington and for the global special interest they partner with these people that don't have your good in mind. Our campaign represents a true existential threat, like they haven't seen before. This is not simply another 4 year election, this is a crossroads in the history of our civilisation, that will determine whether or not, we the people reclaim control over our government.

The political establishment, that is trying to stop us, is the same group responsible for our disastrous trade deals, massive illegal immigration and economic and foreign policies that have bled our country dry. The political establishment has brought about the destruction of our factories and our jobs as they fled to Mexico, China and other countries all around the world. Our just announced job numbers are anemic, our gross

domestic product or GDP is barely above 1% and going down. Workers in the United States are making less than they were almost 20 years ago and yet, they are working harder, but so am I working harder, that I can tell you. It's a global power structure, that is responsible for the economic decisions that have robbed our working class, stripped our country of its wealth and put that money into the pockets of a handful of large corporations and political entities. Just look at what this corrupt establishment has done to our cities like Detroit, Flint Michigan and rural towns in Pennsylvania, Ohio, North Carolina and all across our country. Take a look at what's going on. They've stripped away these towns bare and raided the wealth for themselves and taking our jobs away out of our country never to return, unless I'm elected president. The Clinton machine is at the center of this power structure. We've seen this firsthand in the WikiLeaks documents in which Hillary Clinton meets in secret with international banks to plot the destruction of US sovereignty in order to enrich these global financial powers, her special interest friends and her donors. So true. Honestly, she should be locked up, she should be locked up. And likewise the email show, that the Clinton machine is so closely and irrevocably tied to the media organisations, that she, that she listened to this is given the questions and answers in advance of her debate performance with Bernie Sanders. Hilary Clinton is also given approval

and veto power over quotes written about her in the New York Times. They definitely do not do that to me, that I can say. And the emails show the reporters collaborate and conspire directly with the Clinton campaign on helping her win the election, all over, with their control over our government at stake, with trillions of dollars on the line, the Clinton machine is determined to achieve the destruction of our campaign (not going to happen), which has now become a great great movement the likes of which our country has never seen before, never ever. We've never seen a movement like this in our country before. Yesterday in Florida massive crowds, people lined up outside of big arenas, not able to get in, never happened before, it's one of the great phenomena's of the great political phenomena's. The most powerful weapon deployed by the Clintons is the corporate media, the press. Let's speak clear on one thing. The corporate media in our country is no longer involved in journalism. There a political special interest, no different than any lobbyist or other financial entity with a total political agenda.

And the agenda is not for you, it's for themselves. And their agenda is to elect crooked Hillary Clinton at any cost, at any price, no matter how many lives they destroy. For them it's a war. And for them nothing at all is out of bounds. This is a struggle for the survival of our nation. Believe me. And this will be our last chance to save it,

on November 8th, remember that. This election will determine whether we're a free nation or whether we have only the illusion of democracy but are in fact controlled by a small handful of global special interests rigging the system and our system is rigged. This is reality, you know it, they know it, I know it and pretty much the whole world knows it. The establishment and their media and neighbours will control over this nation through means that are very well known. Anyone who challenges their control is deemed a sexist, a racist, a xenophobe and morally deformed. They will attack you. They will slander you. They will seek to destroy your career and your family. They will just seek to destroy everything about you including your reputation. They will lie, lie, lie and then again. They will do worse than that. They will do whatever is necessary. The Clintons are criminals. Remember that. They're criminals. This is well-documented and the establishment, that protects them, has engaged in a massive cover-up of widespread criminal activity at the State Department and the Clinton Foundation in order to keep the Clintons in power. Never in history have we seen such a cover-up as this. One that includes the total destruction of 33,000 emails, 13 iphones, some by hammer, laptops, missing boxes of evidence and many many other things. People who are capable of such crimes against our nation are capable of anything. And so now we address the slander and libel that was just

last night thrown at me by the Clinton machine and the New York Times and other media outlets. as part of a concerted, coordinated and vicious attack. It's not coincidence, that these attacks come at the exact same moment and all together at the same time as WikiLeaks releases documents exposing the massive international corruption of the Clinton machine including 2,000 more emails just this morning. These vicious claims about me of inappropriate conduct with women are totally and absolutely false. And the Clintons know it and they know it very well. These claims are all fabricated, they're pure fiction and they're outright lies.

These events never ever happened and the people that said them meekly fully understand, you take a look at these people, you study these people and you'll understand also. The claims are preposterous, ludicrous and defy true common sense and logic. We already have substantial evidence to dispute these lies and it will be made public in an appropriate way and added appropriate time, very soon. These lies come from outlets, whose past stories and past claims have already been discredited. The media outlets did not even attempt to confirm the most basic facts, because even a simple

investigation would have shown that these were nothing more than false smears. Six months ago the failing New York Times wrote a massive story attacking me and the central witness they use that

the story was false, that she was quoted inaccurately. She said that I was a great guy. She had great courage, I'll be honest with you, she was an amazing person and never made those remarks, that I was a great guy and never made the remarks and when I read the service sort of surprised how could she say that and she didn't say it.

We demanded a retraction, but they refused to print it. Just like they refused to pen the comments from another source who praised me in her book. Or the words of another wonderful woman who said really nice things about me. They put other statements that she didn't say. They misrepresented. The story was a fraud and a big embarrassment to the New York Times and it was a big front-page story. Front page, center, color picture, a disgrace. They were very embarrassed. It will be part of the lawsuit we are preparing against them. Now today, the same to discredited writers, who should have been fired from the New York Times for what they did, tell another totally fabricated and false story that supposedly took place on an aeroplane more than 30 years ago. Another ridiculous tale, no witnesses, no nothing. Then there was a writer from People magazine, who wrote a story on Melania and myself on our first anniversary. The story was beautiful. It was beautiful. It was lovely. But last night we hear, that after 12 years, this took place 12 years ago the story, a new claim that I made inappropriate advances during the

interview to this writer. And I asked very simple question. Why wasn't it part of the story that appeared twenty or twelve years ago. Why was it a part of the story. Why didn't they make it part of the story. I was one of the biggest stars on television with the Apprentice and it would have been one of the biggest stories of the year, think of it, she's doing this story on Melania who's pregnant, at the time, and Donald Trump our one-year anniversary and she said I made inappropriate advances. And by the way, the area was a public area of people all over the place. Take a look. You take a look. Look at her. Look at her words. You tell me what you think. I don't think so. I don't think.

But it is amazing, doing a story, a love story on how great we are together, and by the way, we're stronger today that we were every were before which is great. But it's a love story. Its a love story. On our one-year and if I did that, she would have added that it would have been the headline and who would have done that if you're doing this and you're one of the top shows on television. These people are horrible people. They're horrible horrible liars. And interestingly it happens to appear 26 days before our very important election. Isn't that amazing? This invented account, has already been debunked by eyewitnesses, who there, they were there, the very witness identified by the author has said the story is totally false. By the way, this is a room that everybody

can see it Scott last walls, tomorrow Lago, it's got less walls.

Can you believe this. Why wasn't it in the story biggest story of the year. This weekend the New York Times published a full-page hit piece with another claim from an individual who has been totally discredited based on the many many many emails and letters. She is sent to our office over the years looking for work. Donald is great. Wanting to go to my rallies. But the New York Times, and this was a full upper piece. Refused to use it. The evidence that we presented refused to use it. If they used it, if they would have looked they would have said all there's no story here. Others in the media, which almost surprises me, because they're dishonest also, were presented with this story by this woman numerous times. And they got very excited. But after seeing the evidence that we immediately give them, all of them refused to write the story. There was no story. The Times though didn't want to see it, they just wrote the story and this was a full page opposite the editorials. This is part of a concerted effort led by the New York Times and others. Now the New York Times is fighting desperately for its relevance and its financial survival and it probably won't even be around in a few years based on its financial outlook. Which wouldn't be a bad thing, if you wanna know. But as it winds down its years and it's becoming more and more problematic, it's gotten more and more vicious, more

and more vile and even the other mainstream media is talking about the single greatest pylon in history. And all between now and November 8th. And you have to see the stories they've written. It's one, after another, after another. And facts mean nothing. Third-rate journalism, the great editors of the past from the New York Times and others, Ladies and Gentlemen are spinning in their grave.

I will not allow the Clinton machine to turn our campaign into a discussion of their slanders and lies. But we'll remain focused on the issues facing the American people. Thank you. Thank you. But let me state this as clearly as I can. These attacks are orchestrated by the Clintons and their media allies.

The only thing Hillary Clinton has going for herself is the press. Without the press she is absolutely zero and you saw that the other night in the debate, where some people said she made virtually a fool of herself. This is not presidential material. Believe me. What they say is false and slanders in virtually every respect. We are now less than a month from the most important election of our lifetime. Indeed, one of the most important elections in the history of our country. And the polls are showing us in a dead heat, don't believe what you said. The new highly respected Rasmussen poll just came out this morning. It's just released. Shows up nationally two points ahead Trump, you. Just came out. So now the Clinton machine is put forward a small

handful of people out of tens of thousands of people over the years that I've met, that I've worked with, that I've employed in order to make wild and false allegations that fail to meet even the most basic test of common sense, not even common sense. Again, this is nothing more than an attempt to destroy our movement and for the Clintons to keep their corrupt control over a government. When I declared my candidacy I knew what bad shape our country was in. And believe me all you have to do is look at world events. All you have to do is look at the 1.7 billion dollars that we sent to Iran in cash, in cash. All you have to do is see the way Isis was created in the vacuum left by Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama out of Iraq. All you have to do, all you have to do is look at the eight hundred people that were very very not good for our nation. They were going to be deported lo. And behold instead of being deported, they were made citizens of the United States. Just listen and lo and behold sadly the eight hundred people is wrong. It turned out to be close to 1,800 people. Our president is incompetent. All he wants to do is campaign. And the last thing he wants to happen is to have Donald Trump terminate Obama care and do all of the other things that are destroying. He's led a very divided nation and it's only gotten worse. And the last thing our country needs is four more years of Barack Obama. Believe me. I've seen firsthand the corruption and

the sickness that has taken over our politics. You've seen it and I've seen it. And we're all watching together. They knew they would throw every lie they couldn't me and my family and my loved ones. They knew, they would stop at nothing to try to stop me. But I never knew, as bad as it would be. I never knew it would be this vile. That it would be this bad. That it would be this vicious. Nevertheless, I take all of these slings and arrows gladly for you. I take them for our movement so that we can have our country back. Our great civilisation, here in America, and across the civilised world, has come upon a moment of reckoning.

We've seen it in the United Kingdom, where they voted to liberate themselves from global government and global trade deals and global immigration deals, that have destroyed their sovereignty and have destroyed many of those nations. But the central base of world political power is right here in America and it is our corrupt political establishment that is the greatest power behind the efforts at radical globalisation and the disenfranchisement of working people. Their financial resources are virtually unlimited. Their political resources are unlimited. Their media resources are unmatched. And most importantly the depths of their immorality is absolutely unlimited. They will allow radical Islamic terrorists to enter our country by the thousands. They will allow the great Trojan horse, and I don't want people looking back in a hundred years

and two hundred years and have that story be told about us, because we were led by inept incompetent and corrupt people like Barack Obama and like Hillary Clinton. We don't want to be part of that history. And by the way, President Obama should stop campaigning and start working on creating jobs. Start working on getting our GDP up. Start working on strengthening our borders. The corrupt political establishment is a machine, it has no soul. I knew these false attacks would come. I knew this day would arrive. It's only a question of when. And I knew the American people would rise above it and vote for the future they deserve. The only thing that can stop this corrupted machine is you. The only force strong enough to save our country is us. The only people brave enough to vote out this corrupt establishment is you. The American people. We are going to have a policy America first. They control incredibly the Department of Justice. And they even secretly meet with the Attorney General of the United States. In the back of her airplane, while on the runway, remember he was there, he's going to play golf, oh, oh gee this year 30 general. Let me go say hello. Planes on the runway. Let me go say hello to the Attorney General. He never got to play golf I understand and it was Arizona a place I loved but the weather was about a hundred and some-odd degrees. Now he's not going to think he was never there to play golf, folks don't be foolish. They met

for 39 minutes, and most likely, it was to discuss her reappointment in a Clinton administration as the Attorney General.

Just prior to making a decision over whether or not to prosecute Hillary Clinton, okay, that's what happened. That's called real life. And that's pretty sad. They met for 39 minutes. Remember he said, we talked golf and we talked about our grandchildren. Three minutes for the grandchildren, two minutes for the Gulf. Then they sat there and they twiddle their thumbs. Now I believe they talked about her remaining in her position under a crooked Hillary Clinton administration. that's what I believe. That's what I believe folks. That's what I believe and I think that's what most people in this room believe.

Likewise they have essentially corrupted, the director of the FBI to the point at which stories are already saying, that the great, and they are truly great, men and women who worked for the FBI are embarrassed and ashamed of what he's done to one of our truly great institutions, the FBI itself. Hillary Clinton is guilty of all the things that director Comey stated at his press conference and congressional hearing and far more, he stated many things, but it's far more and he knows that. And yet after reading all of these items, where she's so guilty, he let her off the hook, while other lives including General Petraeus and many others have been destroyed for doing far less.

This is a conspiracy against you, the American people. And we can not let this happen or continue. This is our moment of reckoning as a society and as a civilisation itself. I didn't need to do this folks, believe me, believe me. I built a great company and I had a wonderful life. I could have enjoyed the fruits and benefit of years of successful business deals and businesses for myself and my family instead of going through this absolute horror show of lies, deceptions, malicious attacks, who would have thought. I'm doing it, because this country has given me so much and I feel so strongly that it's my turn to give back to the country that I love. Many of my friends and many political experts warned me that this campaign would be a journey to hell. Said that. But they're wrong. It will be a journey to heaven, because we will help so many people that are so desperately in need of help. In my former life, I was an insider, as much as anybody else, and I knew what it's like and I still know what it's like to be an insider. It's not bad, not bad. Now I'm being punished for leaving the special Club and revealing to you the terrible things that are going on having to do with our country. Because I used to be part of the club, I'm the only one that can fix it. I'm doing this for the people and for the movement. And we will take back this country for you and we will make America great again! The corrupt establishment knows that we are a great threat to their

criminal enterprise. They know, that if we win their power is gone and it's returned to you the people, will be. The dark clouds hanging over our government can be lifted and replaced with a bright future. But it all depends on whether we let the corrupt media decide our future. Or whether we let the American people decide our future. If this Clinton campaign of destruction is allowed to work, then no other highly success, and this is so true. I mean I've seen this so many times and I've heard this all of my life. I've heard it all of my life. if we let this happen then no other highly successful person, which is what our country needs, it needs a certain thinking. When you look at our trade deals that are so bad. When you look as an example on trade, we're going to lose almost 800 billion dollars this year trade deficit. Almost 800 billion, our debt has doubled in seven-and-a-half years. To almost 20 trillion dollars under Obama. No other successful person after watching this and no other very successful person will ever again, ever and who can blame, them even me I'd say you're right. Will ever again run for office. I've heard it for years if you're very successful you can't run for high office, especially for president. I said I don't care. I don't care. I've done so

many deals. I've done so well. It's a certain mindset that we need in our country at least for a period of time. We have to straighten our country out. I will not lie to you. These false attacks are absolutely

hurtful to be lied about, to be slandered to be speared so publicly and before your family that you love is very painful. What is going on, is egregious beyond any words. People that know the story. People that see the story.

People that know the facts. They can't even believe it. It's reprehensible beyond description. It's totally corrupt. But I also know, that it's not about me. It's about all of you. And it's about our country. I know that, I fully understand. That's why I got involved. It's about all of us together as a country. It's a movement the likes of which we have never in history, in this country, seen before. Never in history. Even the pundits, even the media that truly dislikes Donald Trump for their own reasons will admit this is a movement the likes of which people have never seen before. And it's a movement about the veterans who need medical care. The mothers who've lost their beloved children to terrorism and a crime. It's about the inner cities and the border towns who desperately need our help. It's about the millions of jobless people in America. It's about the American workers who can't get jobs, because our jobs have left for Mexico and so many other countries. This election is about the people being crushed by Obamacare. And it's about defeating Isis. And appointing a Supreme Court and a Supreme Court justice it could be four or five who will defend and protect our Constitution.

This election is also about so

importantly to me, African-American and Hispanic-American people, whose communities have been plunged into crime, poverty and failing schools by the policies of crooked Hillary Clinton, believe me, she's crooked. They've robbed these citizens of their future. And if we win, I will give them their hope, their jobs, their education. I will give them their security back. The inner cities education is almost worthless, it's horrible. We're going to have Common Core ended. We're going to bring education local. But you look at the inner cities and you see bad education, no jobs, no safety. You walk to the grocery store with your child and you get shot. You walk outside to look and see what's happening and you get shot. In Chicago 3,000 people have been shot since January 1st. We're not going to let that happen. Our inner cities are almost at an all-time low, run by the Democrats for sometimes more than a hundred years chained unbroken, so they have no jobs. They have horrible education. They have no safety, or security. And I say to the African-American community, what the hell do you have to lose. I will fix it. I will fix it. I will make it good. I'll bring back our jobs. We'll have good education. Will have great safety in the inner city. And we will help the Hispanic - American people who have been treated so badly and so unfairly in our nation. We will help them. I will deliver, like you've never seen.

Before I deliver, whether people

like Donald Trump or not. They all say he delivers. Vote for Donald Trump. You're going to see something and you'll be so happy. You'll be so thrilled. This election is about every man woman and child in our country who deserves to live in safety prosperity and peace, so true.

We will rise above the lies, the smears, the ludicrous slanders from ludicrous and very very dishonest reporters. We will vote for the country. We want, we will vote for the future we want. And we will vote to put this corrupt government cartel out of business. And out of business immediately. We will vote for the special interests and say lots of luck, but you're being voted out of power. They betrayed our workers. They betrayed our borders. And most of all, they betrayed our freedoms. We will save our sovereign rights as a nation.

We will end the politics of prof- it. We will end the rule of special interests. We will end the rating of our jobs by other countries. We will end the total disenfranchisement of the

American voter and the American worker. Our independence days is at hand and it arrives finally on November 8th. Join me in taking back our country and creating a bright glorious and prosperous new future for our people. We will make America great again! And it will happen quickly! God bless you, God bless you. Thank you! Thank you!

China 04.03.2014 CCTV America, Washington DC/Chicago

So how is the Chinese dream defined and obtained. Earlier I spoke to the founding faculty director of the University of Chicago Centre in Beijing. Professor Dali Yang gave us his perspective. This has been an issue of debate and discussion among the Chinese themselves when it was first raised by President Xi Jinping. It was much more speaking to the dream of national revival especially in light of the history of humiliation and underdevelopment that China had witnessed in the last 150 years.

But then once the concept became public and began to receive a lot of attention. People began to interpret it in their own ways. And increasingly the emphasis has been to say, well there is the need for national rejuvenation, national prosperity. And that's fine goal but at the same time how can you have national rejuvenation with other rejuvenation of the individual of the household in terms of prosperity and so on so. Increasingly the leadership has actually began to refine the concept President Xi Jinping himself went on his visit to the United States began to say, well the Chinese dream is actually linked to the, and in fact it's connected to the American dreams in essence. Actually increasingly people see the need of example of to link it to authors of good things. Whether it's

the rule of law or for that matter in terms of prosperity, in terms of our, for example, education, the environment and so on. And as a result I think actually is being subject to some contention as well. As we just heard President Xi Jinping calling the Chinese dream both timely and profound. He also added that it encourages the Chinese people to pull together and work with all their might and with one heart to realize the great dream of a national revival. You mentioned revival, but can you elaborate, on a revival of China? Well, this is actually in many ways it speaks to the fact that China 150 and 200 years ago was tops of the world in terms of aggregate GDP. It has the largest economy.

Most population. It had a very significant continuous history for 5,000 years of 3,000 years, depending on how you calculate it. So in that sense actually, there is this feeling that China needs to recover its prior prideful place in the world of Nations.

And in that sense, there is this collective vision for China to recover its place in the world. In many ways actually China has already attained a lot of it. It's already the second largest economy in the world. The largest exporter and trader. And of course, in many ways is a behemoth, it's a force to be contended with, globally. But nonetheless I think the leadership feels like it's connected to the fact that there needs to be national prosperity at a higher level. So their initial

target is for 2020 also at that point in fact China by PPP terms would likely have the world's largest economy. And of course obviously a great power.

All right professor Dali Yang we appreciate your time, Thank you so much for joining us from Chicago.

Italy 12.03.2014 Ta1 News, Rome

This text is a text that we, today, formally deliver to all the political leaders who are in the parliament. And it is a text that we do not formalise at the moment, in the parliament — that is here, it's ready. We give 15 days of time to everyone who would want to give us some indications for improvements, and then we'll take it to the parliament. But gentlemen, this is the central point. This is the senate reform.

It means to never again give confidence from the Senate to the government of the Republic. To never again have a budget law voted by the Senate. It means reducing the salary — the number of all of the parliamentarians. 315 senators less to pay a salary to. It means being faster, faster. Today we would already have an electoral lay approved, if there would not have been the 'perfect bicameralism'. It means definitely improving the institutional system of the country. It's an awesome historic and unbelievable passage.

Next step: with the 'fifth title',

we go toward the simplification of the country, and we definitely overcome the provinces that, moreover, see today thanks to the DDL deal of the previous government, the debate currently in the Senate. There is also the abolition of the CNEL. From March 26th, 'come

Gentleman, come 'the 'blue cars' are being sold on an auction. The first 100 are sold by auction, and if we succeed we will also tell you who are each one of the Ministers who have used them. The immediate release and the total payment of the public administration is the measure that we think is fundamental to give one strong and clear signal that the state respects the agreements made.

Which is a thing that has not always happened, because evidently, if we do it — how to say — we do our duty. Nothing more, nothing less than our duty. 22 billions have already been paid from the previous government, and we, by July, we'll unlock everything. 100 millions of additional euros - Graziano, I ask you to confirm - in order to strength of the guarantee fund for the credit: we want to fight the 'credit crunch', whether is true or supposed. We have brought up up to 3 billions and a half of euros, the 'plafond', within which — from which it is possible to draw for the municipalities, the provinces, for those who want it to invest in schools. The procedures will be simplified by the 1th of April, I swear it's not an April fool, the mission unit about the schools

will be active at the Chiggi palace. And I add, tomorrow I'll be meeting the maestro Renzo Piano, with whom — to whom I have — quote: "ripped" the concept of mending in my intervention to the senate...

The goal is to, through him, involve a special attention, let's say dedicate a special attention also on the themes of the quality of the mending. And it is a passage that I believe, gives meaning in the fact that we look with the highest possible level to the interventions on the places where we leave our children.

This billion and a half has to be spent, it exists, it is ready, it's out, it's already computed for the final purposes of the pact of stability. We have to spend it. The projects exist. Often it is the bureaucracy that stops us. From the 'house plan', which we have approved today: 1 billion and 700 millions, three measures are related to the fiscal issues. These measures will be applied from the day of the 1st of May. I confess that I have tried up until this afternoon to get some of them through from April, to make you see them in your pay slips before the elections. Sorry. I tried.

There are 10 millions of people who take 10 billions euros from the Italian state. But there are about 1000 euros — per year that are recovered — from the individual workers. It is a measure of attention. I would say of equity. And it is the fruit of a

politics that gives itself the good example. In other words, we start by eliminating the excesses of the politic in order to give a signal to the families every day are struggling to make it to the end of the month. The cover of these 10 billions is totally done by the government on the base of saving money, on the base of the numbers that I will now indicate you roughly — but that will give you a sense of the amplitude of this cover, of — let's say — general macro economics — but without the increase of the taxation. This is the fundamental point. Operation also on the IRAP that - attention, follow me - this one is financed with an increase of the taxation on other realities. The government bonds are not touched. So, no splash - relax. The government bonds are not touched.

But the tax on the financial annuities goes from 20 to 26. Expected value 2,6 billions euros — and the IRAP is reduced to private companies by 10%.

This is a measure that is not in the 10 billions fiscal wedge of which I spoke earlier. This is an operation that is rebalance: up the tax on finance, down the tax on labor. Finally, from the 1st of May, the cost of the energy for the PMI, which is worth about 14 billions of euros, will be reduced by 10%. It's a beautiful thing. It's a fund for the social enterprises. 500 millions of euros for those who want to create a social enterprise. Create jobs with the social enterprise.

The objective is from here until 2018, to create 100,000 jobs on research. 600 millions of euros to increase the tax credit for researchers. There is an immediate measure which we have proposed and approved with decree law that is the simplification, compared to Fornero's instruments, which are essentially - I do not say dismantled - but very much simplified: immediately. Very important sign. The term contract can be valid at most for three years. And it's applicable without causality, with the limit of a maximum of 20% on the total of the workers.

And — then Poletti will announce it to you in detail — the theme of the apprenticeship. There has never been a path of reform so full-bodied and meaningful. And I will add, here, taking myself the responsibility, that if I cannot overcome the 'perfect bicameralism', I do not consider closed the experience of the government: I will consider closed my political experience. Because there is a moment in which a political leader has the obligation to point out a vision. I think that Italy, today, needs to overcome, with courage and determination, the limits that are blocking it. I'm not afraid to risk everything of myself on a path of reforms that to could say to Italy to return to be able fly. In order to do this however there is the need to help those who cannot handle it anymore.

Because I do not do politics for a personal ambition. I do pol-

itics because they taught me how this is the tool to defend what the great Giorgio La Pira used to call 'the poor people'. So facing this reality, today it is necessary to give an immediate signal. And the discussions of entrepreneurs, of the trade unions, all of the social subjects who are protagonists — only interests me up to a certain point.

I listen to everyone, I talk to everyone, I try to understand. But if you don't put some money on the school, I am not credible when I go back home in the evening. And if I don't put some money to try to keep this territory in a better shape I am not credible. And if we don't start by saying that we reduce the number of parliamentarians, that we sell the 'blue cars', by giving the signal of the good example, from the part of the politicians: we lose the way to go back home.

