

**Video og afskrift: Fejring af  
Berlin murens fald og  
Friedrich Schillers  
fødselsdag.**

**Konference i NYC med Helga  
Zepp-LaRouche som hovedtaler  
den 11. november 2019 (på  
engelsk)**

A Three-Fold Anniversary

Address by Helga Zepp-LaRouche (Se afskriftet nedenunder)

Excerpt from video: "The Lost Chance of 1989"

Schubert/Schiller: Die Hoffnung

Michelle Erin, soprano – Margaret Greenspan, piano – Elliot  
Greenspan, speaker

Schubert/Schiller: An Emma

John Sigerson, tenor – Margaret Greenspan, piano

Shakespeare: Luciana's Monologue from Comedy of Errors, Act 3,  
Scene 2

Leah DeGruchy

Max Caspar on Kepler as a Philosophical Mind

John Sigerson

Schiller: "Die Teilung der Erde"

Frank Mathis

Schubert/Schober: "An die Musik"

Lisa Bryce, soprano – Richard Cordova, piano

# **Ny LaRouchePAC foredragsrække: Koncepterne bag Lyndon LaRouches internationale Nye Bretton Woods-kreditsystem**

Muligheden for, at LaRouches koncepter for, hvordan samarbejdet mellem nationer bør udfoldes, bliver gjort til virkelighed, er større end nogensinde. Samtidig har disse koncepter aldrig været mere nødvendige end nu. De kan blive til virkelighed gennem det fremspirende samarbejde mellem USA, Rusland, Kina, Indien og andre ledende økonomiske magter.

Foredragstitlerne er følgende:

1. Det menneskelige sinds kreative ånd reflekterer universets underliggende kreative princip.
2. Nøglen til at forstå økonomi er videnskab og ikke matematik.
3. Eksistensen af nationalstater er en nødvendighed.
4. Hvad er kreativitet nøjagtigt, som er den sande kilde til økonomisk vækst?
5. Friedrich Schiller, frihedens digter.
6. Vladimir Vernadsky, Biosfæren og Noosphæren.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

```
<iframe width="560" height="315"
src="https://www.youtube.com/embed/cyGJstd52-4"
frameborder="0" allow="accelerometer; autoplay; encrypted-
media; gyroscope; picture-in-picture"
allowfullscreen></iframe>
```

---

**RADIO SCHILLER den 18. juli  
2017:**

**Fremskridt i Syrien og  
Nordkorea;**

**men nu skal LaRouches Fire  
Økonomiske Love gennemføres,**

# plus en rapport om Carnegie Hall-koncert i NYC til minde om Sylvia Olden Lee

Med næstformand Michelle Rasmussen

*Læs her en anden rapport om koncerten:*

*I New York City, i det historiske Carnegie Hall, blev en stor kunster og digter æret med en koncert i anledning af hendes 100-års dag: Sylvia Olden Lee, der blev født på dagen for koncerten, den 29. juni, i 1917. En hyldest til hendes minde og til forevigelse af hendes levende eftermæle blev sponsoreret af Fonden for Genoplivelse af Klassisk Kultur, med deltagelse af Schiller Instituttet, for et totalt fuldt hus og et publikum, der var passioneret involveret i mindet om og fejringen af arven efter denne utrolige kvinde.*

*Koncerten, »En hyldest til Sylvia Olden Lee, mester-musiker og lærer« bestod af arier, der blev sunget af førende elever af Sylvia Olden Lee i hele USA, og som nu er førende operasangere, og af mennesker, som hun havde rørt, og som havde lært af hende og levet ved hendes side. Den verdenskendte Simon Estes sang også. Der var arier og lieder af Verdi, Donizetti, Brahms, Schubert; men der blev også sunget afroamerikanske spirituals, der var så stor en del af arven efter denne kvinde. Sylvia Olden Lee, der var den første afroamerikanske stemmetræner, som blev ansat af Metropolitan Opera. Hun skabte ligeledes muligheden for, at operasangerinden Marian Anderson kunne bryde farvebarrieren og blive den første, sorte sanger til at synge på Metropolitan Opera, med mange andre, der sidenhen fulgte. Der var også udvalgte korstykker af spirituals, der blev sunget af et 220-mand stort kor, der omfattede Schiller Instituttets kor, og som også sang Ave Verum Corpus af Mozart og Halleluja-koret*

*fra Beethovens Kristus på Oliebjerget. Det var en absolut fantastisk musikalsk begivenhed, men også en begivenhed, der bærer vidnesbyrd om den menneskelige sjæls udødelighed. For jeg tror, at, som alle, der deltog i denne hyldestkoncert kan fortælle jer, så blev Sylvia Olden Lee ikke blot mindet på denne koncert; hun var fysisk og åndeligt til stede for dem, der var samlet i dette lokale til hendes ære.*

---

## **New York til LPAC: Tak for, at I forsvarer præsidentskabet. LPAC kortvideo, 22. juni, 2017**

»God eftermiddag, jeg er Michelle Fuchs fra LaRouche Political Action Committee, der rapporterer live fra gaderne i Manhattan. Vi står her på krydset mellem 32. Gade og Broadway, på Greeley Square, hvor vi fører kampagne til forsvar for Donald Trumps administration imod kuppet og for en succes for hans økonomiske program, med LaRouches Fire Love. Jeg kan rapportere, at vi har fået en masse støtte her i dag, med mange mennesker, der kommenterer, at de er glade for, at vi er her, og at de påskønner, at der kræves meget mod for at gøre det, vi gør.

Én meget sød dame rapporterede, at hun var glad for at finde en organisation, fordi hendes mand mener, han er den eneste, så hun ønsker, han skal kontakte os.

Jeg vil opfordre jer til at gå med i LaRouche-bevægelsen og

hjælpe os med at uddele vores avis, 'The Hamiltonian', hjælpe os med at få opringninger ind til Kongressen og til Det Hvide Hus til støtte for denne administration og til forsvar for denne nation. Slut for nu.«

*Offentliggjort den 22. jun. 2017*

*LaRouche PAC organizers in Manhattan have been reporting a sense of gratitude from the population when they see our organizers, 1. Because we've got the guts to be on the street defending the Presidency and 2. Because we pull no punches in discussing the orchestrated coup against Trump. Here's Michelle Fuchs on Greeley Square.*

---

# **NYHEDSORIENTERING      JANUAR 2017: Farvel til krigens paradigme?**

## ***Hvad vi skal gøre – nu!***

*I USA, i lighed med Danmark og andre lande, er der nogle helt afgørende ting, der må gennemføres, som Lyndon LaRouche har fremført som fire nødvendige love, der må implementeres omgående.*

*1) Der skal indføres en Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling, men under den overskrift er der mange andre ting, der må ske. Man må gå igennem bankernes og finansverdenens aktiviteter i lighed med det, man gjorde i USA, da Roosevelt blev indsat som præsident, så man får rensset op og får adskilt tingene i legitime finansielle aktiviteter, der er vigtige for realøkonomien, og*

så spekulation, som skal helt ud af de normale banker. Man vil så få nogle mindre almindelige banker, som man kan hjælpe, hvis de får problemer, mens alle de andre spekulative aktiviteter ikke får lov til at belaste staten og skatteyderne, når de får problemer pga. fejlslagne spekulationer. Derefter skal der

2) skabes kredit til investeringer. Staten må gå ind og regulere det ovenfra og i den udstrækning, det er nødvendigt, med statslige kreditter sikre, at der bliver foretaget de nødvendige investeringer i samfundet og dets produktive aktiviteter. Det skal bl.a. udmønte sig i

3) store infrastrukturprojekter, der kan opgradere hele økonomien. Man kan bare seke til de enorme investeringer, Kina har foretaget siden 2008, hvor Kina har brugt over 1000 mia. dollars om året på infrastruktur og i dag har verdens største og bedste netværk af højhastighedstog. Programmet for Den Nye Silkevej er da også centreret om opbygning af grundlæggende infrastruktur, ikke blot i Kina, men i stadig større dele af verden. Når det gælder Danmark, har vi et forældet jernbanenet, der skal fornyes i form af et nationalt magnettognet eller højhastighedstognet i forbindelse med bygningen af en Kattegatbro. Vi skal så hurtigt som muligt have bygget den faste forbindelse over Femern Bælt og en Helsingør/Helsingborg-forbindelse. Der er masser af motorveje og andre projekter, der bare venter på at blive bygget. Der er så meget, der skal bygges, at vi kommer til at planlægge, hvordan vi kan få nok kvalificeret arbejdskraft og byggekapaцитet for at kunne få alle de mange projekter realiseret. Alle disse projekter er nødvendige som en del af at løfte den danske økonomi op på et højere produktivitetsniveau, og samtidig skal vi have langt mere gang i forskning og udvikling.

**RADIO SCHILLER den 3. januar  
2017:**

**Året 2017: Hvor vi  
konsoliderer verdens nye  
Silkevejsparadigme**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

---

**RADIO SCHILLER 19. september  
2016:**

**Vestens koalition bomber  
Syriens hær; en fejl?**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg:

---



**RADIO SCHILLER den 12.  
september 2016:  
15 år efter den 11.  
september: Schiller  
Instituttets NYC-kor opfører  
Mozarts Rekiem ved 4  
konserter**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg:

---

**RADIO SCHILLER den 15. august  
2016:  
Det forestående G20-topmøde i  
Kina:  
Mulighed for et faseskifte**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

---

# Lyndon LaRouche stiller spørgsmålet: Er amerikanerne parate til at komme sammen igen for at genoverveje deres skæbne?

9. juli 2016 – Diane Sare, medlem af LaRouchePAC's Komite for Politisk Strategi, indledte lørdag mødet '[Dialog med Manhattan-projektet](#)' med følgende indlæg (uddrag):

Diane Sare: Jeg gentager lige: Folk, der har fulgt os på websiden, har set dette i morgenens rapport og hørt det med LaRouches egne ord i går aftes på [webcastet \(Fredags-webcast\)](#).

Men i en diskussion torsdag med medlemmer af Policy Committee og nogle af vore folk i efterretningsteamet, som forberedelse til webcastet, sagde han: »Manhattan-systemet er parat til at blive anvendt. Det må bruges og må igangsætte en bølgebevægelse i hele USA. Det kan vi sandsynligvis gøre.« Han sagde, at det spørgsmål, der lå på bordet, er, »Vil Obama bombe verden, eller vil han opgive, eller noget andet midt imellem?«

Dette skal delvis ses i sammenhæng med [Chilcot-kommissionens rapport om Tony Blair](#), som folk måske er bekendt med, hvor det grundlæggende set nu er kommet frem, at Blair var skyldig i at have lanceret og organiseret en aggressionskrig; en aggressionsskrig er en forbrydelse under Nürnberg-charteret. Det er i strid med FN's resolutioner; det er en overtrædelse af international lov. Krig må kun bruges som den absolut

sidste udvej, og Chilcot-kommissionen fandt, at det ikke var tilfældet; med andre ord, at krigen var unødvendig. Tony Blair er *de facto* destrueret, og avisen *The London Guardian* havde en artikel torsdag med hovedoverskriften, »Krigen i Irak var ikke en bommert eller en fejltagelse, den var en forbrydelse«. Første linje lyder, »Tony Blair er *fordømt*. Vi har set hvidvaskning af etablissementet i fortiden. Fra Blodige Søndag til Hillsborough har autoriteterne konspireret for at kvæle sandheden i de magtfuldes interesse, men ikke denne gang. Chilcot-undersøgelsen var ved at få en satirisk bibetydning for en farce, hvor det tog lang tid at udføre en opgave, men Sir John vil med sikkerhed gå over i historien som den mand, der leverede *den mest* omfattende ødelæggende dom over nogen moderne premierminister.« Og artiklen fortsætter med at diskutere alle de ulykker, menneskeheden har været udsat for som resultat af denne unødvendige, illegale aggressionskrig, inklusive de 60 millioner flygtninge.

Så Blair er færdig. Og spørgsmålet er så, er Obama færdig? Det er i denne sammenhæng, at LaRouche stillede spørgsmålet, »Vil Obama lancere en atomkrig, vil han opgive, eller vil han gøre noget midt imellem?« Og han sagde, »vi må lukke dette ned, vi må lukke dette politiske fremstød for krig ned, vi må lukke det ned nu, og vi må sætte hårdt ind«. Han sagde, »vi har en forpligtelse til at skabe et nyt økonomisk system, der bidrager til de behov, som findes i den amerikanske befolkning og andetsteds.« Og så spurgte han, »er det amerikanske folk parat til at komme sammen igen for at genoverveje sin skæbne?«

Jeg mener, dette virkelig er det spørgsmål, vi bør stille os selv, for, hvad er vores skæbne, vores bestemmelse? Hvad mener I, at jeres skæbne er? Hvorfor skulle I tage det op til genovervejelse? Jeg sagde i går aftes på webcastet, at det slog mig, at Alexander Hamilton (USA's første finansminister, *-red.*) voksede op i en koloni, britisk, hollandsk sukkerplantage, en slavekoloni i Caribien; han kommer til USA, og USA er en koloni, ikke, at der ikke er folk her, ekstremt

betydningsfulde personer som Benjamin Franklin og Mathers og andre med grundlæggende ideer, men en nation er ikke blevet skabt. Og Alexander Hamilton har allerede i sit hoved en idé om, hvad fremtiden bør være, og hvad tanken om en republik bør være, og som er baseret på et grundlæggende begreb om, hvad det vil sige at være et menneskeligt væsen. Spørgsmålet om menneskets værdighed.

Se hele webcastet, 'The Manhattan Project' fra 9. juli.

Se feature-video: 'The Two Massachussetts' med en historisk gennemgang af udviklingen fra Amerika som en koloni og til en republik, 18. min. Forord af Lyndon LaRouche.

Følg med i den løbende oversættelse af [Phil Rubinsteins foredrag på vores kontor i København, om Chilcot-rapporten og kreativitetens nødvendighed](#), God søndag!

---

**Verden efter den britiske  
Chilcot-rapport om Irak-  
krigen;  
samt foredrag om Albert  
Einstein og kreativitetens  
nødvendighed,**

# **v/ Phil Rubinstein, LaRouchePAC, USA. Video og lyd; uddrag på dansk**

Video 2. del:

Lyd:

Følgende er et dansk uddrag, let redigeret, af den første del af indlægget:

Phil Rubinstein, (en leder af LaRouchePAC i USA): Det, jeg vil forsøge at gøre, er, at jeg vil begynde med lidt politisk baggrund; men i dag drejer det sig ikke om at give en briefing, og så fortsætte med et emne. Der er et par ting, som Lyndon og Helga LaRouche har talt om i de seneste år, og faktisk i løbet af de seneste par uger; og der er to ting, som jeg vil komme ind på. Det første er, at Helga, under denne nylige konference i Berlin, har udsendt en appel om en dialog mellem civilisationer; men hvad der er vigtigere, så har Helga understreget den pointe, at vi må have et skifte i kulturen, den globale kultur. En del af at få ændret den globale kultur er at få en relation imellem de eksisterende nationer, der bedst kan bygges på hver enkelte civilisations højdepunkter – den renæssance, der har fundet sted i de forskellige civilisationer, f.eks. den storslåede renæssance i Kina, Tongdynastiet og andre perioder; Konfucius. I Indien var der Gupta-perioden med store udviklinger inden for klassisk kunst og videnskab, og naturligvis også den græske renæssance, den italienske renæssance, og mange tilfælde, som vi ikke ved ret meget om. Men, at bringe disse sammen, og det var især det, der fandt sted ved koncerten lørdag aften – jeg kan kun opfordre folk til at gå til websiden og se det, hvis man ikke selv var til stede. Og dette er, hvad Helga har stillet krav om som en politisk nødvendighed i dag, nu. Intet mindre kan

gøre det. Politik har ændret sig over de seneste 10, 20, 30 eller 40 år, for man kan sige, at, for fyrre år siden var behovet for en sådan total forandring i det kulturelle syn ikke så påkrævet, og vi ville måske have kunnet gennemføre et par reformer, der kunne have fået os igennem krisen. Det er ikke længere tilfældet. I dag står vi, 25 år efter Sovjetunionens fald. Og på det tidspunkt sagde LaRouchebevægelsen og Schiller Instituttet, at dette ikke betød Vestens sejr over Østen, men at det vestlige system sådan, som det var i færd med at udvikle sig på det tidspunkt, også gik sit sammenbrud i møde. Og dét, som Helga og Lyn sagde på det tidspunkt, var, at den eneste måde at undgå dette på, var at åbne op for den fulde udvikling af den eurasiske landmasse. Så langt tilbage går vores fremgangsmåde, med den Eurasiske Landbro, mindst tilbage til 1989-90. I modsat fald ville der komme et sammenbrud i den globale kultur. Hvis vi forsøgte at udbrede den eksisterende London/Wall Street-akse, det såkaldte Washington-konsensus efter ordre fra Storbritannien; fra selve Monarkiet, og det vil jeg gerne understrege, for folk mener, at det er absurd, selv i Europa, selv i USA, mener folk, at det er absurd. Men det er i realiteten dér, vi står. Lyndon LaRouche er kommet med et specifikt udtryk for dette, som går ud på, at spørgsmålet her først og fremmest drejer sig om kreativitet. Spørgsmålet for de fleste af os er: Hvad betyder dette? Hvad er kreativitet? Og Lyn(don) siger, at det er kreativitet i sig selv. Det er simpelt hen kreativitet, og hvis vi forstår det som et faktisk princip om menneskelig udvikling og vores forhold til universet som helhed. Her på det seneste har Lyndon sagt, tænk som Einstein. Og det morsomme er, at for år tilbage – jeg hader at lyde gammel, men det er jeg, ikke så gammel endda, men det skrider frem; måske er jeg den ældste person i lokalet? – Nå, men for mange år siden havde vi et blad, der hed The Campaigner, som var vores teoretiske magasin, tilbage i slutningen af '70'erne, og vi havde et nummer, der hed: Tænk som Beethoven! Jeg vil gerne fastslå den pointe, at der ikke er den store forskel. For, et af de afgørende punkter i at

tænke som Einstein er klassisk musik. Det kommer jeg tilbage til, når jeg kommer til Einstein, men blot for nu at give jer en smagsprøve på, hvad det er, Lyn talte om. For det drejer sig ikke bare om, at Einstein var et videnskabeligt geni, og det var han – vi kommer ikke på den særlige relativitetsteori, men jeg vil komme ind på nogle af de kontroversielle elementer af det – men han var, i hele sin personlighed, som person, et geni. Han havde den rigtige opfattelse af stort set alle spørgsmål, som han blev involveret i, inkl. nogle kontroversielle videnskabelige spørgsmål, hvor mange mennesker mente, at han havde uret. Og jeg taler ikke om de specifikke resultater, men om hans tilgang, fremgangsmåde, selv nu her 100 år efter, eller omkring 60 år efter hans død, er man nødsaget til at komme tilbage til at diskutere nogle af hans ideer. Videnskaben udvikler sig selvfølgelig. Som folk måske ved, og det er blot en del af det, f.eks. men videnskabsfolk er nu, efter at have raket ned på ideen, gået tilbage til begrebet om en helhedsanskuelse af videnskab. Dette må gå langt videre end det, de tænkte, og selv det, Einstein vidste, og Lyn har været en ledende person. For, en del af problemet er denne adskillelse af forskellige discipliner ikke alene er en adskillelse fra videnskab, men også en adskillelse inden for de forskellige videnskaber: fysik, biologi osv. Og de er i virkeligheden slet ikke adskilte. Det er ikke blot det, at de ikke udgør adskilte områder, men at det er en fejl at tænke på dem adskilt fra hinanden. De kan ikke eksistere adskilte. En af de ting, jeg gerne vil understrege, er, at, for virkelig at kunne opnå det, som Lyn og Einstein taler om, må vi anskue fysik fra et helt andet synspunkt; ud fra et synspunkt om, ikke alene biologi, men om livet; ting, der ikke er entropiske, men, hvad der er endnu vigtigere, selve det menneskelige intellekt. Det er altså ikke hjerne, som de fleste mennesker ... jeg så en af disse videnskabsvideoer, og de havde et afsnit om Einstein; Einstein og hans videnskab, Einstein og hans et eller andet; og så Einstein og hans hjerne. Der var en journalist, der stillede spørgsmål til topvidenskabsfolk, hvilket ikke gør det bedre, og hun var

fikseret på hjernen! Det var en fyr, der studerede Einsteins (fysiske) hjerne fra noget skørt materiale, og hun blev ved med at komme tilbage til, hvor stor var hans hjerne, og hvor mange hjernevindinger var der, det var sindssygt! Så vi taler altså ikke om hjerne, men om det menneskelige intellekt. (Se også LPAC-videoen: *The Extraordinary genius of Albert Einstein*, med indledning af Phil Rubinstein, -red.)

Til dels, for at komme derhen, hvorfor taler Lyn og Helga om det på denne måde, at man må have en tilgang ud fra synspunktet om intellektet. På én måde siger man, at intellektet er adskilt fra det fysiske univers, på en anden måde siger man, at intellektet blot er en sen opdagelse, i det mindste her på planeten Jord; vi ved ikke, om der intellekt andetsteds i universet. Så hvorfor begynde dér? Faktisk er det sådan, at det menneskelige intellekt er det, som universet har frembragt. Vi kan bevise en vis relation til dette univers, hvilket er, hvad Einstein arbejdede ud fra. Men hvorfor må vi tage dette udgangspunkt? Vil de fleste mennesker sige. Er det ikke lidt meget; I har måske ret, det kunne muligvis være interessant at tale om dette. Men lad os nu ... som Lyn ynder at sige: Lad os nu være lidt praktiske. Hvad kan vi (rent praktisk) gøre? Kan vi ikke applikere en anden tilgang? Lige nu; lad os få et bedre system i Europa; lad os håndtere euro-spørgsmålet. Lad os forbedre vores relation med Rusland, lad os få en dialog med Rusland. Det er en god ting. Briterne forlod (EU); lad os se, hvad vi kan gøre med det, der er tilbage; vi må på en eller anden måde holde sammen på Europa. Lad os være praktiske! OK, vi må tage os af spørgsmålet om kineserne. Vi må konkurrere med dem, for det handler altid om konkurrence. En nation imod den anden, det er altid geopolitik, det er altid et nulsums-spil; lad os være praktiske.

Det problem, vi står overfor, er, at tingene nu er kommet til det punkt, hvor der ikke er nogen praktiske skridt, der kan tages, *undtagen en form for revolution*. Jeg taler ikke om at



kaste med brosten og mursten. Hvis vi ikke gør det rigtige, vil jeg gerne understrege, at det kan komme så vidt nogle steder. Hvis vi ser på Mellemøsten, dér har vi en forfærdelig situation. Men en revolution i kulturen. Den slags ting, der må udtænkes, f.eks. har vi med musikken, vi har opført koncerten i Berlin, men mere generelt, så bruger vi udviklingen af musikalske kor til at mobilisere folk. Jeg er sikker på, man har noget lignende i Europa; i USA er der mange unge mennesker, der mener, at Rapp-musik er kreativt. De siger ikke bare, at de kan lide det – det siger nogen måske – men det virkelige argument er, at det er kreativt. Det er poesi. Det er virkeligt. Det er gaden. Det er mit liv. De er måden, hvorpå jeg udtrykker mig. Og kendsgerningen er, at, på dette tidspunkt, så, hvis man ikke erkender, at det ødelægger deres intellekt, så kan man ikke organisere det. Men mindre, man i det mindste engagerer sig i denne debat, engagerer sig i ... min hustru er dansk, og Danmark er et vidunderligt land, folk er lykkelige, men jeg har set ungdommen. Og de ligner alt for meget det, vi amerikanere kalder 'Goths', gotere, skinheads osv., med tatoveringer, med alternativ påklædning med kranier og skeletter og 14 nåle igennem næsen, osv. Hvis man har en ungdom, for hvem hæslighed er et højdepunkt af deres kultur, noget, man forsøger at opnå, så har man en ungdom, der har mistet enhver fornemmelse af formål i verden. Mistet enhver fornemmelse af, hvad det vil sige at være menneske. For, at være menneske er ikke hæslighed. Og dette er et virkeligt problem, hvor man ser forskellighederne i kulturer. Især Kina har ungdommen tendens til at være optimistiske. De overtager sikkert nok noget af den vesterlandske kultur, det gør de, og det er et problem. Men bortset fra det, så har de en fornemmelse af, at det at være menneske har en egenskab af skønhed, af udvikling, en egenskab af fremskridt og opdagelse og spænding. Det ser man ikke hos ret mange unge i Vesten i dag, generelt, selv om der nok skal være nogen.

Se på, hvad der foregår lige nu. Vi har et sammenbrud af det vestlige finansielle system. Deutsche Bank – 50, 70 billioner

i derivater – de siger selvfølgelig, at det vil udligne sig, men det er ikke sandt, sådan sker et krak ikke. De sidder ikke der og udligner det hele, og så bliver det til nul, og sluttelig med 50 billioner i derivater, udveksler man en dollar frem og tilbage, og så er det hele løst. Siden hvornår har det fungeret sådan? Det er deres argument. Men det fungerer ikke sådan. 50 billioner i Deutsche Bank – der i virkeligheden ikke er en tysk bank, den har grundlæggende set base i New York osv., men altså, hvad er Tysklands totale BNP? Der er på omkring 3 billioner, sådan noget. Det totale BNP i EU er 18 billioner dollars. Så vi taler altså om mellem 3 til 4 gange det totale BNP. Deutsche Bank er bankerot. I USA har vi ikke råd til noget, undtagen bankerne. Jeg har netop set en rapport fra New Jersey, med 8 millioner indbyggere, den tættest eller næst-tættest befolkede delstat, lidt mere som i Europa mht. befolkningstæthed, der ikke ligner noget andet sted i USA. Der har de en idiot som guvernør, der stillede på som præsidentkandidat, og de har netop erklæret, at de vil standse al reparation og vedligeholdelse af veje og motorveje, for budgettet blev ikke vedtaget. Så han prøver at presse folk. I USA har vi, for første gang i vores historie, en stigning i antal dødsfald i aldersgruppen 25 – 54. Med andre ord, så er antallet af dødsfald pr. 1000 mennesker, eller pr. 100.000 mennesker, er i denne aldersgruppe steget under Bush- og Obamapræsidentskaberne. Undersøgelsen spændte over perioden 1999 til 2012/14. Selvmordsraterne er steget. Men den virkelige historie om sundhedsvæsenet i USA, det er forvirrende, jo, vi har da en 5 – 10 hospitaler i USA, der er hospitaler i verdensklasse. Det er ikke sådan, at vi ikke har disse ting. Men, de bliver ikke brugt, med mindre man tilhører de højere samfundslag, eller udvælges til at deltage i et eksperiment; men bortset fra det, så er bundlinjen lige nu, at, hvis du er over 65, må vi lige overveje, om det kan betale sig at tage os af dig. Så de sætter altså indbetalingen for lægebehandling op, osv.

Hvad ser vi? EU falder fra hinanden. Hvad er signalerne? Vi

ved ikke helt, hvad det er, der foregår i Storbritannien. Vi forsøger at finde ud af det. Men vi ved, at Europa var chokeret over den idé, at briterne stemte for at forlade EU. Det her har en særlig drejning. Den idé, som briterne har spillet, og som giver én en idé om deres rolle, er, at de godt kan lide altid at sætte visse ting op på en sådan måde, der giver kontrol; men de bliver aldrig rigtigt selv en del af det, de sætter op. De holder sig altid lidt udenfor. Churchill er et godt eksempel. Churchill gjorde det meget klart, at de ikke ville opgive Imperiet. Det er grunden til, at de kæmpede mod nazisterne; det gjorde de ikke, fordi de ønskede at redde jøderne, glem det. De kæmpede mod nazisterne – efter at de først havde installeret nazisterne – fordi de ikke ville miste en del af deres imperium, og de indså, at det var den vej, det gik. Men ikke desto mindre var deres exit af EU en faktor, der var noget af en overraskelse, især uden for Storbritannien ... igen, hvad det britiske etablissement tænkte, og jeg vil tro, at der var splittelser selv i det britiske etablissement, og det er sandsynligvis grunden til, at det var så tæt løb. Men en overraskelse, de er ude, og den Europæiske Union er død. Der vil fremover ikke findes noget EU. Disse fyre, Juncker og Schultz, der siger, at vi får et nyt Europa, et stærkere Europa, et kerne-Europa, det grundlæggende Europa – glem det. Europa (EU) er fuldstændigt røget. Til dels, fordi hele banksystemet er røget.

Nu har man Chilcot-rapporten. Jeg mener, at dette også vil vise sig at være betydningsfuldt. Tony Blair udgjorde modellen for det seneste amerikanske præsidentskab. Som det fremgår af selve Chilcot-rapporten, så var han bonkammerat med George W. Bush, og den idé, at det skulle have været George Bush, der kommanderede rundt med Tony Blair, er mere end absurd. Som vi plejede at sige, så var George W. Bush ikke i stand til at holde fast i en idé på vej fra den ene ende af lokalet til den anden. Dette var Tony Blairs krig. Dette var briternes imperie-krig. Det var USA under Bush. Obama har ambitioner; han vil gerne være mere ligesom Blair. Han vil ikke indrømme,

at han ikke ved, hvad han foretager sig, han er alt for narcissistisk, han modellerer sig efter Blair i mange henseender. Dette er det nye Labourparti, husker man måske. Hvad det havde med arbejde (labour) at gøre, aner jeg ikke. Det var så nyt, at de slet ikke behøvede at arbejde!

Chilcot-rapporten gør dette klart. Vi vidste dette; vi sagde dette. Der var andre, der også sagde det. Men den kendsgerning, at dette nu kommer ud få dage efter Brexit, som en rapport – og jeg så faktisk Blair, der forsøgte at undskylde, og han var noget rystet. Så vi har altså enden på EU; vi har de kollapsende banker, og dette har naturligvis udløst en virkning, hvor Carney, som er chef for Bank of England ... og nu har vi bare penge, som de pumper ud, så meget, som de kan. I USA kalder vi det 'helikopter-penge'. Der findes ikke engang en mekanisme længere, hvor f.eks. centralbankerne opkøber obligationer ... det gider vi ikke længere, det virker ikke mere, for det giver centralbankerne for meget gæld. Nu siger man bare, kom, vi giver dig penge, hvis du bliver hjemme, kaster vi penge ned over dit hus!

Systemet er totalt færdigt. Og dette finder selvfølgelig sted på et tidspunkt, hvor der er en ny bølge af terrorisme, med Bagdad, Bangladesh og netop i dag har der været en bombe i Taiwan på metroen, hvor 21 mennesker kom til skade. De har ikke erklæret det for en terrorhandling, så jeg ved ikke, hvad det drejede sig om. Men Bagdad, 250 døde, premierministeren har indrømmet, og er under ekstremt pres, og hvad er det, Chilcot-rapporten bekræfter? At alt dette er en konsekvens af især Irakkrigen i 2003. En afgørende faktor for at forstå Blair, mener jeg, og nogle af jer husker måske dette; denne britiske skuespillerinde, Helen Mirren, spillede Dronning Elizabeth II og vandt en Oscar; og selv i filmen – og dette er sandt – så er den person, der redder den britiske kongefamilie fra vanære efter Dianas død, hendes mord, Tony Blair. Han var deres mand; det var ham, der fortalte dem, hvad de skulle gøre, hvad de skulle sige, hvordan de skulle håndtere pressen.

De vil måske ofre Tony Blair, og uanset, hvad historien er, så er det ikke let blot at feje ham til side som endnu blot en politiker, vi bare skaffer os af med. Dette er fyren der var gesandt for kvartetten til Mellemøsten.

Jeg vil også gerne sige, og dette er meget vigtigt, at, siden mordet på Gaddafi, og i stigende grad siden Ukraine, har der været en konfrontation med Rusland, og med Kina til en vis grad. NATO er rykket frem mod øst, det er rykket nærmere og nærmere til Ruslands grænse. Lad mig sige én ting: så snart, jeg personligt, i november 2013 hørte, at der var et initiativ for at tage Ukraine ud af den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union og ind i den Europæiske Union, og der var nogle demonstrationer – så vidste jeg, at det var dårligt. For Ukraine repræsenterer noget, som er hjertet af Rusland på dette tidspunkt, ikke, fordi det er Rusland, men man må indse, at Anden Verdenskrig for to tredjedele vedkommende blev udkæmpet i det, der nu er Ukraine og dele af Polen; det var her, russerne konfronterede nazisterne. Jo, det kom også til Moskva; men en enorm del af denne kamp blev udkæmpet i Donbass, i Ukraine, i de områder af Ukraine, der efter krigen blev en del af Polen osv.

Man har en situation ligesom den, man har i Polen netop nu, hvor man har et sindssyg hørefløjspræsidentskab og -regering, og de vil begynde at tænke på at tage territorium tilbage og konfrontere Rusland. Det er udelukket, at Rusland ikke vil respondere på dette. Man måtte være sindssyg og totalt ude af kontrol. Russerne mistede 27 millioner mennesker i Anden Verdenskrig. Der er en grund til, at de kalder det den store, patriotiske krig. I USA kalder man det Anden Verdenskrig, hvis man kan tælle. Der er ting i USA, der går bedre end det; men blandt de yngre generationer? Man vil få vanskeligheder med at finde en person under tyve, der kan fortælle dig, hvilket år, USA gik ind i Anden Verdenskrig. Jeg tør ikke vædde på, hvilken procentdel, der ville svare rigtigt. Og en af de meget vigtige ting, der har udviklet sig – der er to ting, der gør dette anderledes end blot at være et dystert billede, og det

er kineserne. Kineserne repræsenterer nu en økonomisk og politisk fremtid. Og det er ikke blot – de har gjort bemærkelsesværdige ting. 600.000 – 1 million mennesker er blevet løftet ud af fattigdom. Ti tusinder af mil med højhastigheds-jernbaner og andre former for jernbaner, hvor de nu er ved at bevæge sig ind i det indre af landet. De startede Ét bælte, én vej-politikken, den Asiatiske Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank. Deres anskuelse er det, som Xi Jinping kalder win-win-politik; ikke nulsumsspil, ikke geopolitik, men et samarbejde om udvikling af især udviklingslandene. Og det er meget inspirerende for folk, der ser, at, min Gud, de mener det. De spiller ikke bare et spil. Afrikanerne, for det meste. Og jeg siger ikke, at der ikke er problemer, men man har jo en eller anden journalist fra *Washington Post* eller *The Economist*, der rejser ud og siger, føler I ikke, at kineserne kommer og voldtager jer? Og afrikanerne siger 'nej'. De bygger noget. Lad mig give et eksempel. Etiopien. Vi havde en etiopier, der talte ved konferencen (i Berlin), og Etiopien er et meget interessant sted, det er det næststørste land i Afrika, der er omkring 90-95 millioner mennesker. Der var tilsyneladende et tilfælde, hvor en journalist rejste derned og talte med en højtplaceret person i regeringen, og sagde, 'indser I ikke, at I bliver plyndret? Er det ikke det, Kina vil', typisk koloniherre'. Og fyren svarede, 'nej, det mener jeg ikke; vi har ingen råmaterialer'. Jo, de har kaffe, men kaffe er ikke noget særligt i Kina. De bliver ikke udplyndret. Dette er ikke et kolonialistisk foretagende. Så man har altså rent faktisk en modstand, og udvikling, begge dele. Ikke kun det negative. Vi så i Syrien, at der er modstand. Folk vil kæmpe. I Etiopien falder de ikke bare til patten. Man ser dette i Afrika i stigende grad. Man ser det i hele Asien. Der er en modstand, og en løsning.

Og kendsgerningen er den, at Putin har spillet en meget, meget betydningsfuld rolle. En af de ting, jeg mener, har ændret dynamikken således, at man i Vesten får en Brexit fra befolkningen. Man får endda det kaos, vi har i USA – jeg siger

ikke, at kaos er godt; kaos kan føre til helvede. Men hvis man ikke har et reelt lederskab, så vil folk respondere. Man kan ikke sige til folk, 'vær ikke kaotiske'. De vil på et vist tidspunkt sige, ad helvede til med det. Tag USA, med levestandarden, der er ved at bryde sammen, kollapsende infrastruktur; vi er ikke længere den førende nation. Vi kunne stadig væk være en førende nation.

Kina har ført an i udforskning af rummet. Månens bagside, osv. USA plejede at være en førende nation i udforskning af rummet – det er vi ikke mere. Vi har stadig noget, der er blevet tilbage – vi har netop opsendt en satellit for at udforske Jupiter, hvilket er godt – men hvorfor tog det fem år at komme dertil? Fordi vi ikke havde udviklet visse brændstoftyper. Og hvordan bliver satellitten forsynet med energi? Gennem solpaneler. Dette kunne være en endnu mere effektiv mission, hvis vi f.eks. brugte plutonium som brændstof. Men vi gør i det mindste dette. Obama, der så berømt sagde, da han blev spurgt om at tage til Månen, 'Åh, der har vi været!' Det ville jeg ikke engang sige om Grand Canyon, eller om Weis-museet, 'Åh, der har jeg været. Har gjort det.' Under en anden valgbegivenhed var der en, der spurgte ham om fusionsenergi, og han svarede, 'Åh, vi behøver ikke noget af alt det der smarte'. Dette er forskningens fremskudte grænse! Hvis man ikke gør det, hvad gør man så!

Så forskellen i situationen, er, at den måde, som Putin handlede rent strategisk – han har f.eks. været meget åben omkring spørgsmålet om en dialog med Europa, inkl. om Ukraine-situationen. Han tog initiativ i Syrien-situationen, det sandsynligvis mest åbenlyse tilfælde, for ingen forventede, at han ville gå ind i Syrien og rent faktisk åbne for muligheden af at ødelægge ISIS. Hvordan ser USA så lige pludselig ud? Vi er der, og vi støttede ISIS, forstået på den måde, at vi beskyttede dem mod luftangreb ved at blande dem sammen med disse 'moderate' terrorister. Moderate terrorister? 'Det var en mindre smertefuld død'. Det kunne man formodentlig sige. De

hugger ikke hovedet af én; måske bruger de mindre smertefulde metoder, jeg ved det ikke. De er moderate terrorister! Vi støtter dem, og derfor vil man ikke skyde på en fra ISIS, for de står ved siden af – ikke en civil person – men en moderat terrorist! Civile kan vi dræbe. Droneangreb på et par hospitaler, der er i orden. Men lad os ikke gøre en moderat terrorist fortræd. Hvis man ikke gør nar af den slags – man er jo vred, man er indfanget af debatten, hvad skal man sige til en 'moderat terrorist'?

(Mere oversættelse følger. Bliv på kanalen!)

Phil, 36 min., fortsat:

Som vi ved ... en af de ting, der skete i går, som jeg ikke har en fuld rapport over, er, at kongresmedlem Walter Jones sammen med et par andre kongresmedlemmer holdt en pressekonference om disse 28 sider, der ikke er blevet offentliggjort, og som peger på saudernes rolle, sammen med briterne, men her i særdeleshed de 28 sider omhandlende saudernes rolle i [terrorangrebet på World Trade Center] 11. september [2001], og som er nært forestående, og som vil blive et punkt, der intensiverer sagen. Men de krævede den omgående offentliggørelse af de 28 sider; og ét af kongresmedlemmerne, Lynch, sagde faktisk, at, hvis dette ikke sker snart, og senest til 11. september, så vil vi oplæse de 28 sider i kongressalen, der således optages i protokollen. Det er et andet univers. Hvorfor sker det? Jeg tror, det er pga. det, kineserne og russerne laver, for det er sådan, verden fungerer. Alle leder efter en årsag nær ved hjemmet, og forsøg for resten ikke at forudsige det amerikanske præsidentvalg. For vi har Trump, der er et 'wild card', en sindssyg mand ... men hvorfor kom han så langt, som han er – fordi folk er vrede. Folk er oprørte over det, de gennemlever. Vi har Sanders, som folk troede, havde et bedre omdømme, men faktisk – han havde stemt for Irakkrigen osv., og han var et falsum et langt stykke hen ad vejen. Så er der Hillary, der virkelig er dårlig, og hun undersøges nu med denne FBI-ting. Verden



befinder sig i en utrolig urolig tilstand, især i det, vi kalder det transatlantiske område (vesten). Men der er fremskridt i Asien, i Kina, og der er en nyligt valgt filippinsk præsident, der måske er i færd med at trække sig tilbage fra en konfrontation med Kina. Og USA presser på for en konfrontation med Kina over det Sydkinesiske Hav.

Det, som Lyn og Helga siger, i det mindste, som jeg forstår det, er, at, i betragtning af en verden, der befinder sig i denne form for uro, så kan man ikke tage det væk. Noget af det, det foregår i USA – jeg kan ikke vurdere det alt sammen – men blot inden for de seneste par dage, med hvad der svarer til disse opstande, er, at vi har haft en ny runde med politiskudepisoder mod sorte mænd i USA, så protesterne er begyndt igen. Men der er en ustabilitet i situationen, der er global og universel. Vi har netop set åbningen af den sekundære Suezkanal, Panamakanalen åbner, kineserne investerer i det – faktisk er et stort flertal i verden i en position nu, hvor, hvis vi gjorde det, de kan sige, 'London er forbi. Vi gennemfører Glass-Steagall, New York [Wall Street] er forbi. Vi går tilbage til FDR med denne sag, og vi gennemfører win-win-politikken'. Men det, vi må gøre for at få dette til at ske, er, at *vi må ændre vores syn på mennesket*. Vi har i det tyvende århundrede været igennem – og det er Lyns pointe, og hvor jeg kommer lidt frem til Einstein – i det tyvende århundrede er det, der i stigende grad er kommet frem, et syn på mennesket, der grundlæggende set kan reduceres til at være et dyr eller en maskine. Vi har måske – altså, folk går i kirke, i moskeen, folk har andre måder at udtrykke det, de har forskellige former for overbevisninger, som de taler om, spirituelle o. lign., men det siger faktisk ikke noget om, hvad arten af den menneskelige natur beviseligt er. I de fleste tilfælde vil det dreje sig om at opgive mennesket i denne verden, og om, hvad man så kan gøre for at redde sig selv. Hvad enten det nu drejer sig om at være en af 'de udvalgte', eller at komme i himlen; hvad historien nu måtte være. Og så har vi det system, som vi rent faktisk lever

under, og dette står for mig mere end noget andet som det, som Det britiske Imperium vi sige, og hvorfor Obama er så dårlig. Og vi mener stadig, at Obama bør fjernes fra embedet; det ville være et pragtfuldt spark i – buksebagen – uanset, hvor længe han endnu kan sidde ved magten, fem eller syv måneder. Det vigtigste element i Det britiske Imperium, mener jeg, og det er noget, jeg i hvert fald til en vis grad har lært af Lyn, er britisk epistemologi (erkendelsesteori; den menneskelige erkendelses natur, betingelser og grænser). Briternes syn på menneskeheden. Det er darwinisme, i den betydning, at, eftersom der er en evolutionær udvikling, så kan vi reducere mennesker til deres biologi, til at være aber, eller til noget, der stammer fra dyreliv. Eller gå længere endnu: at man kan reproducere menneskelig intelligens med en maskine. Der er nu opstået en hel ny runde af denne tænkning i øjeblikket. Denne idé kommer i bølger, at vi kan producere kunstig intelligens, at vi kan skabe maskiner, der tænker som mennesker. Det er rent ud sagt beviseligt, at man ikke kan. Kurt Gödel beviste det. Vi kan måske på en måde kontrollere biologiske former og skabe visse former for levende organismer, men det ville kræve en total ændring inden for videnskab. Det ville kræve, at man forstod princippet om livet; hvad det er, der gør livet levende. Jeg så et af disse causeriprogrammer med videnskabsfolk, hvor de angiveligt, eller faktisk talte om det, de kaldte kvantebiologi, som har nogle interessant punkter, men den store pointe hen imod slutningen var, at en af disse fyre sagde, 'jamen, det virkelige problem her er, at vi ikke ved, hvad livet er'. Men det her handler alt sammen om kvantebiologi. Og vi ved selvfølgelig virkelig ikke, hvad livet er. Hvad er det for et princip, der reflekteres i en levende organisme, og som giver det retning, formål? Som giver det en egenskab af hensigt? Af en drivkraft fremad ('go-orientation'), det, vi kalder teleologi[1]; endelige formål. Det er, hvad vi har med at gøre med livet; livet er under forandring, det er levende; det gør ting, der ikke er tilfældige. Hvad med menneskeligt liv? Og man hører disse diskussioner, og én af disse fyre vil

indrømme, 'jamen, hvad er bevidsthed?' Og det er ikke blot bevidsthed, men det, som Lyn kalder kreativitet (evnen til at skabe).

Lad mig træde et skridt tilbage og give jer en idé om, hvad denne form for begreb om kreativitet er. For det, Lyndon LaRouche siger, er, at kreativitet er nødvendig. Man kan sige en ting om kreativitet: På en vis måde er kreativitet det, som Leibniz ville kalde 'nødvendigt og tilstrækkeligt'. Den definerer, hvad menneskelige væsner er. Det er en bestemmende egenskab, der viser, at vi ikke er som dyrene. Vi tilhører et andet domæne. Vi plejede at referere til dette som 'transfinit', altså med andre ord, at vi lever i et domæne, der er således, at man ikke kan måle noget som helst af, hvad vi gør, ud fra et standpunkt om et forudgående domæne. Man kan ikke måle noget som helst, der er af menneskelig art, ud fra standpunktet om abe-liv. Der er så mange mærkelige ting om alt det her med dyrene; det er simpelt hen vanvittigt. For det første er chimpanser nogle af de mest afskyelige væsner, du nogen sinde har mødt. De er simpelt hen ondsindede. De slår hinanden ihjel, de æder deres afkom, i modsætning til dette billede, som folk engang yndede at udbrede. Jeg synes, det er mærkeligt, at modsætningen til chimpanser er det, de kalder bonobo-aber, en slags chimpanse af en anden art, den er yndefuld, slank, og hvad er så deres store ting? De har konstant forskelligartede former for sex. De er konstant engageret i seksuel aktivitet, og det gør dem så til en bedre version af chimpansen. Så det er altså det valg, man har. Man kan være en chimpanse og gå rundt og dræbe og føre krig og æde egne unger, eller også kan man være en bonobo, der hænger ned fra et træ og er engageret i sex i flæng hele dagen lang. Det er altså ikke det, der skete.

(Der kommer mere oversættelse. Bliv på kanalen!)

Det interessante; indgangsvinklen til at forstå det, som Lyn siger, er hans fysiske økonomi, fremsat i dens enkleste principper. Og man indser, hvor forskelligt dette er fra den

måde, folk tænker på, til trods for, at det faktisk ikke er særlig kompliceret – jeg skriver ingen formler op. Jeg er alligevel ikke skrap nok til matematikken, og matematik er under alle omstændigheder ikke kreativitet. Hvad var det, Lyn gjorde med den fysiske økonomi? Han gik ud fra det standpunkt, hvad er menneskets forhold, i samfundet, til naturen; hvordan overlever vi? Hvordan reproducerer vi menneskeslægten? Jamen, vi gør noget, der er meget enestående: vi applikerer viden, i form af teknologi, til en evne til, fra naturen, at udtrække ting, der tilsyneladende ikke er der. Selv jæger-samlere – som jægere udgør vi ikke den store mulighed: vi er ikke hurtige, vi har dog en hel del udholdenhed i forhold til andre dyr, så hvis man vil tilbringe sit liv med at jage giraffer i Kalahariørkenen, så er vi nogenlunde udrustet til at gøre det. Men den tankegang, at vi kan overleve som et kødædende dyr, er temmelig langt ude.

Så udviklede vi landbrug. Hvad gjorde vi? Vi tog videnskabelige kundskaber, ikke blot redskaber, men vi lærte visse ting om astronomi – hvem ved, hvor langt tilbage i tiden, der har været astronomi – sandsynligvis mindst et sted mellem 5.000 og 10.000 år. Der er endda fundet hulemalerier, der er 30-40.000, eller endda 50.000 år gamle, hvor der er tegn på kalendere. Men mindst 5 – 10.000 år. Vi anvendte denne videnskab til at ændre vores forhold til naturen. Vi blev i stand til at få ting ud af naturen, der tilsyneladende ikke eksisterede, som f.eks. vores evne til at anvende kobber og tin til at fremstille bronze, til fremstilling af metalredskaber. Og derfra rykkede vi opefter i vores viden om udvikling af metallerne. Det var alt sammen videnskabelige kundskaber, der blev anvendt til teknologi, der forbedrede vores evne – disse ting var der jo ikke bare, man kan ikke finde bronze i et flodleje, og der vokser ikke stål på en bjergside. Hvordan gjorde vi det – var det ved forsøg-og-fejl-metoden? Nej, det, der sker, er, at visse mennesker får en idé, de har en forestilling, men det er en ubøjelig forestilling; de vil finde ud af, hvordan de skal bruge deres

tanker om det, der findes, til at udtrække ting, der tilsyneladende ikke er der for sanserne at se, og som i realiteten, i den form, i hvilken vi bruger det, ikke findes. Vi skaber eksistensen af i det mindste tætheden af visse materialer, osv., gennem skabende videnskabelig nyskabelse.

Hvis vi ikke gjorde det, ville vi ikke overleve. Vi ville ikke klare det, for vi ville løbe tør for ressourcer, ikke, fordi ressourcen ikke er der – det berømte eksempel er, at der i én kubikmeter jord findes praktisk taget ethvert mineral, man kunne ønske sig, men man kan ikke udvinde det, fordi det kræver en enorm mængde energi at udvinde det. Så, i takt med, at ens energi støder mod visse barrierer, må man udvikle ny videnskab, mere videnskabelig viden for at udvikle nye teknologier, der giver os nye ressourcer. Som vi altid har sagt, olie var ikke en ressource i 1400-tallet. Hvis man fandt olie i sin baghave, var det dårligt nyt. Det blev man ikke rig af, det blev man meget fattig af. Og så blev det til rigdom. Hvorfor? Det var ikke land-rigdom. Rigdom ligger ikke i jordbesiddelse.

Hvis man tænker over dette, hvad betyder det så; hvad er det, man i realiteten ønsker at skabe i en økonomi? Flere genstande – det har man til en vis grad brug for. Det, man virkelig har brug for, er flere mennesker. For, i takt med, at disse udviklinger finder sted, så øges uddannelsesniveaue, den forventede levetid, adgang til levestandard, og jeg mener ikke bare en levestandard, hvor man lever godt. Hvis man f.eks. ønsker at skabe børn, der kan, skal vi sige, arbejde i en moderne økonomi, kan man ikke berøve dem adgang til visse af et sådant samfunds produkter. Hvordan begynder et barn at lære om elektricitet, om at kontrollere lys og andre ting? Det lærer, at det har en vis magt over disse genstande. Og magten kommer visse steder fra. Det lærer også at relatere socialt til andre mennesker, fordi det har brug for disse mennesker for at kunne håndtere disse objekter og denne magt. Hvis han eller hun ikke har det, er han berøvet evnen til at forstå den

videnskab, teknologi og det samfund, han eller hun lever i. Hvis man producerer fattigdom, er det ikke kun fattigdom, man producerer, men man underminerer udviklingen af selve samfundet og de kreative evner.

For det andet, så er kreativitet det træk, der definerer den menneskelige art. For nu at bruge et filosofisk-teknisk udtryk: Rent ontologisk er det menneskets natur at være kreativt, at vi har evnen til at være kreative. Vi kan udtrykke ideer, der frembringer kreativitet. Ideer, der udvikler andre mennesker. Hvis vi ikke har det, så agerer vi ikke i overensstemmelse med den menneskelige arts natur. Jeg tenderer – jeg er ikke en person, der har en vis baggrund – mod at fastslå den pointe, at dette er nødvendigt. Det er skønhed, hvis man tænker over det, at mennesker – ethvert menneske – har dette, og at det er en moralsk forpligtelse at give børn adgang til dette. Og jo mere videnskabelig udvikling, desto flere børn har man brug for, desto mere kreativitet har man brug for, og desto mere har man brug for at tænke på fremtiden.

De fleste af os – hvis vi ønsker at besvare nogle af de teologiske spørgsmål: Hvad er mit bidrag, hvad er min sjæl, hvad er det, jeg efterlader mig? Man efterlader en fremtid til de fremtidige generationer. Man bidrager til denne fremtid. Ideer, undervisning, udvikling, at redde mennesker. Og ikke alene det, for man må gøre noget, mener jeg, man må ikke alene skabe en fremtid; men man må skabe en fremtid på en sådan måde, at disse mennesker vil have evnen til at skabe en fremtid. Man må på en vis måde se ud over horisonten, længere end til horisonten til ting, som man ikke kan se; men at man har en følelse af, at man må agere på det, man må give de mennesker, der befinder sig på denne horisont, en garanti for, at de vil blive i stand til at se ud over den næste horisont. Og så begynder det i det mindste at nærme sig formålet med samfundet.

Dét er Lyns fysiske økonomi; det er i det mindste ét udtryk

for det. Vi er af nødvendighed kreative, og med mindre vi får denne idé ud til andre nationer, andre folkeslag, til os selv, vil det ikke lykkes os at gennemføre det, vi må gøre lige nu for at garantere en fremtid. Vi vil stå over for krig. Lyn har sagt, briterne bluffer, Obama bluffer; vi kan ikke gå op imod russerne på de østlige grænser med 4.000 tropper, eller hvor meget, det er. Men vi leger med ilden. Hvis vi tror, vi kan tyrannisere russerne, kineserne, presse dem, tvinge dem til at indvilge, efter det, vi gjorde mod dem i 1990'erne, er det højst usandsynligt.

Hvad vil det så ske? Jamen, enten provokerer vi russerne til et angreb, hvilket ikke er udelukket, hvis de tror, de selv vil blive angrebet – et atomangreb – eller også, hvis vi bluffer og bluffer, og vores bluff afsløres, ja, så affyrer vi, af ren desperation. Det er ikke bare 'krig ved et uheld', som man skal være bange for, selv om det er en mulighed.

Det er ét aspekt. Det andet aspekt er det, jeg fortalte om USA. Vi befinder os på en nedadgående kurs – jeg vil ikke gå i detaljer. Vi har høje rater af afhængighed af smertemedicin, osv. Vi har en voksende fattigdomsandel i befolkningen. Vi har ikke en infrastruktur, der er under udvikling. Vi har meget lidt videnskab tilbage, og det, der er tilbage – jeg vil fortælle noget, bare for at fortælle en vittighed. Vi plejede at sige, vi skaber raketforskere, og de arbejder på Wall Street! De hyrer nogle af topmatematikerne, videnskabsfolk, raketingeniører osv., de hyrede dem i '80'erne og '90'erne til at udføre disse fantastiske algoritmer for finansverdenen, for en derivat; man skal være et geni for at regne det ud ... jeg bruger ordet bredt. Nu er Wall Street på spanden, så hvor bliver disse fyre hyret? De veluddannede fysikere? De bliver hyret til sportshold! Og hvad bliver de hyret til at gøre? De bliver hyret til at udføre endnu mere sofistikerede dataanalyser og fysiologi af atleten for at få dem til at præstere bedre og bedre og bedre og blive i stand til at vælge dem, der virkelig er de bedste spillere. Dette gælder for

sport i USA, jeg kan nævne de sportshold, der har hyret nogle af disse fyre. Sikke et utroligt spild! Det er sandt; det er ikke noget, jeg står og finder på. Vi producerer knap nok tilstrækkeligt med videnskabsfolk, og så udregner de data for det lokale fodboldhold.

Det, som Lyn taler om, er ægte kreativitet, og det er derfor, han refererer til Einstein. For at komme til pointen – men før jeg kommer til det, vil jeg fastslå en anden pointe, for det er vigtigt for at forstå Einstein. For spørgsmålet er: Hvordan skaber man kreativitet? Det, vi virkelig har behov for at reproducere, er kreative mennesker. Den virkelige værdi i en økonomi er raten af produktion af kreative mennesker, af videnskabelige og kunstneriske genier. Det er det mål, hvormed man måler sig selv. Hvordan gør man det? Man vil sige, at man uddanner folk videnskabeligt – ikke matematisk. De store videnskabsfolk var ikke matematikere, i modsætning til, hvad folk tror. Matematik er destruktiv, medmindre den anvendes som et tillæg til ægte videnskab. For hvad er matematik andet end et sæt af regler, som man må blive indenfor, hvilket betyder, at man ikke kan frembringe noget nyt? Man kan ikke skabe noget.

Hvordan frembringer man så kreativitet? Det er her, klassisk kunst kommer ind ... man kan ikke bare sige til et barn, gå ud og opdag noget! Man må have en idé om, hvordan intellektet må fungere for at gøre en opdagelse. Af hvilken art, den menneskelige natur er. Noget får man fra historien, ved at se på, hvordan opdagelser blev gjort, ved at gentage videnskabelig aktivitet. *Men kernen i det får man fra klassisk kunst.* For, hvad er det, man gør, især inden for musik, men også med poesi og drama; de har hver deres aspekt. Men hvad er det, man gør? Man skaber et vist tilsyneladende paradoks, en tilsyneladende problemstilling, hvor, hvis folk fortsætter med at agere, eller musikeren fortsætter ud ad det spor, han følger, i kompositionen, eller i opførelsen af kompositionen, så vil den bryde sammen, den vil ende med at lyde som støj.



Eller også bliver den bare kedelig, for noget af det, der sker, er, at man bare bliver ved med at gentage sig selv. Måske med en let ændring, men hvis man lytter til visse former for musik, som rapp-musik, men selv folkemusik. Et af problemerne, hvis man kun har folkemusik, den kan være smuk, har måske dejlige melodier, men den har tendens til at være repeterende. Så, hvis man ikke har en fornemmelse for at skabe noget nyt af den kanoniserede musik, så sidder man fast. Og hvad gør klassisk musik? Bortset fra korformen, den sociale form osv., så gør den det, at den af dig kræver, at du skaber noget, der aldrig hidtil er blevet hørt. Eller at man i det mindste opfører den, og i processen med at opføre den, så repeterer man på en vis måde i sit intellekt den oprindelige opdagelse. Hvad havde komponisten i tankerne, og hvad gjorde han eller hun, der ændrede musikkens natur og udtrykte den fundamentale idé om skabelsen af ideer? Musik er på en vis måde en meta-disciplin. Man skaber ideer om, hvordan ideer skabes. Man ser dette i kor, det er derfor, polyfoni er så vigtigt. Det er derfor, det veltempererede klaver var så vigtigt. For det gav grader af frihed i udviklingen af og udtrykket for nye ideer.

(Der kommer mere oversættelse. Bliv på kanalen!)

Dette er én ting, som Einstein, og især hans generation, men som Einstein vidste. Han var en rimeligt habil violinist. Nogle mennesker siger, at han ikke var særlig god, nogle siger, at han var virkelig god; jeg har ingen anelse. Men iflg. alle overleveringer var han en rimeligt habil violinist. Det, der var vigtigt for ham, var, at musikken var afgørende for hans evne til at tænke. Ikke sådan, at han gav sig til at spille violin, og så følte han sig afslappet, og så fik han en idé. Men det var sådan, at musikken var den måde, han tænkte bedst på. [Max] Planck var lige ved at blive koncertpianist, og det var først ved et givent tidspunkt, han besluttede, det var bedre for ham at blive fysiker. Og i den generation spillede de fleste af dem, Nurdst, de spillede alle, Aronfels,

de var ikke alle store videnskabsmænd; men denne kultur med at udvikle ideer, gennemarbejde nye ideer, gøre nye ideer gældende var rodfæstet i klassisk kultur, i Schiller. Einsteins moder var f.eks. en stor læser af Schiller, Heine, og hans fader var vist også en stor tilhænger af Heine. Det var i heldigste fald den kultur, der blev udviklet. Og det var dette, der gjorde det muligt for sådan en som Einstein at blive en stor tænker. Han var f.eks. ikke nogen stor matematiker; han var ikke en dårlig matematiker, men han var ikke en stor matematiker; han var fysiker. Han havde sine berømte 'gedanken'-eksperimenter: Han skabte i sine tanker visse betragtninger, og han spurgte dem, hvad er løsningen på problemet i disse betragtninger, eller hvad var det, der reflekteredes? Hvad, om jeg kan rejse lige så hurtigt som en lysbølge? Ville universet stoppe? Er det muligt at rejse hurtigere ... Det var ikke løsningen, men det gjorde det muligt for ham at tænke over ting, som han ellers ikke ville have tænkt over. Og sluttelig fik han nogle afgørende ideer, om lysets hastighed var konstant, men mere endnu, det, at love, fysiske love, var universelt gældende. Det er det, relativitetsprincippet ... relativitetsprincippet er det modsatte af det, man tror, det er, og som det ofte fremstilles, var blot ens perspektiv. Nej, hele pointen med Einstein, i betragtning af nogle af tidens problemer, der er af mere teknisk art, om elektromagnetisme, teorien om æteren osv., dukkede der visse problemer op. Og Einstein sagde, vi må have et system, hvor dette systems love gælder for hele universet, for alt! Uanset, hvad den uniforme bevægelse er, uanset, hvad accelerationen var, og uanset raten af forandring, det var generel relativitet. Så det var ikke relativitet, men i virkeligheden, hvad er de universelle principper, som jeg kan sige er sande uanset hvilken bevægelse, der foregår? Og dette var, hvad han anvendte på grundlæggende set alting. Og hans indsats inden for enhedsfeltet var ikke én enkelt ligning, men det var et forsøg på at finde de underliggende, universelle principper, der styrede alle de tilsyneladende spørgsmål i universet.

Elektromagnetisme, tyngdekraft, den stærke og svage kraft, og atomkerneniveauet. Og tænk over, hvad der foregår i det 20. århundrede. I det 20. århundrede er der et angreb på denne form for tænkning. Fra Bertrand Russel, til en vis grad fra Hilbert; og det, der udgjorde en del af angrebet, var, at vi må holde os til matematikken. Lad os aksiomatisere matematikken.

(Der kommer mere oversættelse. Bliv på kanalen.)

---

[1] filosofisk anskuelse, hvor man mener, at det, der sker i verden, har et formål, en hensigt.

---

**USA: Michelle Rasmussen fra  
Schiller Instituttet i  
Danmark  
rapporterer om Instituttets  
seneste interventioner  
imod NATO under Folkemødet på  
Bornholm; se video.**

Michelle Rasmussen, Schiller Institute of Denmark, reporting on thre recent intervention of the Institue against NATO at 'Folkemødet på Bornholm' @ 9:02 in the video,

Asking question about prevention of nuclear war to Diane Sare.

---

# Menneskeheden står ved en skillevej, af Helga Zepp-LaRouche. Åbningstale (dansk) ved konference i New York, i anledning af Mindedagen for faldne soldater

*Vi står på kanten af atomkrig.*

*Alt dette finder sted over for flere akutte, strategiske kriser: én på den russiske grænse i Østeuropa; en anden i Sydvestasien; endnu én omkring Korea; og atter igen en anden omkring Det sydkinesiske Hav. Hver af disse konflikter kunne blive udløsermekanismen for en global atomkrig. Og folk flipper virkelig ud, for det forestående NATO-topmøde, der vil finde sted i begyndelsen af juli i Warszawa, er planlagt til at manifestere alle mulige former for forandringer, som at flytte fire store bataljoner med 1000 tropeenheder i hver ind i de baltiske lande; som, på dagen, hvor dette julitopmøde finder sted, da at forbinde den nyligt installerede BMD-*

komponent (ballistisk missilforsvar) i Rumænien med krigsskibene af Aegis-klassen, som allerede er deployeret i det baltiske område og i Sortehavet og andetsteds. Og dette er nu i færd med meget hurtigt at nå til et punkt, hvor Rusland har sagt, at de ikke kan tolerere en fortsat opsætning af dette ballistiske missilsystem, fordi det tydeligvis er rettet mod Rusland, og det tilsigter tydeligvis at ødelægge Ruslands gengældelsesevne, og det har aldrig, hvad der ellers altid har været påskuddet, det har aldrig været rettet mod den angivelige missiltrussel fra Iran.

Allerede for to eller tre år siden har det russiske militær fremstillet videoanimationer, der viser, at de systemer, der nu er installeret i Polen, i Rumænien, i Bulgarien, i Spanien og på disse krigsskibe, i virkeligheden er tiltænkt at skulle ramme Rusland. Men især efter, at man har indgået en aftale mellem P5+1, med Iran, og som hæmmer faren for missiler, der kommer fra Iran, findes et sådant påskud ikke længere. Det er nu blevet bemærket af sådanne personer som professor Stephen Cohen fra New Yorks universitet, at dette meget klart har til hensigt at lancere en krig. En anden, meget betydningsfuld taler fra Rusland, general Leonid Ivashov, sagde, at det, vi nu ser, er klare skridt som forberedelse til krig.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

# Konference i Manhattan, New York, med Lyndon LaRouche og Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Et levende mindesmærke – med afslutning af krig og terrorisme

*Helga Zepp-LaRouche: "Idet vi taler om og tænker på de soldater, der døde i krige, vil jeg gerne understrege, at, i en tid med atomvåben burde det stå enhver på denne planet klart, at krig ikke længere kan være en mulighed til løsning af nogen som helst konflikt. For, hvis det skulle komme til det utænkelige, at der blev en udveksling af atomvåben – tja, der findes nu nogle teorier, der siger, at man kan have en 'begrænset' atomkrig – en regional atomkrig, der kan vindes. Men jeg tror, at enhver, der har undersøgt sagen lidt mere i dybden, som for eksempel at læse, hvad Ted Postol har skrevet, der uddybende har argumenteret for, hvorfor noget sådant som en begrænset atomkrig ikke findes, og ikke kan findes. Af den simple grund, at enhver, der antager dette, overser den fundamentale forskel mellem en konventionel krig, hvor målet er at slå fjenden, afvæbne ham og så stoppe krigen; men, med anvendelse af atomvåben vil alle eksisterende våben blive brugt, og de vil blive brugt omgående. Og skulle det komme til dette, ville det betyde civilisationens omgående udslettelse."*

New York, 28. maj 2016 – Engelsk udskrift.

Tune this Memorial Day weekend **at 12:30 pm eastern Saturday** for a conference in Manhattan featuring live participation from Lyndon and Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

## TRANSCRIPT

DENNIS SPEED: We are going to begin today this Memorial Day Weekend with this special presentation. We talk and have been speaking at several of these meetings for the past several weeks about the idea of a so-called living memorial. This was an idea that Mr. Lyndon LaRouche initially expressed in a response to matters that have been very much in the news recently concerning 9/11. But also recently, if only a few weeks ago, a Victory in Europe Day or Victory over Fascism Day. This was also the theme of the Immortal Regiment demonstrations that were done in Russia and in other places. However, there's a bigger idea between on the idea of the living memorial we'd like to point out. When you talk about China and the Second World War, most Americans have no idea that there may have been as many as 50 million civilian casualties in China during the Second World War. Most Americans have no idea that the official counts for Russia, for the Soviet Union, are between 24 and 27 million dead. And so, when we speak about the idea of the Second World War, and we think about, for example, the fact that there were countries like India, that were colonized by the British, didn't have the freedoms, that they were being told to fight *for* in that war.

The true issues behind what the keynote speaker of this morning is going to be talking about are left unrealized. It's been well over, now, 25 years that Helga LaRouche and Lyndon LaRouche led a campaign, which at different times had slightly different names. But it was a campaign that all veterans will understand. The campaign for the World Land-Bridge, first called the Eurasian Triangle, then called the Productive Triangle, and then the New Silk Road, and now called the World Land-Bridge, is the only real, living memorial you can give to the people who died, not merely during the Second World War, but in many, many other wars, and in the wars that are continuing today.



There are recent developments of a very important nature in this area, but there is also the extraordinary danger of war, a global war that can wipe out humanity. So we thought it was important this Memorial Day to remind people that the idea of fighting wars, is to end all war; and that that's the only way that you can truly celebrate the contributions and sacrifices that people make. And so, the idea that Helga LaRouche and Lyndon LaRouche put forward, the World Land-Bridge, *this idea*, that is the idea and the only idea that is the actual appropriate means by which we can, I think, even begin to think about the importance of the deaths and the sacrifices that veterans all over the world have made to bring us to this moment where we are capable of ending war forever on our planet.

It's always my honor and privilege to introduce, on these occasions, Helga LaRouche, the founder and chairman of the Schiller Institute, who will now address us. Helga?

HELGA LAROUCHE: Hello. (applause) Dear members of the LaRouche PAC, guests of the Schiller Institute, dear friends, it is a great pleasure for me to talk to you today. And as we are talking and thinking about the soldiers who died in wars, I want to stress that in the time of thermonuclear weapons, it should be clear to anybody on this planet that war cannot be an option anymore to solve any conflict. Because if it would come to the unthinkable that you would have the exchange of nuclear weapons, well, there are some theories, right now, that you could have a limited nuclear war – a winnable, regional, nuclear war.

But I think that anybody who has studied the matter a little bit more in depth, like, for example, reading the writings of Ted Postol, who has made the very elaborated argument why such a thing as a limited nuclear war does not and cannot exist. Simply because, anybody who assumes that, overlooks the fundamental difference between conventional war, where the aim is to defeat your enemy, to disarm him, and then to stop the

war; but with the use of nuclear weapons, it is the logic of such a war that once it starts, all existing weapons will be used and they will be used instantly. And if it would come to this point, it would be the immediate extinction of civilization.

And I think that was clearly understood at the height of the Cold War. You had the Mutual Assured Destruction doctrine, where it was very clear that either we survived together or we all die together. But that MAD strategy has been eroded since quite some time; because now you have all kinds of scenarios with the idea of winning war by having smarter, smaller, leaner, more usable, more precise, nuclear weapons and delivery systems, and that therefore you could use them. But that is now a mortal danger to civilization. We have been warning of that quite some time ago. We made a movie called, "Unsurvivable." We made many speeches about it, and we were almost, with few other people, the lonely callers in the desert. But now, in the last several weeks, there is a sudden eruption of awareness of many people who are now speaking out, warning that things have gone completely haywire.

This is all happening in front of several acute strategic crises: one on the Russian border in Eastern Europe; another one in Southwest Asia; still another one around Korea; and another one around the South China Sea. Each of these conflicts could become the trigger point for a global nuclear war. And people are really freaking out, because the upcoming NATO summit, which will take place at the beginning of July in Warsaw, is scheduled to manifest all kinds of changes, like moving four major battalions of 1,000 troops each into the Baltic countries; of linking at the date of that July summit, the recently installed BMD (ballistic missile defense) component in Romania with the Aegis class destroyers which are deployed already in the Baltics and the Black Sea and elsewhere. And that is reaching very quickly a point where Russia has said that they cannot tolerate a continuous

building of this ballistic missile system, because it's clearly aimed at Russia, and it's clearly aimed to take out the second strike capability of Russia, and it has never been what always was the pretext, it has never been against the supposed missile threat from Iran.

Now already two or three years ago, the Russian military had produced video animations showing that the systems installed now in Poland, in Romania, in Bulgaria, in Spain, and on these warships, are really assigned to hit Russia. But especially after the P5+1 deal with Iran containing the danger of missiles coming from Iran, has been agreed upon, there is no more such pretext. Now it has been noted by such people, like the New York University professor Stephen Cohen, that this is very clearly with the intent to launch a war. Another very important speaker from Russia, General Leonid Ivashov, said what we are seeing right now are clear steps in preparation for war.

Now it is very significant that even in Germany, somebody who I would characterize as a staunch Atlanticist, somebody belonging absolutely to the mainstream establishment, last week called a very important article in the conservative daily newspaper *Die Welt* with the headline, "No Protocol Will Save Us From Nuclear War." And there he talks about the modernization of nuclear weapons; the fact that they are supposedly less, even so, one has to say that the Obama administration has reduced less nuclear weapons from the stockpile than any other post-Cold War administration before, and the rate of reduction has been slowing down significantly. Now what this Michael Stuermer notes is that people should not assume that because these nuclear weapons become fewer, smaller, that this is good news. To the contrary, it is more reason to worry; because the very idea that these weapons are usable is lowering the threshold of them actually being used. And then he says, the problem is that during the Cold War, the military and political leadership had a very clear

understanding of what Mutual Assured Destruction would mean, namely the annihilation of all of mankind. But we have now new generations of both political and military leadership, who don't even pay attention to it anymore. And he said, all these almost fatal incidents, which are taking place now almost every day either over the Baltic Sea, or in the Black Sea, or in the South China Sea, they would have, in former times, put the alarm clocks to the highest noise possible; because people would have recognized how quickly such an accidental almost-incident could lead to the global war. And other statements in the recent months have made very clear that both the system of NATO and of Russia are all the time on launch-on-warning, and therefore, the actual decision-making time of any side, either the President of the United States or in that case the Russian President, have is about 3 to 6 minutes, at best half an hour. So we are sitting on a potential Armageddon, which if people would just think about it, they would really do everything possible to stop that.

Now there is right now a growing awareness of this. There was a hearing in the US Senate where Senator Feinstein commented on the fact that the United States is now committing \$1 trillion in the next decades to modernize the nuclear arsenals, including the tactical nuclear weapons, the B-61-12, which are stationed mostly in Europe; that makes the idea of using these weapons more within reach and that alone is utterly immoral because of the implication that it could lead to the extinction of civilization.

We have a similar situation like that in Europe, right now, in the South China Sea. There is a lot of propaganda that China is supposedly aggressively taking land. Nothing from that could be further from the truth. All that China is doing is, they put installations on some of these islands which historically they have claims to going back to the 9th Century, and which every other country in the region, the Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam, they are all doing the same

thing since a long time. And not one ship has been prevented, a cargo ship, from ever travelling. So the whole argument that this is a violation of the freedom of navigation, which has been put forward by the United States, is simply not true. And all the incidents were caused by violations of U.S. ships in the 12-mile zone of these islands or over-flights; which is also a breach of the code of such behavior.

So we are really at the edge; and I must say I got a very, very eerie feeling, when I got reports that Obama, before he went to Hiroshima, not only did not apologize for throwing these bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, for which there was, in reality, no reason. It was not that which saved a million lives of American soldiers, which was the official narrative of the Truman Administration. It was very well known that Japan had already negotiated with the Vatican a resolution and capitulation; so the throwing of the bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki was simply to establish the principle of *Schrecklichkeit*; to demonstrate to the Soviet Union at that point what the power of nuclear weapons would be.

So, Obama did not apologize, which is really telling already; but in an interview with the Japanese TV he said, when he was asked what he thought about this throwing of bombs on Hiroshima, he said, "Well I have been a President now for seven and a half years, and having been a wartime President myself, I can understand that presidents, under those conditions could be forced to make such decisions." I think people better wake up to where we are really at.

We have no reason to go to war. Russia is not aggressive; don't believe it for one second. Every step Russia has been taking, especially since the effort to pull Ukraine into the EU Association agreement, which was the beginning of the Ukraine crisis; which was unacceptable because Yanukovich, at the time, fled and left and reacted so strongly from the EU Summit, because he realized that that would have given NATO control over Ukraine. And it would have opened up the Russian

market for all the EU products, which was unacceptable for Russia. So, he cancelled the agreement.

Then the Maidan was sprung against the Ukrainian government. Then you had the coup on the 21st of February 2014, which was a coup by Nazis, which, everybody knew they were going back to the Stepan Bandera tradition. So the West went along with that. That led to the terrible conditions inside east Ukraine; and as a reaction to all of this Russia then annexed Crimea. People saying Russia was aggressive in taking the Crimea is wrong; because Russia reacted each single step as Russia reacted to the whole breaking of the promises which were given to Gorbachov, but also to other people at the time when the Soviet Union disintegrated, that NATO would not expand its troops to the border of Russia. Then you had the color revolution, the sanctions, all of this has been correctly characterized by Russia as being forms of a hybrid war which is already going on; which has the ultimate aim of regime change in Moscow. As Madame Albright and the former Green Foreign Minister of Germany, Joschka Fischer, said at one point, Russia has too big a territory and too many raw materials; as if it could be allowed to exploit these raw materials all by itself.

The same kind of geopolitical intention for regime change really exists against China, which I don't want to elaborate now, we can do it in the discussion if people want. But what I'm saying is that neither Russia nor China are aggressive. Don't believe these media lies which are part of a pre-war propaganda. As a matter of fact, the absolute opposite is true. China has started a policy which is a war avoidance policy; and actually, the only perspective to overcome geopolitics which has been put by anybody on the table. Back in September 2013 when Xi Jinping announced in Kazakhstan the New Silk Road, this was a policy in the tradition of the ancient silk road, which 2000 years ago, during the Han administration was an exchange of goods, of culture, of ideas.

And it led to a tremendous increase in the prosperity of all the nations participating in the Silk Road at that time; and what China is now offering with the New Silk Road, is doing exactly the same thing.

This project, which is now almost three years old, in September it will be three years since it was started, is now already involving 70 countries, mainly in Asia, along the ancient Silk Road, but it is also now reaching out to the ASEAN countries, to Iran, to Africa, to Egypt, to India. This is now a project which is pursuing a completely different principle. It is not the casino economy of the trans-Atlantic sector; but it is the idea to build infrastructure, to have a banking system associated with it which is not investing in high-risk speculation, but providing the necessary credits to solve the incredible lack of infrastructure which was the result of the policies of the IMF, the World Bank, who deliberately denied Third World countries access to credit for infrastructure.

The New Silk Road policy, and the banking system which is associated with it, the AIIB, the New Development Bank, and the new Shanghai Cooperation Bank which was just started, also the Maritime Silk Road Fund, the Silk Road Fund, the Bank of the SAG countries, the South Asian countries, all of these banks represent a completely different model of banking and economic cooperation. And they have invited the United States to join. Xi Jinping repeatedly said, this is an open concept for every country on the planet. We want to have a win-win perspective, where naturally, China has its advantages; but every other country has their own advantages if they participate.

Now, where does the war danger come from? Why is the United States, and the EU and Great Britain, why are they not simply not joining? Well, the problem is the British Empire. The problem is that the United States, in reality, is run by the idea that there must be a unipolar world run on the basis of

the special relationship between the British Empire and the United States. And unfortunately President Obama has completely bought into this idea, which is really a continuation of the Neo-Con policy, which was presented by such people as Wolfowitz, Perl, already at the end of the '90s. They called it the Project for a New American doctrine. And that is the idea, that, with the collapse of the Soviet Union, there is only one super-power left, and that super-power has the right to, basically, deploy militarily around the globe; that that super-power will not allow any nation or group of nations to bypass the United States in terms of economic, political, or military power.

Now the problem is, that unipolar world, in reality, does not exist anymore. Because China is rising, all of Asia is rising. China is already producing a lot more high technology goods for exports than the United States. They are producing more scientists, more engineers. They are just much more future oriented, as you can see by the most fantastic space program China has, while NASA has been dismantled. And the problem is that not only China is rising, but many countries in Asia are rising. India, for example, India has the largest economic growth rate in the world, about 8%. Other countries are totally committed to being modern, middle class countries by 2020 or 2025, such as Malaysia; or even Ethiopia wants to be very soon a normal, developed country. This is happening and you cannot stop that desire for development of all these nations around the globe.

Now, the problem is that the trans-Atlantic sector is about to blow up financially. You just had the conclusion of the G-7 meeting. The G-7 is supposedly the most important economic countries, or that's what they think. In reality, their influence is shrinking; so that even the German tabloid, *Bild Zeitung*, which is read by 8 million people every day, had a banner headline saying that the G-7 summit was the summit of the seven dwarves. That was a correct characterization, and



the only reasonable person at that G-7 summit, was, to a big surprise, Japanese Prime Minister Abe. Because he went into the summit after coming back from a visit to Sochi, where he met extensively with President Putin, and concluded many, many economic deals; gas and oil in the far east of Russia and many other such projects, which he did despite enormous pressure from the Obama Administration not to do. He came into the summit and said, "Look, we have to discuss the fact that the western financial system is about to have a crisis as big as 2008," the crisis of Lehman Brothers.

The problem was that did fall into deaf ears. Obama said, no, no such thing, we are in an upswing. So the final communique of that summit said the upswing is continuing, we are all doing fine. Now nothing could be further from the truth. Because right now, the too-big-to-fail banks, if one of these banks would bust, the entire system could evaporate. You have right now the ridiculous debate around helicopter money. That is the idea that the last measure of the Central banks is to print money electronically, like throwing money notes out of helicopters over cities, to prevent a crash from happening, which was the crazy idea of Ben Bernanke many years ago, but they are now doing it.

They have negative interest rates. They are issuing hundred-year bonds. If you want to give a donation to the bank, then buy a hundred-year bond, because what happens with this bond in one hundred years is a big illusion. It will evaporate, not exist; and if you sell such a bond before the hundred-year term is up, you will lose a lot of money by doing so. So it is a complete swindle to just try to get people who have savings to invest in the banking machine. The fact that people are buying these bonds, shows you that the confidence in the markets has really shrunk to an abysmal point.

This is the real war danger. Because you have people in the trans-Atlantic world who are absolutely determined to not allow Asia rising; who are about to commit exactly the mistake

the former Joint Chief of Staff General Dempsey warned of many times, to fall into the Thucydides trap. That was the conflict between Sparta and Athens in ancient Greece, where the fear of the one of the rise of the other led to the Peloponnesian War and finally to the destruction of the Greek empire. And Greece has never regained the importance it had at that time. Dempsey had warned that the United States should not make the same mistake; but that is exactly what is happening.

You have right now many, many changes in the world which are taking place with an absolute rapid speed. As I said, Japan is, right now, swinging towards the BRICS coalition, the Silk Road coalition. And, obviously, if Japan has very good relations now with Russia, that is a good stepping stone to improve relations with China as well. The Indian Prime Minister, Modi, was just in Iran; and concluded together with President Rouhani and the President of Afghanistan, Ghani, long-term investments into the Chabahar port industrial zone, which is part of extending the Silk Road from China to Iran and from there to India and to Afghanistan.

Now, the former President, Karzai, had already stated at a conference in New Delhi in March, that the only way Afghanistan can be pacified is by making Afghanistan a hub of trade and commerce for the New Silk Road connection between Asia and Europe. The President of India, Mukherjee, was just in China for a four-day visit, also concluding many, many deals. He made a beautiful speech referring to the long, ancient cultural collaboration and exchanges between China and India; and he said, "If our two nations," which are the biggest in the world in terms of population, they together are more than 2.5 billion people, "If our two countries work together, there is nothing we cannot accomplish on this Earth."

So, you have right now two completely different sets of policies. You have the trans-Atlantic world being still in fear of this unipolar control, which is preparing for war;

however, people in Europe [are] freaking out about it. There is a big discussion about ending the sanctions; there was a meeting in the French National Assembly, voting against it. Just yesterday, there was another meeting in the Senate in France in a commission, also voting against sanctions. Italian Prime Minister Renzi is against sanctions, and he's going in June to the St. Petersburg economic summit; which is clearly not what the United States would like to see. And in Germany, half (or even more) of the country is in favor of ending the sanctions; and right now, people realize they have to make a choice. Do they stay in the war machine in the trans-Atlantic world, or do they side with those countries which represent the future?

We have right now a branching point in history. Don't think that this very quickly changing situation will last forever. I think the decision of which direction mankind will go will be made in the coming weeks; in the month of June and not much beyond that. There is a war danger for this summer; people are talking about a danger of war with Russia for 2017. There is a book by a neo-con out with that title. People are very worried that this summer the crisis in the South China Sea may explode, or be exploded. I think there comes a point of no return.

So, we have to really think of what can be a way out. Let me bring in one other problem. In Europe right now, we are in really a complete turmoil because you have the influx of the largest refugee crisis since the end of World War II. Last year, there were about 2 million refugees coming to Europe; this year it's expected to be a little bit less, due to the fact that the EU is now committing a murderous policy by using the military means of Frontex driving the refugees back. Many of them drowning in the Mediterranean, and making extremely dirty deals with Turkey and with Saudi Arabia to help them to prevent the refugees from entering the EU. This will not work; it already has led to a complete discreditation of the

EU; no one from the EU should talk anymore about humanitarian values, or even human values, when they are committing such murderous policies against the refugees. But it should be obvious that you will not solve that problem by building new walls around every country; that is the end of the EU anyway. And also not walls around the outer borders of the EU. But you need to eliminate the real reason why people are risking their lives with a 50% chance they might die to get to Europe; because they are running away from wars and hunger and other catastrophes in Southwest Asia and in Africa. In the case of southwest Africa and Libya, it's clearly the result of American and British wars, NATO wars which were all based on lies; which has led to a complete explosion of southwest Asia. And in the case of Africa, it's the result of 50 years of induced increased death rates because of the conditionalities of the IMF.

Now, there is a way out. As I said, now China, India, Iran are all working to extend the Silk Road into Iran, Afghanistan; and the obvious idea is that we need a Marshall Plan-Silk Road approach towards the entire southwest Asia region – from Afghanistan to the Mediterranean, from the Caucuses to the Persian Gulf. We have to have a real development strategy to conquer the desert in this region through the development of new fresh water; peaceful nuclear energy for desalinization of large amounts of ocean water; aquifers; ionization of the atmosphere. We can do everything; these countries, which once were blossoming cultures, can be turned again to become blossoming countries which give a future to the young generation. And it is already on the way because the neighbors are committed to do that. All we have to do is convince the United States and the European countries to participate in such a Silk Road-Marshall Plan for the Middle East, and also for Africa. It would be so easy to eliminate poverty; we could do that in half a year. No person would have to die of hunger anymore, because the technologies all exist; and if you then would go and build infrastructure –

ports, railway systems, waterways, highways, food processing. Build new cities; build advanced technologies in all countries of Africa and southwest Asia. It could be turned around in a few years, and in one or two generations these regions could be as developed as the United States or Europe were in the '70s. I'm not saying now, but as they were in the '70s.

So, why don't we move in this direction? There is no good reason. We will lose identity as being human if we don't do that. I think we have never been at such a challenge as right now; and it is extremely important that we remember that this planet is inhabited by only one human race. Contrary to what the new racists and the new fascists – which are unfortunately on the rise; like in the '30s, you have the rise of racism and fascism. You have old wine in new bottles, but the content of these bottles remains the same. Anybody who says the refugees or foreigners are of a different genetic composition, or have different reproduction schemes and therefore must be kept out; these are racists in new clothing. And we must absolutely establish the idea that what makes us human is that every child born on this planet, is gifted with a potentially limitless potential to be a genius.

The fact that we don't have more geniuses on the planet right now is not due to the nature of the human being, but due to the fact that the conditions of life do not allow so far the best development of every child who is born. If they would have universal education and a decent living standard, and have a vision and a hope for the future, we could have an increase of geniuses in the world; which would really show that mankind is in the infancy stage, maybe even embryonic stage of its development. If you want to evade the fate of the dinosaurs – that is, vanish – we have to make that evolutionary where we are not defined anymore by blood and soil, or territory, or color of our skin or hair. But that we are defined by that which is human to all of humanity, that we can all be beautiful souls. That we can not only develop

limitless new insights into the law of the Universe and make scientific discoveries of physical principles leading to tremendous breakthroughs in science and technology; but that we can also become better human beings. That we can become more beautiful in our character; that we can become more loving; that we can become more artistically brilliant; that we can compose music at least as good as the great Classical music and beyond.

So, I think we are really at a branching point, and you people there in New York have a very, very special responsibility. Because as Lyn has said, New York is a very, very special place in the United States; it's the founding of the United States. It's the place from which Alexander Hamilton operated. But even today, the New Yorkers are generally more cosmopolitan, they are less chauvinist, they are more intelligent, they are more political. And if we want to get the United States back to be a republic, a country which other countries want to be allied with and not shriveling in fear and terror, then it is you, the New Yorkers, and your example shining in the entire United States of America which will turn this country around. So, I think on this Memorial Day weekend, we have a tremendous moment; think about the people who died in previous wars, and we must have a solemn commitment that war should never become a means of conflict resolution again. If we mobilize people around that idea, and the idea that humanity is really at the point of finishing itself off, or making an evolutionary jump where we are all being defined by the global development partnership in which we can engage; and the responsibility for future generations that we must build the bridge to a better time and a better age. I think we can do it.

DENNIS SPEED: OK, we're going to go to questions now. There's a microphone here in the middle of the floor; there are chairs people can line up. When you get up, state your name, and please try to be concise in your asking of the questions.

First question.

Q1: Hello, Helga. On the question of war, something that people here may not know is that in 1962, while Kennedy was dealing with the Cuban Missile Crisis, Kennedy's intervention – which is not very well known – but Kennedy intervened in the Indo-China War; which is the 1962 war between India and China, and was working with the Indian government to de-escalate tensions. It got to a point where even the aircraft carrier *USS Kitty Hawk* was stationed in the Bay of Bengal to come to the aid of India, in case we needed help. And this is something that he and James Galbraith – Kennedy's ambassador to India – were working with the Indian government; especially Prime Minister Nehru, who was the father of Indira Gandhi. Since then, the world has really changed, where in the United States you have a President who is escalating tensions in the world; and you have India and China, who are coming closer than ever. So, I just find it very interesting how the world has really shifted; because of interventions and because of leadership like Indira Gandhi and you and your husband, Mr. LaRouche.

So, I wanted to ask you, how in our interactions with Indira Gandhi, how did your concept of the World Land-Bridge change or develop? And how did she influence your ideas about the World Land-Bridge? And how do you think India can use its cultural heritage now in organizing the rest of the world into this New Paradigm?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, we talked with Indira Gandhi, I think it was between '79 and '83, until when she was assassinated. That was obviously before the idea of the Silk Road could appear; because you still had the Warsaw Pact and the NATO bloc. So, we were talking with Indira Gandhi about a 40-year development plan for India; and that was actually the idea that you need two generations – or at that point we assumed you needed two generations to do that. Because there were many parts of India which are totally undeveloped; not

even roads, you had dirt roads. The idea was to bring infrastructure in the first generation and universal education to every child. This is a big thing, because in India at that time, and I think to a certain extent it's still going on; there are many parents who send their children instead of sending them to the school, to help in the countryside in the fields. Which naturally, it's preventing children from having education, so that was our main concern; these two aspects – infrastructure and universal education to every child. And then in the second generation, you could have – with every child being educated – you could develop India fully. So, she liked that approach, and was totally determined to implement it; and when she was killed, we continued to work on that with her son, Rajiv Gandhi. And then he was assassinated as well.

So in a certain sense, India has been set back a lot by these assassinations; and therefore it is not extremely good that now with Prime Minister Modi, who is from the BJP and not from the Congress Party, but nevertheless he is very, very popular. And many people in India today compare him to Nehru, to Indira Gandhi; and they respect him as one of the great leaders who can really change the world. And he has managed to do one thing; he has successfully, in the short period he has been in office – a little bit more than two years – managed to change the role of India in the world from a regional power to become a true global power. And India is now assuming that role by saying they have already the biggest economic growth rate; they soon will have the largest number of people, they will bypass China. And therefore, I'm very happy; because when I was in India in March at the Raisina Dialogue, there was still a big concern about India-Chinese tensions – the border conflicts. And also naturally the issue of the development corridor China is building in Pakistan; will that be against India? So there were still a lot of these worries, and for the two problem points we have now made a breakthrough. Because with President Mukherjee going to China, and saying these countries are in an absolutely fantastic alliance, and



we can solve every problem in the world; this is on a very good track. And with Modi going to Iran, basically building bridges with Afghanistan; Afghanistan is a big security concern for India. So, this is all moving step by step in a very good direction; and I think the best thing we could do is, I think there are 3 million Indians in the United States – I think so, yeah. So, if these people would take pride of the great advances India is making right now, and basically say, "We are now living in the United States; and we want to have good relations between the United States and India. But that means stop this confrontation with Russia and with China, and then we can really move on in a global development partnership." So I think these 3 million Indians living in the United States could become a great asset for peace and for the future of all civilization; and we should appeal to them to act exactly in this way.

Q2: Hi, Helga; it's Alvin. I'm glad that you're here because there's a recent article on LPAC that's talking about and describing a recent conference that took place in the capital of Yemen as a breakthrough. And the Schiller Institute influence is being felt there, and continues to grow. As the article describes, this was widely attended; hundreds of finance ministers, private industry, civil and economic organizations were there. And of the many items that were resolved or passed, three of them involve the work of the organization as a whole, the principle of Hamilton where you're restoring – the New Silk Road of course, Reconstruction Bank and national credit. Now here is this small nation which is war-torn through the Saudis, through the British, through Obama, and they find themselves taking this giant step forward and making demands upon the UN to exile the Saudis and adopt these policies for future peace and development. Now obviously, the Schiller Institute's influence, this shows a good example of why we come under the types of attacks that you do, when you have such an influence. But what I wanted to ask you was, what do you really think are the implications

from a successful conference like this? And how should we, here in Manhattan, use this as a weapon to bring others in to understanding what a real global, strategic outlook requires?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think the first message obviously is, no country can be so small or in such difficult conditions as not being able to rise above its so-called fate and take the initiative to change the situation. If we can stop this general war danger which I tried to describe a little bit earlier, if we can stop that and get some public debate in the United States about the fact that that war danger exists; the problem is, people don't even know it. There is no uprising; there are no people in the streets. There is nobody saying "We do not want the United States to start World War III." I think that's the first step. If we can stop that, then I am very optimistic in terms that we can get this World Land-Bridge approach for the reconstruction.

Because right now, with Putin intervening in Syria, the Syrian Army regaining more and more territory; China has now committed a special person for the reconstruction for Syria, who is presently in Damascus. There are many projects being worked on; and we will soon publish a lot more about it. We are working with Syrian architects and engineers who are totally determined to make the Project Phoenix a reality; which if people don't know yet what Operation Phoenix is, they should look at it. It's a very concrete project to rebuild the cities which were destroyed in Syria. All of this is going to happen; and also for Africa. There is a new mood in the developing countries. I'm almost reminded of the time of the Non-Aligned Movement, when there was a totally determined nation to get a Just New World Economic Order; and while they may not name it New World Economic Order right now, as I said, there are many countries in Africa and Asia who are absolutely determined to overcome underdevelopment. And isn't that what Roosevelt wanted, or what Martin Luther King was talking about; what Kennedy was talking about? And that is now a

distinct possibility; but I think everything depends upon us getting these changes inside the United States. Because the best person cannot live in peace if the evil-minded neighbor does not allow it; and that is a German proverb which applies to all these efforts. All these countries will not succeed if we cannot change the United States.

Q3: Helga, this is R— from Bergen County, New Jersey. You mentioned the losing of one's human identity; which can happen from the types of activities that one's government is involved in — referring to the nuclear build-up and so forth. My question is, if we go back to the case of Nazi Germany, the Germans under Nazi Germany, did Germans lose their human identity due to the activities of their government at that time? And also, what did it take for Germans to regain their human identity; and is that entire scenario analogous to what's going on in the United States today? In other words, have Americans lost, or are they losing their human identity due to the types of activities of their government? Can that be drawn as a similar situation to Nazi Germany; and what will be required for Americans to regain their human identity?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, I think the German example should be a warning example to any country around the world; that a country which is — I am at least proud to have produced some of the most beautiful composers, inventors, poets. I find the German Classical period is probably the richest of any country; and I'm not saying this because I'm arrogant, but because it's simply a fact. How could such a country plunge into the depths of the Nazi horror? I think it is very important to study exactly are the axioms which erode; and I think we have done some studies about it. That what started to erode the Classical period in Germany was the Romantic period; because the Romantic period started to destroy the clear principles of the classics. And that was then followed by an increasing pessimism with Schopenhauer; out of that came the youth movement before World War I, which was a terrible

youth movement. It was actually a proto-fascist youth movement. Then came World War I, World War II.

Just today, there was a big celebration of 4000 German and French students celebrating German-French friendship; looking at what was it for four years to fight in the trenches in Verdun. And trying to build an understanding; what were these soldiers doing for four years? Mindless battles; shooting; killing back and forth; gaining nothing; back and forth. These four years of the First World War denuded the young generation in Germany so badly, that then with the Versailles Treaty and the hyperinflation and the Great Depression, gave rise to extremist movements. The Nazis, the Bolsheviks, which led to a right-left confrontation in the streets. But the Conservative Revolution, the idea that man is fixed; that man is not good; that you have to fight against the ideas of 1789, which is the American Revolution, the French Revolution. The idea that there is only one human race. That spread; 400 movements existed like that.

So, people now look at the present, and they don't see the continuity of these movements today. Even so, the Conservative Revolution is absolutely a continuous movement since the American Revolution; it's the oligarchy. It's the idea of taking back, reversing the American Revolution; reversing the idea of a Constitution. And that is why I think it is so extremely important that Americans have the clear idea to return the United States to become a republic again. To go back to the Founding Fathers; to Benjamin Franklin, Alexander Hamilton, to a little bit later John Quincy Adams, and to the principles of Lincoln. And these early Presidents represented a United States which was quite different than what is happening today. And I think you have to revive the best traditions, in order not to let it come to such a deep plunge, like Germany did. It has, in my view, not happened yet, even though it's had much in the vicinity of it. But, you have to really use the *best* traditions of the United States,

to prevent the disaster. Because, racism is clearly there. You have, clearly, elements which I would characterize as, "Nazi-like," and people don't dare to say it, but that is what people should really recognize. Germany, right now, I would say, is, sort of, you know, a little bit, still impotent, decapitated, doesn't dare to have a clear idea of its own traditions. But, it has successfully changed; it has admitted the guilt. It is clearly, "no war!"; people have a clear idea – never war again. And therefore, I see *apotential* that Germany may not go along. You know, if *Japan* can break out of this, and Germany could break out of it in Europe; we could solve this danger. Because, without Germany the war would not happen. So, I think, you know, we should draw lessons from history. Because, if we deny history, we are bound to make the same mistakes.

Q4: I came to this country in '73. And, kind of a secret mission. During the civil war in Russia, my father was in the "White Army," not in "Red." So, they never trusted me; and I lost my sea career in the Pacific. Instead of becoming captain, I became a professor of political science, because I could not sail. They were afraid that I would escape. It's family arguments. Now, finally, in the 1960s, I came to Moscow, and sent my old mother to United States, to seek her brother in Chicago. He was a soldier in the White Army, and left Russia in 1921, from the Crimea, with General Wrangel.

Anyway, what I talk about: I knew how to behave, in that world, where I was; one word could cost you too much. So, it was much more comfortable not to talk, but to listen. And, I was in Moscow in 1970, when the political police arranged mental asylum for me. At that time, already, no shootings; it was a democracy. So, then I— that was the system that I built. In Moscow, you have two restaurants: National, where Russian KGB catching Western spies; and Prague, this is the citadel of the Russian elite. So, I went there, and found a guy, who proved to be a colonel in the KGB, at the top of the pyramid.

And, he took me to his home, in Moscow, locked me for three days. And then, came back and said that, "You're under protection, don't worry." And, I stayed some years, and what was my problem, then: To return to merchant marine? Only in coastal trade, because, if you go abroad, you never return. So, I understood that the people, never knew what they were doing. The situation was, that I had a cyanide pill, here – all that nonsense. And, in 1972, I finished my first – while sitting in Moscow; I wrote 900 pages my travel in the Pacific. It's coastal trade, between Japan and Arctic. And, tell me the concentration camps, everything, big material for people who can read. And, they wanted to publish the books, abroad. In that case, I have to go to mental asylum. They could not help me.

So, we agree that I better go out. And, they arranged me; KGB all obeyed. Immediately I got my visa, and, in '72, in fall, I left. And, when I came here, after some time, some thought that I was a Russian agent, a twice American double agent, and they never know what they are doing. I never touched anybody. I was a driver for 25 years; driving school; fresh air, and I enjoyed it.

Now, about this organization: I heard about it, but I have doubts. In my secret mission, I delayed for 20 years, then I sent to Bush my analysis of American war in Middle East. I got from him a big photo, with, "Thanks." And, Mr. Reynolds, from Republican Congress, reported to me that they appointed to me as a "honorary American [inaudible 1.06.21]" That has been my plan. But that was all I could do. As I promised my guys in Moscow, I never joined any political struggle inside. It was not the purpose. Anyway, I sent him my material, first time, and got results. Then, Mr. Obama appeared, and invited me to join to his shadow cabinet. At that time, I didn't know that he as bad as you pictured him. I had no idea about him; I was a Republican. So, I joined him, now. And, I stand aside.

What I know, now, the situation is. I don't know even the name

of this organization. But I saw them. And, I see, clearly, a few points: That they talk business. The world is moving to war; this I know. Back in Russia, my father was in the White Army, not Red. My uncle was in the Tsarist army, fighting Germans. And every week, they met each other for drinks; they called it "brotherhoods." And then, Stalin – not only you – in Russia, nobody knows him, what he did that way. I saw it all: I lived in Siberia, then Arctic, the whole country, one-sixth of the Earth.

After Stalin prepared Russia for war, after Lenin's death, he created the world's biggest military machine. And in 1941 in Moscow, when Hitler's army group one, under big Marshal Bock were ready to take Moscow; when Stalin recalled his divisions from the Pacific. I saw them arrive, near Moscow, it was in October. Then, in November, they prepared; in December, they attacked, and destroyed German army, completely. It was a catastrophe, there. They drove them about 600 km – 300 miles away from Moscow. That was the end of the WAR, in fact. After that, Hitler knew that it's all over for him. But, he tried to save his army, himself, and Germany. He failed, everywhere. Finally, a bullet into his throat.

I don't want to talk about Hitler, because he was a nervous man, not fit for anything. But Germans paid a high price for that.

I talk about this situation. Now, Russia is a huge, military machine, ready to – why? – I did not tell you. The last thousand years, Russia was ten times attacked, once from the east, nine times from the west. Incessant attacks. And, Hitler's attack was the latest draw. So, one of them, before I left; I had friends, no jobs. He told me, if anybody comes to us, once more, with guns; so far, they came, we chased them back. This time, nobody will be chased back; we kill them all and bury them, and that will be the end. If you take Russia, European part, to Moscow, it's like Europe, then also from Moscow–

SPEED: Excuse me, Viktor, we need you to wrap it up.

Q4: I finish it, tomorrow, thank you.

SPEED: No, no, no. Just, if you have a final point.

Q4: No. Just one word. This organization talks business. But, what I found out, it gets no financial support, absolutely. I am the banker. I have a friend; I gave her \$100, several times. Just now, I'm empty, then, soon I going to make, again. It's amazing, for me. The only organization that talks business, which involves prevention of war; because nuclear war will make this planet dead. Even spiders will die. They already afraid of my house, never returned to my house. I have a house – I am a rich man, now. And, I keep my mouth shut; first time I talk. [laughter] But, listen: War is war. I talking nonsense, but, I can talk different ways. So far, you see, I am a retired political scientist.

SPEED: I think that Helga may have something to say.

Q4: So, give me two minutes more!

SPEED: No, no, no– [laughing] you get 30 seconds.

Q4: OK: I wish you good luck! [laughter, applause]

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, I think that you are not the only person with Russian background, who is reminded of the Great Patriotic War, and the fact that Russia was attacked several times. As a matter of fact, if you look at what Napoleon did, he tried to conquer Russia. And it was the brilliant collaboration between the Russian generals, and the German-Prussian reformers, such people like Scharnhorst, Gneisenau, and also the cousin of Schiller, who actually defined the line of long penetration, into Russia, luring the Napoleonic army into the far territory, Russia. So, then when, finally, Napoleon reached Moscow, they burned it down so that he couldn't have Moscow as a winter headquarters. And then, on



the way back, they chopped the entire Napoleonic army – an army which was several hundred thousand – ended up (I think) with a couple of hundred people, at the end of that war. And, that was exactly the same mistake Hitler made, who thought he could conquer Russia.

And, right now, you have, fortunately, in the person of President Putin, somebody who has proven to be much, much superior as a strategist, than the West; especially the people who are trying to push this confrontation.

But, right now, the fact that you have the largest concentration of troops, on the Russian border is bringing forward the memory of exactly the Nazi invasion in '40, '41. And it is really something people should not underestimate; the suffering of losing so many people in the war, that memory is coming back in the Russian population today. And that is why the Immortal Regiment demonstrations were so absolutely moving, a couple of weeks ago.

And I think we have to somehow revive that spirit of fighting Nazism, fighting fascism. That fascism is not coming in the form of Hitler, it's coming in the form of a unipolar world and imperialism and basically destroying other nations for the sake of the world empire. But we have to call forth, nevertheless, the deep emotions associated with the sacrifice of previous generations; and not gamble it away lightly. Because what Lincoln addressed in the Gettysburg Address, or what other people said in similar occasions, we have to keep the suffering of our previous generations as a source of inspiration to build a better future and make sure this never happens again.

I think that your experience is unfortunately typical of people who got in between the various developments. But I think we really have to have a clear vision that the future of humanity should not be like that; that we have to have a situation where people relate to each other as scientists, as

composers, as poets. If you read the letter exchanges of great people of the past – of Einstein and Max Planck, or Schiller and Humboldt – then you get a sense of what is a truly human relation.

And I think we have to have a clear vision today of what should be the future in 100 years, in 1,000 years. People should grow up; I don't think people should remain the way the 20th Century has been, or the beginning of the 21st Century for that matter. I want people to become like Plato, like Nicolaus of Cusa, like Leibniz. Why should every person not be like that? I'm not talking about copies; I'm not talking about talking like Leibniz, talking like Schiller. But in the realm of genius, there is no limit; there are infinite possibilities to develop creativity and contribute to the human development. I think we have a tremendous responsibility, because it is our action today that will decide that we unleash this unbelievable potential of the human species.

I can imagine that in 10,000 years from now, people will be completely focused on problem solving in the Solar System, in the Galaxy; they will probably have traveled to other Galaxies. We have probably mastered higher energy flux density, so that moving around in the Universe will be a completely different question than we even think about it today. And that people will discover principles and creativity that we have not even an inkling of today; in the same way people in the Stone Age could not anticipate that fusion power would solve soon the energy problems of the entire planet. Would people have discovered the use of fire? Would they have thought that we would be able to control matter/anti-matter reactions in the future? No. And they couldn't even think it; and I think there are things we cannot even think about, but which become the absolute natural condition of man. And that people will be loving. I don't think that the nasty character most people have today is what

is human. I think that people will become loving, creative, humorous; they will have a totally different character. And therefore, I disagree with President Obama fundamentally when he made this speech in Hiroshima, where he said the nature of man has always been to go for war. I don't think that that's true. I think the idea of making war is an infantile disorder; and in the same way as little two-year old boys kick you against the knee, when they are grown up they stop doing that if they are civilized. And in the same way, I think this idea of solving conflict with war will vanish. And man is principally good; he just has to be more developed so the goodness can come out. I fully agree with Nicolaus of Cusa, who said that sin is a sign of underdevelopment; and that if all people just had the ability to spend the time on the development of their creative potential, sin would vanish. And that's what I think is absolutely true. [applause]

SPEED: Let me simply say, hold on before we go any further. We want people to be concise. It is true that it's Memorial Day; it is true that we have veterans of the war, and we wish to hear from people. But you have to think about what you just heard Helga say; and think about it as you pose matters for deliberation for the people here. Other things can be discussed in the halls or in the breaks and so forth; but it's important we, here, focus. So, I just wanted to say that to everybody before we continue.

Q5: Thank you. I will be concise. My name is H— M—; I'm from Staten Island. I apologize for my voice. I agree with much of what you said in your presentation. There were a number of issues that you didn't mention that I think are critically important. The first is that the American economy is going through a major transition with the advance of technology and different sources of energy. We need fewer and fewer fully-educated unskilled workers; and essentially we don't most of the lower 80% of the labor force. Thomas Frank, who wrote that famous book, *What's the Matter with Kansas?*,

recently published a follow-up to that.

SPEED: Hold on; this is exactly what I meant. If you have a matter that you want as a question, fine.

Q5: The first issue that you didn't mention is what's going to happen with the transition in the global economy that is occurring. We don't need low-skilled workers. How are we going to deal with that? If you had all geniuses, you would still need somebody to pick up the garbage. The second thing is that when you have international conflicts that can't be resolved, the Second World War, for example, was necessary. There were a lot of conflicts that were going on in Germany and Eastern Europe and Western Europe prior to the Second World War; and the only way they could be resolved was through an explosion, which occurred. These conflicts between China, Russia, and the United States have to be resolved.

SPEED: OK, hold on. You have two issues there.

Q5: I have a third; can I just mention the third? So war can create a new stabilization. And the third is that we have global warming; and that's going to have an immense impact on the population of the world.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, just to mention global warming first. Global warming does not happen; it's global cooling since about 16 years. And global change, change in weather patterns, have nothing to do with CO2 emissions; they have everything to do with the cycles of our Solar System in the Galaxy. So, we better get accustomed to these changes, because we cannot influence them. We have to learn to live with it better; because there were these Ice Ages and warming periods over the last hundreds of thousands of years. That's just the way it is. In the same way, if we lose a couple of species, we should not be so concerned; because the evolution of the Universe produces new species all the time. That's part of what evolution is all about.

But to the more fundamental point, I cannot agree with what you say that the Second World War was necessary, or that it was a cleaning explosion or something like that. And in the same way, it's utterly untrue for the present conflict between Russia, China, and the United States. The Second World War was really the continuation of the geopolitical games which led to World War I; which Haushofer, Mackinder, Milner, such people had basically worked out. Which was really the idea that whoever controls the Eurasian heartland is the master of the planet; and that this would be at the disadvantage of the trend of the Atlantic Rim countries. It was that crazy thinking which led to World War I; and that was not resolved through that war. It was cemented through the Versailles Treaty; which really was the basis for all the conflicts now, including the conflicts in the South China Sea. Because the Paris Treaty, which was part of the Versailles Treaty, left the territorial conflicts of the South China Sea unresolved by leaving a tremendous feeling of injustice in the Chinese population; because a lot of the previous German colonies were given to Japan. And the same thing happened with the Sykes-Picot agreement already in 1916; it happened with the Trianon Treaty which was part of Versailles. And all of that was the result of the same empire policy persisting with Versailles after the First World War; and Versailles was an absolute contributing factor to World War II, in which the same imperial forces who groomed Hitler as one tendency – the National Socialists were just one tendency of that Conservative Revolution which I mentioned earlier. They groomed Hitler as a orator through the Thule Society; and they read *Mein Kampf*, and they said if we pit Germany and Russia against each other, it will lead to World War II. And that's why the oligarchs in Great Britain and such people as the Eugenics Society in the United States backed Hitler; because they liked his race policies. That was the reason why World War II finally happened; because it was a geopolitical manipulation. And it was a total setback for mankind; and many countries have not recovered from it to the present day,

Germany being one of them.

So I do not agree that you need these explosions. And if it would come to such an explosion today, I'm pretty much afraid that nobody would be left. I think we have to think completely differently; we have to think about a New Paradigm of mankind. A paradigm which is defined by the common aims of mankind; that which makes us human together. The problems we have to solve together, like space travel, to make it safe for the human race to exist. We are not safe right now; we could be destroyed by asteroids, by volcanic explosions which could lead to a winter period like what probably happened after the dinosaurs. Ninety-six species gone 65 million years ago. We have to think about how to make life safe for the human species; not only on Earth, but also on Earth. And for that, we have to work together. The New Paradigm must conceive of mankind in the same way as the difference was between the Dark Age of the 14th Century and the modern times which started with the Renaissance period of the 15th Century with the Golden Renaissance in Italy.

If you compare the leading axioms of the Middle Ages with the leading axioms of the modern times, you have two completely different sets of ideas. The Dark Age, the Middle Ages, were characterized by scholasticism, by the Peripatetics, by the control of Aristotle in all the universities, by witchcraft, by the Flagellants, by people who would burn women as witches, by the Inquisition. All of this was characteristic of the Middle Ages. And then came, based on Dante, Petrarca, Nicolaus of Cusa brought the heritage of Plato to Italy at that time; which had been lost for about 1700 years, and that all led to a tremendous scientific and cultural explosion known as the Italian Renaissance. And the image of man, the absolute emphasis on the individual creativity, on the idea of the common good as being the purpose of the state, the idea of the sovereign nation-state, all of these new ideas developed in this period of the early 15th Century into the middle of

the 15th Century, about two generations. We had an explosion of science, of knowledge, and that led to the foundation for Nicolaus of Cusa, for Kepler, for Leibniz, for the allusion of modern science, of precise natural science, of great Classical art.

And these two systems have coexisted for 500-600 years, and now this has come to an end. We are now at an end of an epoch. The end of the epoch of the coexistence of empire and nation-state. And if we don't make the jump now, to say, both empire is a finished model, but also the nation-state as such has to be complemented by a higher form of "the common aims of mankind," and the idea of the truly human behavior of people working for the common aims; making a new Renaissance of all cultures of this planet, where each culture knows the other culture, the high point; every American will know what Chinese culture was, what Russian culture was, what German culture was, and make something new, beautiful out of that: a new Renaissance which will take the best of the ideas of what each nation produced, celebrate it, make it common knowledge.

Make the cultures of the world as known to every human being, as maybe the *Ninth Symphony* of Beethoven is pretty known to all human beings. But do people know everything about Chinese philosophy, poetry, Indian painting, Indian Classical dance, Indian Classical music? No, they don't! And that is the kind of human heritage which we have to have as the common good of all people, to create something new out of it.

So we need a new paradigm, and I think people should each, individually, think, what do you want to contribute with your life, so that in a hundred years, mankind is more human by several orders of magnitude than today? And that your life has contributed, to end this *terrible* popular culture which we have today, which is completely Satanic. I mean, all the youth culture is utterly Satanic. All the pop music is Satanic, fashion is mostly ugly; all of the modern painting is an insult to the human mind, to even consider that as

creative. I mean, true, there are some exceptions, but we have to go back to the highest standard of all the cultures before, to make something new out of it.

So do not think that war is necessary, or was necessary. War is a relic of an infantile feature of the human person.  
[applause]

SPEED: We're going to take two questions, and then we're going to take a break. We're going to take a break so that all those people who completely disagree with much of what was just said, can vent in the halls, before you come back, hopefully with cogent questions about the next session. So, go ahead.

Q6: Hello, Helga, we have a question here from a contact from Brazil that we met recently, B-A-. And his question is, "What do you think about the coup that is going on against the democracy of Brazil? It is a violence and danger for Latin America. For example, what would be the impact on the world economy if the Brazilian economy collapsed, since it is the seventh largest in the world? Without the BRICS would there be a world?"

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, we will publish in the coming issue of *EIR* a documentation of who is running this coup. Because Dilma Rousseff herself said repeatedly that this has nothing to do with corruption she was involved in, but that it was a coup by the right wing Brazil. Now while it is obviously clear that the right wing in Brazil has been involved in this, what she has not said is what we will document, that, how certain forces in the United States in particular, and in Great Britain, have been behind steering this coup, in the same way as the attack on Cristina Fernández de Kirchner is organized from the United States, from certain hedge funds, from certain political interests; and we will put this out in writing.



And hopefully somebody in Brazil will pick it up. Because I think the only way how the integrity of Brazil can be protected, is that the truth comes out, and that the population in Brazil which is obviously being targetted by a black propaganda campaign following the Italian model of "Clean Hands." And this was even admitted by Bloomberg, that the model of Clean Hands is what was being used.

This goes back to the history of Italy, where everybody in Italy knew that the way how Italian politics would function in the postwar period was the *amici di amici* principle: that if you would give somebody an order, you would give him a kickback and the kickback would be distributed to all the friends of that person and it was called the "*amici di amici*" principle. And that system, which everybody participated in for decades, all of a sudden was exploded, when the British decided to take over Italy for cheap money with the coup; the plot of the *Britannia* royal yacht, devaluing the Italian lira by 30% and then buying Italian firms up for cheap. And then in the context, they destroyed all the political parties in Italy, and created new, synthetic ones, which no longer could defend the sovereignty of Italy in the same way.

And that is exactly the model which has been applied in Brazil. And Dilma Rousseff herself went after this corruption system and she was not involved. And now this new phase has erupted, where the finance minister had a telephone discussion with a Senator, where they said, if we want to stop this corruption campaign, we have to get rid of Dilma and put in Temer [the then-Vice President]. So now that has been leaked to the media and this is like "the revolution eats its children" because there is no honesty among thieves. The next wave of the destabilization is already hitting now, those who committed the first wave of the destabilization.

And this will go on. And the danger is chaos. And I fully agree with you, if the Brazilian economy would be weakened even more, than it is right now, it would be a disaster for

all of Latin America, and therefore, the first priority is that the truth of who is behind this coup should be published, and it should become a household word in all of Brazil and all of Latin America.

Q7: Hi Helga, this is Lynn Yen, from the Foundation for the Revival of Classical Culture. You've made two great intellectual breakthroughs: One which is the idea of Friedrich Schiller, that to bring mankind into adulthood, you have to educate the emotions through great art and great culture. And the other is the breakthrough of Nicolaus of Cusa, who said that as man comes closer to absolute truth, if he's intelligent, he realizes that he knows nothing at all.

Now, at our foundation and our work with a lot of young people, the idea of Classical culture, it's easy, when you introduce Classical culture to young people, they can get it almost immediately. But what do you do about all the other people? How would you do about the adults? A lot of people out there oftentimes the adults, who think they know things that they actually don't know, and how do you address that?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, my own experience is that when you make people more conscious about the difference of the music they like and Classical music, they realize, at least there is a superior species when they deal with Classical culture. So I have done educationals and pedagogicals where I would download from the internet, the worst example of black gothic rock or some other Satanic popular culture, because there's some really *awesome* examples! I mean pop music has many varieties and Madonna has made some Satanic movies, you know? Like sitting on an electric chair having an orgy with herself. I mean, there are some really *horrible* examples! And then I would show these, not too long, maybe a minute – loud, ugly, the people would really see it like in a mirror. And then I would confront that, for example, with Marian Anderson singing the National Anthem at Kennedy's invitation in 1962, and people would see; or confronting Beyoncé singing the National

Anthem with Obama and Marian Anderson singing the National Anthem; and I would really invite you go home to your laptop and look at that, because Beyoncé is Hollywood-like, a façade-like face, not really human; she could be a robot. And then you have in the video they made about that, they had Michelle and Barack Obama looking like heroes in Russian Socialist art, looking into the future listening to this Beyoncé. It's so – in German there is this word – *kitsch*. You know, *kitsch* means, when the fat and the oil is dripping out of something which is so horrible. Anyway. And then you see Marian Anderson, who completely, simple, non-stylized, just very truthfully and beautiful, sings the National Anthem and it moves everybody to tears.

And that way you have to educate people to start, you know, when you have a completely degenerated taste, it takes a while to reeducate that people even have the tastebuds to taste what is beautiful! And you have to give them many, many examples, also the principles of when is a painting beautiful, and when it is not truthful. Or when is a poem beautiful, and when is it not beautiful. And you have to use examples, because it's something people can learn, and I'm absolutely certain adults – you know, age as somebody said recently, is not a question of the bones, it's a question of the mind. And I *fully* subscribe to that. Because if you are future oriented and optimistic, and have big plans, you're not aging. It just doesn't happen. Your body may be a little bit more stiff, and quirky and whatnot, but your mind can be as youthful as whatever age you choose to be.

And in the same way, I think that older people, they can recognize the difference between ugliness and beauty. In that sense, Schiller, for example was completely against the idea that you would have categories of the *Sturm und Drang*, which was the period before the Classical period. He said, the difference is, is art beautiful or not. And anything which is not beautiful should not be called art. And I think that that

is so true: Because if the art is elevating the human mind, and appealing to the soul, bringing forth this power of love, of what makes us human, this inside power which enables us to do everything we want, for the good, for the future, for mankind; if art evokes that, it is beautiful. And if art brings us down, makes us more full of lust or greed or just mindless passion, like in a rock concert where you're just moving like an ape, you can repeat rhythms you know, like a monkey rattling his cage; but that is not human!

So the question really, is how to teach the eye, the mind, the ear, to see the beauty, and reject the ugly.

SPEED: So, we're just going to be taking a brief break. Before we do, Alvin, I'd like you to take the microphone for a moment, and we want to recognize our veterans. We're just going to go person by person, we'd like each of you to say who you are, what war you served in; and anyone that we're missing, please just hold up your hand, and Alvin will go around.

BILL MONROE: Good afternoon everyone. It's a real pleasure to be here today amongst you all and with my fellow veterans. I'm looking forward to an opportunity to speak to Lyn, but it's always a pleasure to speak to you, Ma'am.

I'm sorry: My name is Bill Monroe, I'm from New Jersey. I've spoken with you on several occasions, Helga, and it's always a pleasure to see you. You're doing a wonderful job, dear lady! Keep it up! God bless you!

AL KORBY: This is Al Korby. Pearl Harbor was bombed on my 17th birthday. On my 18th birthday I joined the Army Air Force, and I worked as an aircraft mechanic on B-24s and B-29s in Texas, Kansas, Colorado and Utah. ...

PATRICK S: Good afternoon, I'm Patrick from Greenwich, Connecticut. I'm happy to be here. I was in the United States Army, stationed in Germany, in 1960-63.

PAUL BARRON: [ph] Good afternoon, Helga. My name is Paul Barron and I was in the Vietnam era, and I've from Storrs, Connecticut.

BILL MONROE: I forgot to tell you: I served in World War II, in the European theater of operations, and from there I went to the Philippines at the cessation of the war.

JAMES CHRISTIAN: Good evening, my name is James Christian, I served in the U.S. Navy as a radio operator between 1957-1960.

MICHAEL LEPPIG: My name is Michael Leppig and I served in the U.S. Navy, I was a Vietnamese linguist in Vietnam in 1966-67, and Helga, I was very inspired by your presentation. Thank you so much.

HAL VAUGHN: I was in the U.S. Army, '72-'74; I was in Turkey in 1973 when your friend Henry Kissinger caused a little trouble over there.

TORY HALL: I was in the U.S. Army, I was stationed in Germany from 2012-2016.

RONALD: My name is Ronald. I served from 1969-1971 in Vietnam.

INTERMISSION

*Lyndon LaRouche Dialogue with the Manhattan Project*

LAROUCHE: Well, what we would look at is Putin. Look at Putin. Putin is an honest soldier in every sense of the word.

DENNIS SPEED: So, my name is Dennis Speed and on behalf of the LaRouche Political Action Committee, I want to welcome you here for our Saturday, May 28, Memorial Day Dialogue with LaRouche.

Of course, this is an event which needs and demands no introduction [laughs]. We've come – whether or not we wish to

have come to the conclusion or not – to expect from Lyn, his normal, highly truthful, characterization of all things related to thinking.

As I said earlier, I hope that people have by now vented sufficiently and are ready to ask questions, and receive the answers that they're going to be given. Whoever our questioners are, please line up.

Lyn, would you have any statement for us at this point?

LAROUCHE: Well, I think I've been aware of what my wife has been saying, during the passing hours, and, I would like to add a rebuttal! In a certain kind of way.

SPEED: [laughs] Like I said! I think there may be some things that some of the veterans had to say, but let's just ask first of all, if there are one or two questions, either from the last session. If not, we'll give you gentlemen, – a couple of them had a few things they wanted to say.

LAROUCHE: Okay.

SPEED: So maybe Patrick, you want to start us off? You had something....

Q: Good afternoon, Mr. LaRouche. I'm Patrick from Greenwich, Connecticut. I'm honored to be here today, for the Live Memorial to the veterans, and the 9/11 victims.

A little bit about myself: I joined the Army, May 2nd, 1960. And, I had basic training in Fort Dix, New Jersey, and I went to Fort Sill, Oklahoma for artillery, and I trained on a 105 Howitzer. Then, I was stationed in Germany – I went overseas, and my new outfit was the 3rd Missile Battalion, 21st Artillery. This was the "Honest John" missile, which had a nuclear capability. And, in 1961, the Berlin Wall went up; 1962, the Cuban Crisis started, and 13 days, we were out in the field, about 3 kilometers from the Czech border, with our

missiles fully prepared and ready to go. But, thank God that Kennedy and Khrushchov were sane people.

Anyway, my question is: The Cuban Crisis of that era, and what's going on now, with the nuclear capabilities. What is your opinion as to the two different – the Cuban Crisis, compared to now?

LAROUCHE: The Cuban Crisis was something which was being pressured, under the conditions of the FBI. The FBI was a key factor in bringing the matter to its form. And, that was a big problem. It was a rather evil operation, because the thing that was being done at that time, from my direct, personal knowledge what was going on, and I was in a leading role, position of authority, in the first part of my existence, as a major figure.

Then, of course, I was cancelled by the FBI; the FBI just threw me out of the organization, where I had been a leading figure, in what the FBI did. And, I got bounced around a few times, and I finally organized my own organization; which was quite successful up to the point of the FBI again came into my career and put me in prison.

So, I'm used to these kinds of treatments, that kind, knowing that every one of these guys who were doing that against me were bums! Rots and bums! With no right to anything.

But, I just go ahead and do what I have to do, and I do it.

Q: My name is Mike [leppig], I'm from New Jersey, and I'm a Vietnam veteran. And well, Helga kind of provoked a whole series of memories in my mind. I was 17 years old in 1965 when I joined the U.S. Navy, and I became a Vietnamese linguist. I went to Vietnam, and I left for Vietnam in November of '66. At that time, this was after the Gulf of Tonkin; after the Kennedy assassination, the view of my family and my parents was that the military would "make a man of me." The attitude generally, at least in the community that I came

out of, was supportive of the government, "if the government's behind it, this is it."

While I was in Vietnam, what I experienced was an almost total cynicism about the war itself, on the part of the military leadership, with a significant element of that leadership, I would consider in retrospect very patriotic; that they were committed in Vietnam, they wanted to see it develop, they had, what I now understand, is a kind of a traditional military outlook. Others were careerists, they were their own career.

Anyway, coming back from Vietnam, by the end of the '60s, what you describe as the condition of the government today, that it has no legitimacy, that's the way I felt. And, I think a lot of my age-people felt the same way. Now, we're confronted with a society that's their children, and we have an FBI-run Presidential election; like the riots in San Diego yesterday FBI show.

And it seems to me like this is our moment, like never before. I am so optimistic; I can't believe it! Because, nobody believes in the election; people who say that they're for Trump – they hate Hillary; people who say they're for Hillary – they hate Trump. But, you probe it, and they don't give a crap about either one of them; and when you mention your name, there's respect. Either they go away, because they don't want to hear it, they don't want to know the truth, or, if they're at least interested in the truth, they stop, they take the literature, they may not give money, but they know that you represent the truth. So, it seems to me that this puts a big burden on all of us here in the room, because you've done your work, now what we've got to do is just say that we're with you, and be able to stand up, with you in mind. That's what I want to say.

LAROUCHE: We have to do more than that. We have to activate the thing, again, by understanding exactly what's wrong, with the way the government runs today, and to present an account



of what the errors are, of government, in management today. It has to be cleared up. Because what happens? The people who are doing the frame-ups against people, are still doing the frame-ups! By and large. Not the same people who kept doing it, but new, alternative figures, who are doing the frame-ups. That's where the problem lies.

So, the difficulty is to find an honest group of people who will actually listen to their own mind and find out what is going on *in* their own mind. And the problem is, in the United States generally, most people are incapable of listening to the product of their own mind.

SPEED: Okay! Next question, if it's actually a question.  
[laughs]

Q: Hi Lyn! This is Tory Hall. I'm also a U.S. Army veteran. I served from 2012 to 2016. I was in Germany. They sent me to a few different places as well. And most recently they had sent me to Ukraine. I was there, physically. In my own mind, I rejected the entire operation that happened there. But that wasn't common. That wasn't typical of the other people there. And because I rejected these things—in a way I was already looking towards the New Paradigm—the idea of the Silk Road—then this type of conflict doesn't even make sense. What does a military look like in a New Silk Road paradigm?

LAROUCHE: Well, what we would look at is Putin. Look at Putin. Putin is an honest soldier in every sense of the word. His commitments are honest to the total extent of the work. He's the greatest builder of competence right now. His brother was killed, in the family. He became a career.

I met him, not directly, I met him indirectly, because I was doing some work in that area against the Chechen operation there. He was doing it at the same time. So I was actually operating in parallel to him, not in direct relationship to him, but in parallel to him. Then I came out of that service

and he went on with his own career, as we've seen up to today, so far

He's a very capable person. He probably is one of the best, most competent, military figures of the current time. He has a *tremendously* good record. And he has great achievements. He's learned how to do things that most other people in government and in military service have not learned what to do.

And he's a backer for China. He probably will turn out to be a backer for Japan, because the evidence now is that the Japan organization is going to agree, *against –against Obama*. They're turning against Obama.

But the overall situation is: Just think of the military situation, as such. Now, in the military situation is, there's no reason why the United States military under the military system should do anything for Obama. Obama is evil. He's a thief, a swindler, he's a cheat, and other unpleasant things. And therefore, the important thing here is, that Obama is what he is; but Putin is also what he is. And Putin is a man of great achievement, *unusually* great achievement. If you're going to win a war, you'd better work with him on that, and you're likely to win.

Q: Hello, Mr. LaRouche, I'm Igor Kochan. I'm the president of Russian Youth of America organization. I'm also a member of Coordinating Council of Russian Compatriots in the U.S.A. We do a lot of different cultural events to bring Russians and Americans together, to let Americans know more about Russian history and Russian culture.

One of the events that we had this year, was called the Immortal Regiment. I'm really grateful that members of your organization joined us, and grateful for the choir that sang at that event. The Immortal Regiment, so that everybody understands what it is, is that, it's the walk where people

are walking with pictures of their grandparents. We do it close to the May 8th, which is Victory in Europe Day. The idea is to preserve the history of your family to make people remember the veterans of their family, and to walk with their pictures in their hands, and to lay the flowers, this year, to the East Coast Memorial.

There was about 600 people this year. We would like to get more Americans involved in that, so that it becomes not only a Russian tradition, but an American tradition also. Because we believe that to bring Russians and Americans together, it's really important that Americans remember their own history—the history of their families, the history of their country—because right now, unfortunately, when we were asking people what they remember about the World War II, they couldn't even remember who won that war! Some people were giving some ridiculous answers, like "Well, you know what? Germans won the war." No, no, no! It's like Germans were Nazis!

By trying to remember the heroes of the war, people who fought in that war, in their families, people also learn who were participating in this war; that Russians and Americans were not enemies, actually; that they fought together, against Nazis. It's real important. If they were friends at that time, maybe they're still friends, or they should be.

So, what do you think about the idea of the Immortal Regiment? And do you think it's possible to make it an American tradition to remember the veterans?

LAROUCHE: Well, "American" is a special name for the kind of process we're talking about. There're many nations which have memorial organizations; that is, they have a history of tradition. And that is, of course, different in different nations. But the idea of having such organizations is not wrong. You've just got to make sure you've got the right home of that organization. That's all you require. Otherwise, what

happens, you have people like that who become the firemen, everything else that is needed for emergency purposes. Those people who serve as a military or other kind of service, of the same kind of thing, these groups are usually, and generally, very useful inside of society.

Q: Mr. LaRouche, this is Al Korby. Pearl Harbor was bombed on my 17th birthday. Then I joined the Army on my 18th birthday. I was on my way to Okinawa when the atom bombers bombed Nagasaki and Hiroshima. I thought that was a good thing at the time. The war was over. I found out later that it was a senseless massacre; that Japan was in the process of negotiating surrender. As a civilian again, and in a small business, I avoided politics because I thought it was a corrupt system. Then the Kennedy assassination and the cover-up. I said, "Why? A cover-up?" I was looking for an answer, looking for the reason. It wasn't there.

Then a call came from Margaret Greenspan in 1994. It was within a few days of you're getting out prison. I took a subscription, and then I started understanding what was going on; that we were being manipulated by the British Empire. Then in 2001, I became a full-time activist with the organization. Now, on the 7th of this month, I participated in the Immortal Regiment march, with the colonel from Russia. I said that we had to make a joining of the continents at the Bering Strait a reality.

So, what are the particular actions we must take now, to make this a reality?

LAROUCHE: What you've got to do, is you've got to change the mentality of the usual citizen in the United States, because most of the usual citizens in the United States who are living today, are incompetent; they are confused at the very best. And therefore the problem is, we don't have a standard, under our government today, which trains people or induces people to pick up a career which is justified for the help of the

protection of a nation. The idea that you have to protect a nation. You have understand why you're protecting the nation, what the protection is, what the requirements are. We don't have that any more. We have too many FBI people, and not enough real citizens. [applause]

Q: Hi Lyn! It's Alvin. A quick quote from something you recently stated: "There's a large, powerful, force which is accumulating its expression, and this will be the deciding factor if mankind is to survive." Now, we're taking the Obama/British Empire of repeatedly only knowing one type of script to follow. They're dangerous, but they're very stupid. You continue to emphasize to us the importance of the strategic leadership, particularly around China and Russia, with Xi Jinping doing something in his way toward development, and Putin demonstrating his ability to outflank the Empire and avoid war, so that we might live to actually have a future; that mankind might be able to actually realize its true potential and grow up.

On the [Fireside Chat] call Thursday, we're here in Manhattan, and we're trying to organize people around these conceptions, have them get over their own ignorance and fear. You mentioned—and this relates to the work that we're doing outside of the political realm—the question becomes, "Can a human being become greater than themselves?"

That's our job here: To improve ourselves as human beings, and then inspire others. So, I just would like for you to elaborate on that theme, and how we can continue to make progress.

LAROUCHE: Well, that's difficult to do, because you have to explain a lot of things that go into this kind of question. Very few people really have much skill at that. That's where the problem lies. You have people who have some insight into what it *might* mean, but they don't understand what it is to *deliver the product*. And the people's ability to deliver

the required product, is where the problem comes up.

Q: Hello, Lyn. John Sigerson. I'm not a veteran, though both my parents were. This is along the same lines as some of the people who have addressed this, but I wanted to look into the future, along the lines of what Helga said about a world without war, a world where this infantile malady had finally been expunged from our culture, and we should look at all of the people who have served and have died, as people serving in the name of *that*, rather than simply defeating some enemy, however, nefarious that enemy might have been or might be.

But my question is, looking into the future, with a vision of a society without war, how do you do maintain a warlike attitude in the population so that the population does not go *soft*, and that you still have a warlike attitude, but not from the standpoint of actually physically fighting wars against some enemy?

LAROCHE: ... involve wars or fighting wars as such. What's important is the ability of the human individual to apparently fulfill a military obligation, *apparently*. But that is not necessarily true. Often the professional soldier, is a fake. This is a common problem in the military service, that the people who are in there do not have the qualifications to carry out the mission! So generally you get a limited number of people in the military who do have some understanding of what this means and appreciation of what its implications are, but in general, most people in society do not have a comprehension of what that means, and I'm talking about people who are civilians as well as otherwise. That they are not capable of summoning in themselves, the kind of role which is necessary to do the job.

Now, this comes up in strange ways, which are not really formal ways. When somebody who comes in to rescue someone who is endangered, *that's* the typical case. And therefore, you find out, is that person *capable* of delivering a successful

effect, for the benefit of the population. That's what's important. It has the implications of being something tantamount to a military organization, but it really isn't. It's the guy who, with clothes or not, who goes out to do something, to save people from some threat against them, or to some injury against them in another sense.

And that's what the issue is. It's to get people to understand that their obligation *in*society, is to *lead* society or to assist in leading society to enable a population, to accomplish its true mission. Not just *some* mission, but the true mission of a member of the society as a whole.

You get people to understand this, to see, to understand what they *are*, and find out there's something *good* that there is what they are. And when they find those talents are expressed, then you have a sense of victory.

Q: Hi Lyn, this is Daniel [burke]. On that question of a successful leadership of the population, we're embarked upon something, which we discussed at the opening of this event here, which is to create a justice and a meaning for the lives of those people who were killed, wantonly, in this horrible attack on 9/11/2001. And I'm very concerned to know, to discover, what are the proper principles of achieving this? And I do think that it is in context, or that we have to keep in context, the fact that Obama and the Saudis and the British are losing. They have lost a certain amount of control of Japan; they have major people in France and Germany saying "end the sanctions against Russia." There is an opportunity here, and so, it's all the more important that we achieve this justice: How do we do that?

LAROUCHE: On the case of Japan, for example: The Japan case, Japan is now realizing that its enemy is coming from those quarters, and they have to deal with that quarter, and they're doing it, to some degree. I don't know to what perfected, or non-perfected degree; that's working out now. But there is an

orientation among people in Japan, to develop Japan as an instrument, to *defend* the people against Obama! So, this is a part of thing.

So therefore, you can't come down with some kind of mechanical explanation. You have to say, these are developments where people, in this case, Japanese, who've moved into this area of attitude, and they've moved into it. Why? Because they thought it was in their best interest, and they thought what they were getting from Obama and company was not in their best interest. I don't know how much they were against Obama, or not. But I do know what they were doing in practice, was something which was to the advantage of the people of the nation, and to the Japanese themselves. So, that's fine.

And these are the kinds of things you have to look at; look at it in those kinds of terms. Not simple, mechanical kinds of interpretation.

Q: This is R— from Bergen Country, New Jersey. In the recent issue of *EIR*, there is an editorial called "LaRouche's Triple Curve," and I found something that you — on the occasion of bringing out this Triple Curve concept, you gave a talk — this was around 1995 — and there's a quote in there, which I'd like to read a simple extract from that, if I could. I'm quoting you:

"We always blame somebody else. Now, the job of a leader is not to blame leaders. We can point out some are bad, some are defective, some are utterly immoral, some are barely human. But the problem lies in the people, not in the leaders. The problem, often, of oppression, lies in the oppressed. Because they will not accept any proposition that is not consistent with the assumption that they must remain 'the oppressed.'"

So is it accurate to say that people get the leaders that they deserve? And if so, is that why the cultural issue is so important?



LAROUCHE: Well, the cultural issue is one which I laid out about the time where I was about to be bounced out of the organization. And I designed this program, which I proved, and then they bounced me out and I disappeared for some time as a result of that, because I was in jail, put in jail by the FBI. And so that was what the temporary end of the thing was.

Now, we have a different situation, a very similar situation, however, not just a different one, and they're still after me; the FBI is still after me. They're a little bit more skittish than they were in times back, but the point was that what I was talking about was simply, my scientific discovery, of the fallacy of the usual kind of assumptions, about *how things work*. My specialty was *how things can be made to work*. And I introduced a new idea, which was unknown to most of the people in that time. And are *still* unknown to most people of the present time! Because they never discovered what I presented. But some people got it.

Q: Hello Mr. LaRouche, my name is J— and I'm from the Bronx.

LAROUCHE: That's all right! [laughs]

Q: I heard something over the weekend that I think you might like: The education and the act of educating is to overcome ignorance. But I believe, and I'm sure you would agree with me on this, that the education system today is *meant* to make kids my age, and maybe a little younger, to *keep* them ignorant. [laughter] See people already agree with me on that point.

LAROUCHE: The main purpose of the education system in the universities and high schools and so forth today, is to make the students dumber.

Q: [follow-up] Now, what we've been doing — by "we," I mean we started a "Basement club" as well, that we started here in New York, me and a group of four other students, including Lynn Yen, and we've been led by Megan as well; and what we've been

doing, is we've been studying Kepler and we've been looking at Classical pieces. And over the summer as well, we've been holding summer classes, where we teach Plato's work, the *Meno* dialogue, especially, as well, which has *really* resonated with me, to combat the ignorance that the education system has placed in the minds of these students. And I know this to be true, because I am part of this system, that tries to keep us ignorant [LaRouche laughs] ... standardized testing, SATs that restrict the way we think, that don't allow us to look at things differently, but say "this is what's right, and this is what's wrong: out of four options on this bubble sheet that you have, only one of them is right and you are not allowed to think differently."

LAROUCHE: [laughs] I know what you're talking about!

Q: [follow-up] Basically, what I'm trying to get at is, is there *more* that I could be doing, and that others can be doing, to fix this system, other than just reading Plato; and other than just looking at Classical music? Is this enough? Is that what you're telling me?

LAROUCHE: No, you really have to have, an in-depth discovery, an actual discovery, done by many scientists in different generations, and so forth in the process. And you have to rely upon *that* experience, and seeing that experience in terms of your experience; and trying to see whether you agree or not. But to get to insight into what this is all about. When you go with formalities, all you get is blab. And blab and flab. So you don't need blab or flab.

So what we have to do, is get some people out there, who will actually engage in discussion of what makes the truth be the truth. And you've got to come up with some evidence. You've got to produce some evidence which tells you that the truth that you believe is the truth, is the truth. That's where the tough business comes into play.

Q: Hi Lyn, this is Asuka. My question is about my country, Japan. There's quite an earthquake going on, the political earthquake, and it could be bigger than "Hokushima." But I want to ask your insight into this, because certainly there is a role that you and your wife played in this. Last December, Helga went to Japan and had a conference where she keynoted. And she also spoke among the prominent industrialists of Japan, and also there was Yakunin, former head of Russian Railways, present.

So, for me to see the recent development in terms of Abe's visit to Sochi and meeting with Putin, coming out with this fantastic proposal to develop the Siberian region, I think there was a certain precursor in this that we saw in Helga's visit to Japan. And I know you personally went to Tokyo with Helga before. So if you can elaborate a little bit about your insight and your experience regarding Japan, and what's going on?

LAROUCHE: Well, the point is, what you're seeing is the effect, and the effect is already available to you immediately, without too much explanation. What's happened is that Japan, the population of Japan has produced within itself, a body of people who are concerned with a fresh view of what the future is, because what's happened, they're being stuck now with some of the things that are going on in that region, and therefore they want to get *out* of that region and be more sane, and practicable. And they're attracted to this. They are attracted to this against, – and every time they get a smell of Obama, they want to vomit! And therefore what they do is they aim their mouth in the direction of the distance, and let the vomit come out, and then feel fresher. [laughter]

SPEED: OK – next question!

Q: Hi, Lyn, it's K– from Bronx.

LAROUCHE: Acknowledged!

Q: I see a mental shift taking place among the nations and among people, to a higher level, where they want to have growth and they want to have cooperation among nations and among each other. I wanted to interject about the Middle East: I have gathered some information together, that tensions are somewhat reduced in that area. They're not eliminated but there is some reduction; from what I understand Hamas and Hezbollah have other enemies that they're more interested in than Israel, and they also recognize that Israel could wipe them out or certainly decimate them quite badly.

I also believe that there is a change of leadership coming in Palestine and if I'm correct on that, do you know anything about it? And is the next leader, to be more amenable to trying to get along in the neighborhood?

LAROUCHE: Well, as you probably know from your background, on this matter, that, in the Jewish community in particular, you had some very rough treatment: Assassinations being perpetrated by Jews, against Jews. And I was of course, early on the course of my postwar experience, I was associated with an initial Israeli organization, which was a military organization at that time, and I was associated with that. So therefore, I was very much concerned with the defense of that.

Then at the end of a cycle, what happened was, everything went bad, and from that point on you had people who were Jews or murderers, or not murderers. And that was going on under the influence of the *British*. The British system took control over the Israelis on that basis, and thus they produced a degenerate quality of person, and some of the degenerates were in California. California had a Jewish community which was really a butcherous community.

But the core of the Israeli population, not so much from Russia, not so much from Germany. Germany was a disease; for Israel, Germany is a disease, it's a disease that's infectious and you try to duck it if you can. But in this case, what I

was associated with, was a group of people who were the hard core of the people who had been the military leaders who were already operating in the Middle East in that time, and these people were then suppressed by the crowd coming from Britain. So the British crowd that came in, started a war among Jews, and therefore, there killings of Jewish leaders by some people, and killers of Jewish leaders by some other people – in other words both ways. And this thing was going on for some time.

One would hope, that on that question, given the present circumstances, we would have a more peaceful arrangement under which the Israelis or the Israeli faction, were being a more, shall we say, suitable leadership. The leadership of Israel under those guys, the British guys, – get rid of them! is the best advice. And, if we could get some peace in this area, we can save Jewish lives and everything else. And just look at it that way.

It's the British system. It's the British angle of this thing, that sets up all these evil things that come out of Israel.

Q: [follow-up] A rabbi in the neighborhood where I live said there are two Israels: there's the religious and there's the secular. And in her opinion, if Israel goes down that would be the reason they went down. That's her point.

I had also heard, and I don't know where I got this information, that the Chinese, the Egyptians, and the Indians were hoping to work with Israel and the Palestinians to try to do the resolve. If that were to take place, it would knock the United States and the British out of that neighborhood. Do you know anything about that?

LAROCHE: No, that would not. The point is, you've got a population of Jews in that region, and other groups as well, and you have people who are good people, just honest, good

people; they may be a bit confused on this or that, and so forth, or ignorant. But that's it.

But the point is, my concern is, here I was, I had just come out of military service and I went out to associate myself with the Israelis who had been the leaders of the defense of Jews in that period. They got bounced out about four years later, and I was bounced out. But so that was the condition.

What today is, if we can pacify the situation, now that doesn't mean the individual as such; pacify the situation, because you'll find that when people are pacified in a certain way, they are no longer *freaking out* about accusations against one person and another person. If you can get a community to agree, on making arrangements with each other, in order to function better, then you've won. So I think that's where you've to go today. I know what the situation was when I saw it, after the initial Israeli development there. But the whole thing changed after a time; we went through a whole period when the British element was controlling the Jewish population. That thing is shifting. And I think the time now, because of the Turkish problem, and some other kinds of problems, that the people in that network would be very happy to escape from getting entangled into that kind of nonsense, which is going on today.

People do like peace, you know! They do like to live! [laughter] So the point is, how can we get – this has always been for me, what's the problem? What you have to do to make people peaceful? And to help each other?

Q: Hi Lyn, it's Denise. First off, I was really, really moved by Helga's presentation on the new paradigm. And I was thinking about this new paradigm from the standpoint, that I was making a mistake, and I'm sure many other people, who are mentally focusing on these idiots who are running for President. And if you only think about that, or if that's in your mind, you can't have a new paradigm, you're a dead duck.

What I thought of was the only way to have political freedom, as Schiller had said, is through beauty. And I'd wanted to make a special call to honor Jeanne d'Arc whose saintly feast is May 30, and her being the leadership of France against the Burgundians and the English; and I also want to say that it's our chorus and our music work that's going to come above all of this stuff having to do with the two idiots who are running for office.

You know, this week we're going to open our *fourth* chorus in the New York City area, which is *wonderful* that we're doing that. And now I'm thinking, more and more, having heard Helga and having heard you, to get out of this other mindset.

And I finally want to mention that I'm the eldest of seven children, whose father was a United States Marine and served in both World War II and Korea. Thank you.

LAROUCHE: Thank you.

Q: Hi Lyn, this is Renée [sigerson]. I wanted to just address briefly a matter that I've been thinking about for the last few weeks, in which you opened up my mind by nothing that people lack the qualifications or the developed capacities, to address the subjective questions that come up in the organizing, and how we actually deal with that, which we're actually doing in this discussion. But I want to focus on one aspect of it, which I think is crucial and quickly, to frame it in this way.

A year after you were in jail, I'll never forget a message that you sent to us, it was about one year later, and you said: "I'm the happiest man in the world, because I have the most wonderful wife, and all of my enemies are complete moral degenerates." [laughter] And I'll never forget that.

And it came about the same time, that Michael Billington was going through the most incredible harassment in the Virginia prison system. And the combination of these circumstance,

captured by those two elements and what Mike describes in his book, which really, at the time, was completely – it was another very heavy blow – I know went through a transformation, where during that period of time, I just got really *bored* and sick of my fear of the enemy. And I just suddenly said, "we just got to crush these guys." And there was a certain resolution in my own mind that suddenly, they weren't frightening any more, but they just had to go.

And I thought about this a lot, because in a way, it exemplifies a principle which you then addressed when you came out of prison, which is very relevant to the discussion we're having, which is the principle of metaphor. Because I think that it is really impossible to do what you want us to do, unless people rivet themselves on being able to identify that truth lies in metaphor, and metaphor is truth; that this is not some kind of interesting "twist," or decoration, but that this is the essence of how truth actually functions. And it really clears your mind.

Like people bring up fixating on the election. Well, if you think metaphorically, you don't fixate on the election, because you just say, this is a bunch of idiots, and you can see it right away. You don't see contradictions between saving the United States and dealing with the Congress and at the same time, fighting internationally to win the fight for the Land-Bridge: All these things that are *different*, somehow form this very beautiful, elaborate crystal, that in your mind, is a One, if you think metaphorically. But if you haven't worked at thinking metaphorically, you're always in this truncated, vulnerable state of mind. And I think the question of metaphor is also, that your emphasis on this over years and years, in different ways, was one of the things that strengthened some of us, at a critical moment to finally find out that fear is a very boring emotion.

But could you say something about that?



LAROUCHE: Yeah. The question of metaphor is ambiguous at this point, unless you qualify it. Because the question is, what can you do in society, and how can you do it? And so, the problem is, if people are not able to equip themselves to adapt a policy which inures them against fears, and that's what the issue is. And if you want to educate a population, you have to educate the population as such, in order so that they don't get in the grip of *fears*. Like fears of the FBI. For example, you should rejoice, every time you can dangle a jig about yourself against the FBI out there. Wherever the FBI are doing something and you hope, saying, "Well, let them go out there and jingle on the sidewalk, let him go out and make an ass of himself. Let him see what a damned fool he is." Right? And say, "*that's* the way to look at this guy!"

Q: Good afternoon Mr. LaRouche. It's Jessica from Brooklyn. On May 24th, which was just the past Wednesday, there was an article in the *New York Post* and I didn't read the *Post* because, you know, we've talked about newspapers before. But I saw it on the internet also, that Schumer had up-ended the 9/11 Saudi suit which is called the JASTA bill [Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act], and what's interesting about this, is when you're living in history, things change from moment to moment very quickly. And before I knew it, the families of the victims of 9/11 were saying that this was an article that was not reported accurately; that Schumer had not done these things; that it was some Republican faction or something that was trying to introduce something to water down the bill.

And I thought about our work on the 28 pages, and even though we are in support of the JASTA bill, it kind of led me to talk about the 28 pages even more among my colleagues. And so, in their asking me about this article, I started talking about the 28 pages, and how this is actually something that we're doing as a mission to get to the truth; to talk about the truth about the Saudis and the British, in *all* terrorism, in

terrorism around the globe, and how people need to really understand what the truth is about this entire 28-page operation.

So I'd like you to kind of comment, because now my colleagues, every time they see me, and they ask me questions about stuff, they go "all power to the people." So any time I see a colleague, they go "Oh, Power to the people, that's Miss White," you know. So I'd like you to comment on the fact that our mission is to expose the truth about the 28 pages, *and* the fact that two Presidential administrations have not only reclassified their own information, but have covered this whole, entire thing up, to the point of where it is now, and we're trying to get to the real crux of the matter, concerning, not just the 28 pages, but these Presidencies.

LAROUCHE: Well, there has been a very bad twist put on this question, in terms of Manhattan. Especially for Manhattan as such. And this was a lie! Now, why was the lie: The lie was in order to try to avoid making Schumer the scapegoat for the FBI; that's essentially what it was, plus and minus.

Q: [follow-up] That's amazing.

LAROUCHE: Yeah. He was guilty. I mean, Schumer was actually guilty by sliding along – I think sliding along is the most appropriate thing, or sliming along is equal. But the point is, he did wedge in an argument against the steps, and that confused people. And then, therefore, people in other parts of the government tried to crawl onto that thing, and thus make a case against what had happened, and to cover up what Schumer had said. Schumer had slid into something, and they covered up for him. Because he wanted to be in with the right boys!

Q: [follow-up] Right: "go along to get along" right? Thank you.

SPEED: Any other questions?

LAROUCHE: Any survivors? [laughter]

Q: [Bill Monroe] First of all, I want to wish you a very memorial holiday, today, Lyn. And guess what? Look. [Gives a crisp salute] Some of these folks may not know that you and I both are old warriors. My name is Bill Monroe, same as that country western singer.

I've been following your brilliant career for way over 20 years. I wish to state, it has been brilliant, illuminating, and consistent, never, ever wavering! You have inspired my life, sir! And I want to thank you for that.

I want to tell you a little something about myself. I'll be as brief as I possibly can. I joined the Army in 1943, and I went over to England aboard the *Queen Mary*, and never mind the British government – the British *people* treated Bill Monroe *real, real damned good* and I thank them for that! They made my stay there, I was there about a year before the invasion.

I landed over there on D-Day, the third wave of invasion of Omaha Beach. A lot of people did not make it. I'm very fortunate to say, luckily, I did make it. I further want to say, that as things began to quiet down, I had a most illuminating experience. I became a friend of the mayor Sainte-Mère Église, and one day, he sent word over, "Sgt. Monroe, I want you to come over and meet somebody!" So, I said, OK, as soon as I possibly can. So when I got leave, I went over, I walked in, and look at me [slowly cranes his head upward] – I said, "Êtes-vous Général de Gaulle?" "Je suis le même!" ["Are you General de Gaulle?" "The very same!"] [laughter]

I want to back up just momentarily: When I was in high school, it was compulsory at that time, different than it is today, unfortunately, that you had to take *some* foreign language. Unbeknownst to me as to my destiny, for some reason unknown to

me, I chose French. So when I got to France, I was able to converse with most of the people there. Again, they treated Bill Monroe *darn* good! I met what I call my French mother and father, because they kind of adopted me while I was in their area, and they treated me, as I said, "darn good." That dear lady walked three miles into town to get something special for Bill Monroe, and three miles back. Guess what she made? *Escargots*. [laughter] At that time I had not the slightest inkling as to what *escargots* was! I said to myself, "Oh, they fix tuna fish a little different here!" When I got back to camp, and I leafed through my French-English booklet and I seen "escargots," and I said, "Oh my God, I at snails!" But these are edible snails.

So, when I finally got back to the States, at an Italian restaurant, "Hey, Bill, what would you like to have today?" I said, "Escargot!" He said, "Oh, yeah? Okay!" And I said, "And give me a cappuccino, too!" [laughter]

Lyn, I want to say one thing: I've had a very, very illuminating career myself. You've been a real inspiration to me, sir. I believe you have helped pilot my life. I'm hoping that a lot of folks will do the same. I want to God bless you, sir, you and your wife, Helga. You're doing a brilliant thing, in spite of the so-called "FBI" which I used to have respect for! Keep it up, all right? [laughter, applause]

SPEED: Well, do you have anything to say in response to that?

LAROUCHE: It's hard to do that. That consumes my appetites.

SPEED: OK, very good. It looks like we may have a follow-up question.

Q: It's me again J— from the Bronx. You know, the English language is pretty dumb, it's pretty dumb, right? And university students have found a way to surprise me and this is something I expressed to Dennis as well, but they've found a way to make the English language even dumber! You can't

even call someone a color any more because it's offensive. You're not allowed to say an idea if it's offensive to someone, or if someone's offended, and frankly someone of the things you say offend me! In fact, why don't I just censor you now? Why don't I just storm out of this building and protest against you?

I'd like to believe that I'm probably the last open-minded person in my generation nowadays, because everyone is so afraid to accept a new idea, or everyone is so afraid to live outside what comforts them, or – I don't know. People are afraid to get hurt by something they've never heard before; or people are so accustomed or coddled by gender-study professors [laughter] – it's true! People forget what's in-between their legs nowadays, and then you know, you refer to them as Mr. or Mrs. and suddenly it's like "I want to be referred to as 'zee' or 'they', or some other pronoun," and it's like, "Oh, okay." And then this subject of man-splaining, where a man who explains an idea is perpetuating sexist culture, and that's a way of censorship, honestly. That's all that it's leading up to, censorship! I believe my generation has almost shot itself in the foot.

And we're going backwards! It's called the "regressive Left." You know, there was a time when the Left stood for something right. You know, MLK, the '60s, it was a great time. And somehow we've gone backwards. We can't seem to do anything any more. And I don't know, I just want to know your thoughts on that.

LAROUCHE: I think we need to improve the population. [Speed guffaws] I think we're in a desperate strait for cleaning up the population.

SPEED: All right, I think we've sort of drawn out everything we're going to draw out for the moment. There's probably some more opposition in the audience, but I don't think we're going to hear from it today! So, Lyn if you have any – oh, of

course, it is a bit expanded from the last time you saw us, and I think we're going to be seeing this as a trend. But if there's anything you'd like to say to our – or your army in Manhattan, please go ahead.

LAROUCHE: Well, I think we are ready to extend the grip of Manhattan, into the area of some parts of the neighboring waters, a little bit distant. We're going to be opening up more channels in different parts of the world than we have been doing before. And that's going to be the augmented aspect of what's going to happen to me in the coming days.

SPEED: Great! That's good news. We'll await results.

LAROUCHE: Yes. You'll get it, too.

SPEED: All right great! [applause]

---

## **Schiller                      Instituttets konference i New York, 7. april 2016: At bygge en Verdenslandbro – og realisere en ægte menneskelig menneskehed**

Schiller Instituttets konference i torsdags i New York City, "At bygge en Verdenslandbro – og realisere en ægte menneskelig menneskehed", markerede en succes for Lyndon LaRouches idé. Selvom flere og mere fyldige rapporter vil følge, så kan så meget allerede nu siges med sikkerhed; nærværende rapport

reflekterer kun en del af begivenhedsforløbet.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche åbnede konferencen med en omfattende og inspirerende tale med titlen, "Hinsides geopolitik og polaritet: En fremtid for den menneskelige art", i hvilken hun blotlagde den umiddelbare trussel om en udslettelseskrig og viste, at alene idéen om Verdenslandbroen, som hun sammen med sin mand udviklede i perioden under Warszawapagtens sammenbrud, kan tilvejebringe en varig garanti for fred. Hun gik videre med at skitsere en dialog mellem civilisationerne, hvor alle civilisationer i verden vil blive repræsenteret ved deres historiske, kulturelle højdepunkter, så som Weimar-klassikken for Tysklands vedkommende og et USA, som det først blev udtænkt til at være af Benjamin Franklin og Alexander Hamilton.

Helga efterfulgtes som taler af den tidligere amerikanske justitsminister Ramsey Clark (1966-67), der sammenvævede sin egen mangeårige erfaring til en redegørelse om den nyere verdenshistorie, og som understregede et alternativ til den krigspolitik, som de fleste amerikanske regeringer efter Kennedy-tiden har ført.

Den næste taler var en aldeles enestående person fra Kina, nemlig landets ledende professor i journalistik og tilligemed leder af meget andet, Li Xiguang. Professor Li har anført en pilgrimsfærd, der har varet i årtier, for Silkevejen – tværs over Centralasien og ned langs hver af de tre nord-syd ruter, og tilbage igen. Ikke færre end 500 af sine studerende har han siden 1990 ført med sig på denne pilgrimsrejse, og han har skrevet et tobindsværk om den Nye Silkevej. Skønt hans mål med Silkevejen ikke er af religiøs karakter – hans mål er de samme som LaRouche-bevægelsens – så modellerer professor Li sig selv efter de store kulturelle, kinesiske helte, buddhistmunkene Xuanzang (602-664) og dennes forgænger Faxian (337-422). Begge foretog vidstrakte og anstrengende rejser langs Silkevejen og bragte den første, reelle viden om meget af verdenscivilisationen, der især omfattede sanskrit-sproget og kulturen, samt originale, buddhistiske skrifter, med tilbage til Kina.

Xuanzang tilbragte intet mindre end 16 år på denne rejse og vendte tilbage med 600 indiske tekster. Efter ønske fra Tangdynastiets kejser, færdiggjorde han i 646 sit 12-bindsværk, "Krøniken om det store Tangdynastis vestlige områder" der er blevet en af hovedkilderne til studiet af Centralasien og Indien i middelalderen, og som danner grundlag for romanen fra det 17. århundrede, "Rejsen til Vesten", en af de fire store, klassiske, kinesiske romaner.

Der vil senere komme rapporter fra eftermiddagens session, der satte fokus på rumprogrammet, og som blev indledt af Kesha Rogers med en levende præsentation. Sessionens højdepunkt var en spørgsmål-svar-session over Skype med Lyndon LaRouche. LaRouche førte de fleste af spørgsmålene tilbage til kardinalspørgsmålet, nemlig, at forandringer i det fysiske system, og i menneskehedens fremtid, skabes af selve det tænkende menneskelige intellekt; det er der intet dyr, der er i stand til. Menneskeheden organiseres gennem sine egne handlinger af denne art; det er disse, der leder til enten succes eller fiasko. Dette er kendetegnende for den sande videnskabsmands intellekt, som Einstein eksemplificerer. Men denne redegørelse er blot en karakteristik; de faktiske svar bør studeres i detaljer.

Flere end 200 mennesker var mødt frem, kernemedlemmer ikke medregnet. Omkring et dusin fremmede lande fra Europa, Asien og Afrika var repræsenteret, enten ved diplomater, kulturelle forbindelser eller på anden vis. Mange musikere deltog, og mindst fem mennesker fra Brooklyn kirken, hvor vi opførte Messias i påsken. Dette er muligvis den største konference, vi nogensinde har holdt.

Som konklusion skal det siges, at denne konference markerer en sejr for en af Lyndon LaRouches ideer: nemlig Manhattan-projektet, som han præsenterede tilbage i oktober 2014. Og dog blev han dengang, i lighed med Einsteins berømte udtalelse om Kepler i 1930 på 300 års dagen for dennes død, "ikke støttet af nogen og kun forstået af ganske få". Lyndon LaRouche, der skabte det Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ og senere sammen med sin kone skabte den Eurasiske Landbro, har endnu engang skabt



en ny og fuldstændig anderledes original idé. En idé, som atter har vist sig at være gyldig.

Klik her for videoerne og afskrifterne på engelsk.

---

# **Händels Messias (2. og 3. del) med Schiller Instituttets “Manhattan Projekt” kor**

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

**Lyndon LaRouche:**  
**»Vi må have en udvikling mod frihed;**  
**og udgangspunktet kan kun være indsigt i,**  
**hvad der er det sande og**

# **gode«**

**Lyndon LaRouche, 12. marts 2016:**

»Jeg ville sige, at, i USA netop nu, i den grad, hvor nogle af os bidrager med nye indsigter i, hvad USA kan blive til, at vi må have en udvikling mod frihed. For problemet er, at de folk, der ikke kan lide os, der ikke kan lide frihed, er problemet. Men spørgsmålet bliver derfor, hvad er frihed? Nogle mennesker siger, »min idé om frihed er det her«, og deres idé om frihed er så ikke det.

Så pointen er, at der må være en sammenhæng, en aftale, baseret på fornuftig indsigt i den praktiske udførelse. Dette er, hvad der altid har fungeret i nationer. Dette er, hvad der har destrueret nationer! Napoleon destruerede nationer! Briterne har altid destrueret nationer! De specialiserer i det; og dette har været kun alt for sandt i historien.

Så man har altså det, at dannelsen af regering er baseret på ødelæggelsen af særskilte regeringer, på konflikt, mord. Jeg tænker på det, Tyrkiet nu gør, diktaturet i Tyrkiet. Men dette er ikke en karakteristisk af tyrkerne; dette er en karakteristisk ... for jeg ved noget om tyrkerne og deres historie. Jeg har været tæt associeret med nogle af heltene i Tyrkiet. Og lignende ting er sande for andre ting. Der er ingen grund til, at vi bør sige, at der er et naturligt had, en naturlig konflikt blandt folkeslagene i verden! Det er ikke naturligt. Det faktum, at der er konflikt, er ofte et u-naturligt produkt.

For, når folk ser, hvad det gode er, når mennesket ser, hvad det gode er, i praksis, så vil man finde, at de ikke ønsker at gøre den slags ting, som tyrannerne gerne vil frembringe. Spørgsmålet er, vi opstiller argumenterne for, hvad bør det gode være? Hvad er det, vi bør gøre, som er det gode? Hvad er bedre? Det er, hvad det handler om.

Og alle de andre ting er nonsens. Mennesket er forplig... Hvor står vi f.eks. nu? Bare for lige at afbryde mig selv. Hvor er vi nu? Vi er på randen af en generel atomkrig over hele planeten, og udover selve planeten. Og denne ting kan ske, lige nu, i den form for krig, som netop nu bliver planlagt, som kan ødelægge hele planeten, og planetens mennesker, netop nu! Og spørgsmålet bliver derfor, hvordan kan vi forhindre dette i at ske? Og hvordan gør vi det, uden at gå ud i en eller anden form for underkastelse under dette, eller underkastelse under hint? Nej! Det må komme fra en indsigt i, hvad sandhed er, hvad menneskeheden er, hvad menneskeheden må være. Og mange mennesker, ligesom – jeg tror, man kunne sige, at Putin er et ret godt eksempel på en model – forsøger at gøre præcis dette. Og der er mennesker i andre dele af verden, der har til hensigt at gøre dette.

Og det er, hvad vi må gøre. Vi ser dette med Kina, med Rusland og med andre dele af planeten nu. Vi ser, at disse nationale enheder kommer sammen, og de går ikke bare i seng med hinanden, men det er en proces af at erkende, at de må arbejde sig igennem det, ved hvilket deres fælles interesser fremmes, på en bevidst og progressiv måde.

Og det er, hvad vi forsøger at gøre. Se på, hvad Kina gør. Indien forsøger at arbejde sig igennem her. Andre dele af verden forsøger at arbejde sig igennem denne proces. Det er denne form for mål, denne form for proces, hvor man siger – og det udmunder i, når man begynder at tale om rumprogrammet. Man taler om Månens bagside. Hvad gør Kina? Kina har kig på Månens bagside, og Månens bagside er det, Kina forsøger at finde ud af: Hvad er den virkelige betydning af det her, Månens bagside? Og Kina er ved at mobilisere for de næste to generationer, blot for dette formål. Og det er ikke bare en hensigt, men det er et begyndelsessted for at forstå, hvordan menneskeheden, jord-mennesket, kan spille en rolle i at udforme galaksen. Og galaksen er det mål, som menneskeheden bør have for øje netop nu.«

**John Ascher (mødeleder):** Jeg vil blot lige nævne her, at alle de temaer, du netop berørte, vil blive temaer for en meget vigtig konference, som bliver afholdt den 7. april i Manhattan, sponsoreret af Schiller Institutet, om spørgsmålet om, hvad det nødvendige begreb om menneskeheden er; og at få USA til at tilslutte sig Verdenslandbroen. Vi har en invitation, og forsøger at få denne konference, der kommer den 7. april, til at blive det store gennembrud. Og det, som hr. LaRouche netop gennemgik, er præcis temaet for denne konference, inklusive spørgsmålet om rumprogrammet og videnskab som drivkraft.

*Ovenstående er et uddrag af webcastet The Manhattan Projekt med Lyndon LaRouche, fra 12. marts. Hele videoen kan ses her: <https://larouchepac.com/20160312/larouchepac-manhattan-project-town-hall-lyndon-larouche-march-12-2016>*

---

## **Nancy Reagans død betegner 'Afslutningen af en bestemt æra'**

*7. marts 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC)* – Det transatlantiske systems kollaps er en dødbringende situation – fra det fysiske, økonomiske sammenbrud, til den finansielle nedsmeltnings kaos, til faren for krig og den rædselsvækkende virkning af det rådne opbud af kandidater til det amerikanske valg og dettes forløb. Det, der kræves under disse irrationelle omstændigheder, er en rationel respons. Der findes løsninger. Netop en sådan rationel respons er i gang i form af det fremstød, der kommer fra Ruslands og Kinas ledere,

for samarbejde om rummet, videnskab, økonomisk udvikling i Eurasien og hele verden, og om fred. I sidste uge blev det under nationale møder i Beijing fastslået, at rumforskning nu vil blive en integreret del af Kinas økonomiske innovationsprogram. I USA leder LaRouchePAC's Kesha Rogers det politiske fremstød for at genrejse netop samme anskuelse, der oprindeligt var et varemærke for det Amerikanske System, og som NASA legemliggjorde.

I dag satte Lyndon LaRouche spørgsmålet om lederskab ind i et umiddelbart, historisk perspektiv med reference til Nancy Reagans død i søndags. Han sagde, at, hvis man tager perioden fra Ronald Reagans valg til præsidentskabet i 1980, i frem til Nancys død, så er det et tegn på, at »en ganske bestemt æra netop er afsluttet«. Reagan legemliggjorde en kvalitetsstandard for lederskab. Han var en meget dygtig person. LaRouche talte om sin forbindelse med ham, og nu om mindet om hans hustru.

I den ny æra, der nu er i gang, handler krisen ikke kun om fraværet af lederskabskvalitet, men om den udbredte fjendtlighed over for en sådan kvalitet. Folk i det transatlantiske område – Vesten – bliver mere og mere vanvittige. Men vi kan ikke desto mindre, hvis vi intervenserer med rationalitet for at levere lederskabet, komme til undsætning og have held med vores forehavende.

Fjendens deployering er intens, med fremstød imod BRIKS og mod krig. Ingen anden end selveste den britiske kronens tjener Ambrose Evans Pritchard er på scenen i Sao Paulo, hvor han udgiver en artikel fra 7. marts om, at »BRIKS-fantasien« nu er forbi, og at »BRIKS-konceptet er blevet meningsløst ...« Han hævder, at »Brasilien er den første af BRIKS-kvintetten, der bryder sammen på så mange fronter på samme tid«, og at Sydafrika, Rusland og Kina alle er plaget af problemer. Han hævder, at kun Indien stadig har »vind i sejlene« – hvilket i realiteten refererer til beskidte, angloamerikanske tricks for at forsøge at få Indien til at blive 'den sidste, stående

BRIK'.

Med hensyn til den relaterede, forrykte militære oprustningsfront, så er de største militære øvelser nogen sinde – kaldet Key Resolve – nu i gang mellem USA og Sydkorea. Med et opbud af 17.000 amerikanske styrker og 300.000 stk. sydkoreansk personel vil øvelserne vare i otte uger. Dette finder sted på et tidspunkt, hvor der er skarpe spændinger med Nordkorea, i betragtning af den kumulative virkning af årevis med geopolitik.

I **LaRouchePAC's ugentlige TV Policy Committee-udsendelse** i dag formandede Lyndon LaRouche, »Det er slutningen på det gamle system. Det må erstattes af et andet. Det kan gøres.«

Det er farligt. Bliv ikke bange.

---

**Kesha Rogers fra LaRouchePAC  
uden for  
Johnson Space Center,  
Houston, Texas:  
»USA bør lancere et  
rumprogram som  
videnskabelig drivkraft for  
økonomisk**

# genrejsning«; Luk Wall Streets og Barack Obamas drivkraft bag folkemord

*31. januar 2016* – Hej, alle sammen, jeg er Kesha Rogers fra LaRouche Komite for Politisk Strategi (LPAC), og jeg er her i dag ved NASA's Johnson Space Center, hvor jeg var for seks år siden, da jeg lancerede en kampagne for Den amerikanske Kongres og krævede en rigsretssag mod præsident Barack Obama for hans nedbrydning og afmontering af det bemandede rumprogram, privatisering af det bemandede rumprogram og ødelæggelsen af det, der var vores nations vision under præsident John F. Kennedy. Det var Kennedys plan at gennemføre et forpligtende engagement for videnskab som reel drivkraft for økonomisk fremgang.

Det, vi har set i de seneste seks år under præsident Obama, og tidligere også under præsident Bush, er en fortsat degeneration af vores kultur; en håbløshed, og fortvivlelse. Vi har set et rekordhøjt tal og en stigning i selvmord, stigning i narkomisbrug blandt folk, der normalt er mere velhavende og velstillet, især blandt de mennesker, der ser på minoritetssamfund som dem, der ville være berørt af narkoepidemien; nu er det folk blandt den hvide befolkningsgruppe i aldersgrupperne 25 og 35 til 45 år.

Hvorfor er dette sket? Der er sket, fordi vi har fjernet en vision, vi har fjernet følelsen af at have en mission. Vi har ikke længere en videnskabelig drivkraft i nationen, og det skyldes præsident Barack Obamas bevidste politik, og den bevidste politik for ødelæggelse af denne nation gennem at kapitulere til Wall Street. Nu har vi så en situation, hvor

vore unge mennesker befinder sig i dyb fortvivlelse og håbløshed.

Og det er ikke bare unge mennesker! Det er den kendsgerning, at denne nations befolkning ikke har nogen muligheder. Den største ulighed og ødelæggelse har ramt vores nation; hele det transatlantiske finanssystem er bankerot.

Hvad er løsningen? Kina har foreslået en løsning. Kina fremstår med visionen om en »win-win«-strategi med en stor mission for samarbejde, til beskuelse og inspiration for ikke alene Kina, ikke alene USA, men for hele verden, nemlig, at vi kan samarbejde om store projekter, såsom at minere Månen [for helium-3],[1] og atter betragte Månen som en affyringsrampe for hele udforskningen af rummet og forståelsen af menneskets rolle, menneskehedens rolle i galaksen. Det er gennem dette, at vi må inspirere mennesket.

Hvis vi gør dette, kan vi lukke Wall Street ned, og vi kan faktisk skaffe den nødvendige kredit, som det var Alexander Hamiltons hensigt, så vi ikke behøver at gå til Elon Musk eller nogen af disse folk med deres kæpemæssige pengebank, der allerede er bankerot. Vi kan faktisk gøre det, Kennedy gjorde, som Franklin Roosevelt gjorde, og vi kan anvende den nødvendige kredit til at opbygge et videnskabsdrevet program og atter opbygge en stor mission for denne nation.

Vi kan sørge for, at vore unge mennesker ikke tager deres eget liv, at de gives en vision med en ægte kultur. Dette videnskabsdrevne program ville sikre, at vi har energi til Jorden, med helium-3 fra Månen, i flere generationer fremover. Vi kan sørge for, at folk bliver inspireret ikke alene af et videnskabsdrevet program, men et, der er forbundet med en storslået kultur, en storslået musikkultur, som hr. LaRouche har lanceret i vores Manhattanprojekt i New York. Og vi kan forene disse to kræfter og atter give inspiration til forpligtelsen over for menneskehedens fremskridt, der engang var den håbets bavn, der inspirerede hele menneskeheden, og



atter bringe USA tilbage i spidsen for denne form for vision.

Tak.

[1] Se: Tema-artikel: Udvinde af helium-3 på Månen for en menneskehed med fusionskraft, <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=1894>

---

# **SPØRGSMÅL OG SVAR den 28. januar 2016: Hvorfor skal vi skabe en ny renæssance med klassisk kultur?**

Med næstformand Michelle Rasmussen.

Links:

Vores side om klassisk musik.

**Er skønhed en politisk nødvendighed? Interview med Helga Zepp-LaRouche.**

**»Beethovens årtier lange kamp for den Niende Symfoni« af Michelle Rasmussen.**

**Skønhed er nødvendigt, ikke praktisk, for menneskeheden.**

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

# Lyndon LaRouche: Det britiske Imperium, med Wall Street og City of London, må sænkes

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 18. januar 2016* – Det britiske Imperiums økonomiske system er mere end dødt, og det eneste, der er værd at diskutere, er at annullere det hele, fjerne det totalt og skabe nye muligheder, udtalte Lyndon LaRouche i går, den 17. januar.

Det giver ingen mening at forsøge at afgøre mængden af kadaveret, eller mængden af spekulative værdipapirer, der allerede er ved at gå op i røg. Man kan ikke måle det, for det er allerede mere end dødt. Der er ingen, der ved – bortset fra, at kollapset er i gang, at det skrider frem i accelererende tempo, og at der ikke findes nogen løsning inden for systemet selv. Når man befinder sig på randen af samfundsmæssigt kaos og samfundsmæssig disintegration, så er det eneste, der er værd at tage i betragtning, ikke de dumme, bedrageriske, løgnagtige kommentarer og handlinger, der kommer fra bankierer og Obamaregeringen; det eneste, man behøver at vide, bemærkede LaRouche, er, at man virkelig ikke ønsker at gifte sig med et kadaver!

Det transatlantiske system er uendeligt, håbløst bankerot, og hele molevitten må ganske enkelt annulleres omgående. Det eneste spørgsmål er, vil det blive begravet og et nyt system skabt, præcis, som Franklin D. Roosevelt gjorde det?

Vi må skabe sunde, fornuftige muligheder ved at eliminere alt, som Wall Street repræsenterer. Der er ingen som helst garanti

for nogen som helst værdi i hele deres system, så hvorfor forsøge at måle det? Vi må simpelt hen annullere det og komme tilbage til atter at hævde et nyt system, som FDR gjorde.

Vores fjende, som vi klart må holde os for øje, er Det britiske Imperium, der blandt andre forbrydelser er skyldig i at placere sit værktøj, Barack Obama, i USA's præsidentskab. Som LaRouche udtalte under diskussioner med medarbejdere i går:

»Der er kun ét spørgsmål: Det britiske Imperium, punktum. Det er det eneste emne. Hvad gør vi med Det britiske Imperium?«

Alt andet er blot snak og afledning, sagde LaRouche. Det britiske Imperium dominerer planeten, inklusive Wall Street, og inklusive den fascistiske, 'grønne' politik, der nu er blevet taget op og promoveret af Pave Frans. »Hvad er den 'grønne' politik? Det er helt og fuldt Det britiske Imperium. Det er ikke andet end det britiske system. Så lad være med at lede efter forklaringer, som sådan. Vi må sænke Det britiske Imperium!«

---

# Skønhed er nødvendigt, ikke

# praktisk, for menneskeheden

*Hvordan udvikler vi i et folk en afsky for fordærv og en sand forædling af evnen til at føle?*

*Schiller siger, at midlet hertil er kunsten, den skønne kunst. Han siger: "Kunsten er, ligesom videnskaben, uafhængig af alt praktisk og af alt, hvad menneskelige konventioner har indført, og begge kan glæde sig over en absolut immunitet over for menneskenes vilkårlighed. Den politiske lovgiver kan afspærre deres område, men herske inden for det kan han ikke. Han kan bandlyse hver ven af sandheden, men sandheden selv bliver stående; han kan ydmyge kunstneren, men ikke forfalske kunsten."*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

## Nyhedsorientering december 2015: GLASS/STEAGALL – ELLER KAOS!

*I denne nyhedsorientering har vi valgt at bringe en række uvurdelige, strategiske vurderinger vedrørende kampen imod Islamisk Stat, flygtningekrisen i Europa og det igangværende finanskollaps, som er fremkommet i løbet af december måned på de ugentlige webcast, der finder sted hver fredag aften amerikansk tid på [www.larouchepac.com](http://www.larouchepac.com). LaRouchePAC er en amerikansk politisk aktionskomité, grundlagt og vedvarende inspireret af den amerikanske økonom og statsmand, Lyndon LaRouche. Jeffrey Steinberg (t.v.) er en*

*ledende medarbejder til Lyndon LaRouche og er også efterretningsredaktør for tidsskriftet Executive Intelligence Review. Ben Deniston er leder af LaRouchePAC's Videnskabsteam.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

# **Lyt til Händels Messias, opført af Schiller Instituttet i New York City, 20. dec. 2015**

Opførelsen fandt sted søndag den 20. december 2015 på All Souls Unitarian kirke i Manhattan, NYC. Schiller Instituttet og Organisationen for Bevaring af Klassisk Kultur stod for koncerten. Koret bestod af medlemmer af Schiller Instituttet samt venner, der har dannet et "community" kor; musikerne var sammensat af både medlemmer af Schiller Instituttet og professionelle, og fire professionelle solister deltog også.

Dagen inden blev koncerten holdt i en anden kirke i NYC, og der var ialt flere end et tusinde publikummer.

Første del

anden del

Programmet



---

# **Leder, 13. december 2015: Lyndon LaRouche: Alt, hvad der er vigtigt ved mennesket, kan reduceres til kravet om, at mennesket må udvikles til et højere niveau af selvudvikling**

Lyndon LaRouche: Men pointen her er altid, at menneskeslægten ikke er en (automatisk) selvudviklende personlighed. Menneskehedens skæbne er forbedring af menneskets evner, i den betydning, at mennesket kan forudse menneskehedens evner til at opnå virkninger, som menneskeheden ellers ikke ville være i stand til at præstere. Dette er noget, der går op til et højere niveau end det, vi tænker på som givne kendsgerninger, eller givne former for kendsgerninger.

Alt, hvad der er et vigtigt omkring menneskeheden, kan reduceres til kravet om, at menneskeheden må udvikles til et højere niveau af selvudvikling. Menneskeheden skaber ikke selvudvikling, men menneskeheden kilder potentialet for selvudvikling. Og det er, hvad vi kalder opdagelsen af kreativitet. Og det bedste eksempel på dette, det enkle tilfælde på dette, er Einstein. Einstein gjorde præcist, hvad

der måtte gøres: At opdage, hvad fremtiden er, at opdage, hvad menneskehedens muligheder er, for at virkeliggøre intet mindre end noget bedre, som kan forstås i denne sammenhæng. Det er, hvad Brunelleschi gjorde. Det er sådan, det fungerer, og det er den eneste måde, det faktisk virker på tilfredsstillende måde.

Med andre ord, så kommer menneskeheden ikke og siger, »Jeg er et stort geni«. Kommer frem og siger, »Jeg er et stort geni«. Hvad betyder det? Ved hvilken standard opdager man, hvad dette såkaldte geni er? Man ser på Einstein, og man ser på hans største række af udviklinger, og man ser det samme. Man ser det samme tidligere, i Brunelleschis arbejde. Det er alt sammen det samme. Det er begrebet om menneskehedens udødelighed, at altid gå op til et højere niveau af kreativitet, ikke inden for den eksisterende opfattelse af menneskeheden, men i en opfattelse ud over, for mennesket, ud over menneskehedens tilegnede kundskaber, på det tidspunkt.

Det er fremtiden, skabelsen af fremtiden på et højere niveau. Dette kommer ikke fra mennesket selv. Det kommer fra menneskehedens skæbne som en agent for opdagelse, der når op på et højere niveau end menneskeheden nogen sinde før har nået.

-----

*Redaktionens bemærkning: Dagens leder fra LaRouche-bevægelsen er hele Lyndon LaRouches Manhattan-diskussion fra lørdag, den 12. december. Vi har desværre ikke kapacitet til at oversætte det hele til dansk, men anbefaler kraftigt, at man læser/hører hele diskussionen, der omhandler LaRouches pointering af unikke, videnskabelige opdagelser, viljemæssigt udført af enkelte individer, som det bærende element i de periodevise revolutioner, der fører den menneskelige kultur fremad til et højere niveau, og altså ikke er noget, der 'sker af sig selv' som følge af en forud fastlagt 'evolution'. God fornøjelse! (-red.)*

---

Lyndon LaRouche Dialogue with the Manhattan Project, Saturday,  
December 12, 2015

HUMAN CREATIVE COMPOSITION: ALEXANDER HAMILTON'S MANHATTAN,  
BRUNELLESCHI'S DANCING ROPE BRIDGE, AND VERDI'S TUNING IN  
MUSIC

DENNIS SPEED: My name is Dennis Speed and on behalf of the  
LaRouche Political Action Committee I'd like to welcome you to  
today's meeting. I believe this is the 27th meeting, but I  
want

to say this:

Lyn, everybody today, has or has access at least, on the  
table in the back, to an {Executive Intelligence Review}  
magazine

simply entitled "Brunelleschi." Now, our Manhattan Project is  
over the next week going to go into a new phase, and the music  
will be leading that. And that musical process, which will  
reach

a certain level, particularly over next Friday, next Saturday,  
and Sunday, has already been started here today, by what Diane  
just did, especially her last reference to the question of the  
Solar System being inside one's head.

So Lyn, I'd like you to do something today which I'm  
requesting, which is an opening statement which takes us past  
the

noise of the Barack Obama apologizers of this week, such as  
Donald Trump and others; and puts us on a different plane so  
we

can consider this concept you've put forward about the unity  
of

the nation, and the need for people, good people, be they  
Republican, Democrat, Independent, or other, to come together  
and



accomplish what you've outlined can be done, which is the immediate removal of Barack Obama from office, and the immediate defeat of Wall Street, but by use of these methods that you had uniquely pioneered. And the Brunelleschi {EIR} just brought this to my mind. So I know I don't usually do that, but I'd like to ask you for an opening statement, and then we go to Q&A.

LYNDON LAROUCHE: Yes, I think the important thing that is for us to consider, is what was actually accomplished with Nicholas of Cusa, but prior to Nicholas of Cusa, and what preceded that. And therefore, once you place your ideas of judgment in that category, suddenly you find yourself in sort of a happy state of mind, that you are sure that you're on the right ground, you realize that there's creativity. And you go through the Brunelleschi series entirely. And Brunelleschi is a very complex question for people to deal with, who are particularly {ingénues}, because they don't understand it. But in the time of Brunelleschi's leadership, he was {really a master} in this area. And that was something on which the foundation, of modern civilization, has depended, on the great achievements of Brunelleschi. And everything else followed from that. But that's a whole story in itself. It's something, we've just gone through a choral practice, and the idea of a choral practice, which you've just been doing again, on this afternoon, and what we do in society in general, are one and the same thing. There has to be a harmonic agreement which is not simply

singing

notes one after the other, but going with the idea that everything you've done up to a certain point, requires that you

make an innovation to the next note; and then to make another one, again, an innovation to the next note. And that's exactly

what Brunelleschi did. And the best illustration, is he composed

or constructed, a harmonic chorus, which was {totally beautiful

music, itself}, absolutely beautiful, in his composition, in this small area, that he occupied for this subject-matter.

And

this thing set a standard for all wise people, to look up and see

something beautiful.

SPEED: Thank you, Lyn. He's referring to the Pazzi Chapel, I believe.

And I'd like to have us go to the first question, which is here.

Q: My name is J-W-. And I love that we're doing notes, and starting on notes, because my gosh, we've got some crazy notes going on in politics – like Trump and Hillary Clinton. So

who, as a bipartisan coalition, would you see helpful to bringing some harmony in our country?

LAROUCHE: I think, the point is, why not go from, beginning with Brunelleschi; And Brunelleschi was actually the founder of

modern science, in many ways. He did everything, everything imaginable. The list of his accomplishments is immense. But his

building of the Florence Cathedral, that particular

construction,  
which anyone can see these days, still, this was a magical  
development, and it reflects his mind.  
And what the small occasion that he struck there, in that  
little temple kind of place the Pazzi Chapel, musical temple,  
is  
one of the most beautiful little things ever produced, and it  
sets the standards for all kinds of beautiful things, in  
poetry,  
music, and so forth, in general. And so he is one of the  
great  
geniuses who brought the future of mankind into possibility.

Q: [follow-up] In our bipartisan coalition that we would  
like to see happen in this country, do you see any particular  
individual that we could anchor in on, and get some better  
music  
notation?

LAROCHE: Well, in terms of my own experience, I search for  
these kinds of opportunities. And by that I mean, when I'm  
dealing with something, I don't like to do something I think  
is  
shabby, or dull, either one. And therefore I think my  
impulses  
always are, to get some element of beauty, that is, but beauty  
in  
the true sense, not beauty as some kind of construction. But  
when you just try to do the things that you think are the next  
things which should happen, which is what Brunelleschi did, in  
his practice, If you go back his history. We're doing this  
now,  
it's a big story.  
But what he did, he set up whole systems. Like this idea  
that of a rope, if you take a rope and you pull a rope across  
the  
stream, and the rope has a flexibility in it. So the people

who

are walking across this rope, from one shore to the other; and this one of the famous things of Brunelleschi, and his treatment

of "yes, no; yes, no; yes, no," and so forth, was a typical part

of his whole mental life. And he used this to induce people, how

to trust a rope system, as you walk as a human being across the

rope, from one shore to the next. And people were doing that.

In Italy up to the recent time, this thing of the Rope Song, was

a very common feature of the culture.

In other words, you imagine you had two points across a

river. You create a flexible structure, of the type Brunelleschi

himself made, developed, designed. And you walk across the

thing, and you find that the rope dances. And in order to cross

the river, you must dance, in a sense, across the rope. When you

move on the rope, you change the direction of the rope, in terms

of the walking; and you can think that backwards and forwards,

and that's what the Italian standard was. And people up to the

present, or recent time, at least, remembered that song, about

the dancing rope. Because there's two points; you have one rope,

with a slack in it, and you're going to use the slack as like a

piece of music. So you step on the rope; now when you make the

next step, you're going to a different point in the crossing of

the rope. The effect is that the rope effectively dances,

according to your steps of moving in one direction or the other.

And this is typical of the concept of construction, which Brunelleschi represented.

And up to recent times, people used to sing that song, of the Rope Song, created by Brunelleschi. And this one of the principal methods of demonstration, of what he was trying to convey, to the minds of the people who were actually using that

rope to cross a stream. And that's still a valid thing today, as

even in my youth, or a little bit later, I was part, you know, you would sit there and you were thinking, you were thinking the

dancing rope; but just imagining that you were walking from one

step to the next in either direction, in terms of passing over that rope. And this idea created an idea in the mind of the people who were walking across this rope, from one point of departure to point of arrival. And this was an Italian theme, which dominated everything since Brunelleschi, up to a recent time, of the dancing rope.

Q: [follow-up] How can we apply that to our bipartisan issue here, politically, with Trump and Hillary Clinton, and how can we...?

LAROUCHE: Very easily, just do it. The way to do it is, you go backwards. What you do is, you construct the experiment.

Now, Brunelleschi did a lot of that. Everything that he did, including the whole development of the chapel that he created, he

did everything that way. And so therefore, everything worked. He built the whole structure of the tower was based on creating a shell which had a space, a shell within a shell.

And

I and my wife Helga walked up that system, inside the shell.

You

have also in the Italian music records, the same thing, you have

the choral presentation there. It was all there. It's still all

there.

The problem is, you don't have a population today which has that sense of experience. And the best thing we can do, is to take Brunelleschi's old work, including the tower that he built;

and that will give you an education, because you are forced to follow a certain ropes, with values. And you realize that your

music is the way the rope moves when you walk across it. And by

designing that thing as what you can do in music, is the same thing. You can change the character of the rope, and that will

change the tune of the walking of the rope, across the stream.

Q: [follow-up] Sounds good to me. Thank you very much!

[applause]

Q: Okay Mr. LaRouche, it's a pleasure to actually be here, actually meet with you, and not to mention that singer-songwriter

Mariah Carey will perform here at the Beacon Theater tonight. And so it's a pretty wonderful experience, you know, to learn more of the notes that take you back to high school, with the music notes that we just pronounced here.

Basically, my name is C-J-, and I'm actually an owner of a law firm. And so basically my primary concern is, basically on

regards of Barack Obama, our President, who is supposedly in violation of the 25th Amendment. So I wanted to know,

basically  
in order to require more of my students, and to teach more of  
my  
law students in more with regards to the 25th Amendment; and  
as  
far as the Congress, who, as far as not producing any  
functioning  
or producing any reins, on his behalf as far as not  
contributing  
to him violating the 25th Amendment, and as far as them not  
per  
se doing anything in regards of him moving in directions away  
from Constitution, or violating the Constitution. What do you  
think on that?

LAROUCHE: I looked, as to Obama's function, was the  
beginning of his career. And I looked quickly at what he was  
up  
to. I had a large core group was gathered around me on this  
business. And I launched the identification of what Obama  
meant,  
and before the end of the week, I had Obama's number. And my  
justness on his number was never lessened; I was right from  
the  
beginning. {He only became worse.}  
And if we want to have a civilization, you must remove any  
leadership, which corresponds to that of Obama. He is  
identical  
with the idea of a Satanic mentality. I think there are  
certain  
Roman emperors, Nero, for example, who would fit exactly what  
Obama represents today.

Q: [follow-up] Definitely. So do you think that him and the  
British Crown are affiliated with each other, as far as  
coinciding with each other?

LAROUCHE: They're identical. The Roman legacy, that is the

ancient Roman legacy, is still the foundation of the British System.

Q: [follow-up] Definitely.

LAROUCHE: It's evil.

Q: [follow-up] So, what do you think as far as Congress? And what is their functional role because of him violating the 25th Amendment to the Constitution?

LAROUCHE: It's obvious. Mankind has to create. Mankind is not something that is going to be fixed. This is stupid, the way

it's done. And the ignorance with which people approach the subject, by habit, by induced habit, is really very destructive.

Because mankind is not a self-determining creature. Mankind is a response to the potential of not only the Solar System, but

the Galactic System. Now, here mankind is actually, from our own

experience, mankind has progressed in understanding itself by educating themselves to get these ideas of physical principles,

or what is the effect of physical principles, and to recognize,

that that is the natural tendency. And when you study the Galactic System as such, and the Galactic System is a very large

and varied system. It's an immense thing. We have very limited

actual knowledge of the scope of that principle.

But what we find out, is we find out we can adduce the destiny of mankind from the standpoint of things like the Galactic System. But the Galactic System is only {one part} of a

larger system, which is the whole system of the Solar System



and

beyond. And so, therefore, mankind, must come to an agreement with that objective. And you get that with Kepler, Kepler is a

big change in the system, his accomplishments. Then you go to another layer, a higher layer of discovery. From Einstein, for example. Einstein is one of the greatest models for introducing

the concept of what the human mind is properly directed to do.

And we have {not} explored this thing fully. We just know

that mankind is not the stupidity of a single human being. No single human being, per se, is adequate to be a human being.

Mankind must always, be moving in a direction which goes to mastering challenges, as Einstein did, in his time; is to find a

creative pathway, to a higher level than mankind has ever known

before.

So mankind is not {sui generis}. Mankind is not something

which creates a Solar System per se, but rather mankind adapts to

the opportunity of the Solar System and beyond; and mankind is

not a self-contained creature. Mankind is a guided creature,

which is guided by the heavenly powers, so to speak; those

heavenly powers which are way beyond anything mankind had known

before. {But}, the crucial thing, if you follow that pathway of

improvements, you are acting in {harmony} with mankind's destiny.

Q: [follow-up] I think it's well said. I very much appreciate it, Mr. LaRouche. Thank you.

Q: Hi, Mr. LaRouche, my name is C—. I've been looking into

Brunelleschi, ever since you mentioned the triad, with

Brunelleschi, Cusa, and Kepler. And one of the things that

stood

out to me when I was looking into the subject, – you know, with

arches, an arch structure is not stable until you put that last

centerpiece, the keystone. And with domes that were built in that

time they needed the centering, and they were only stable when the keystone was put in place.

With Brunelleschi's dome, it never required any of that. It was self-standing throughout the entire process. And there was a

contemporary during that time who described that, because he grew

up watching Brunelleschi do this incredible thing, and he described it such that the catenary effect allowed for every brick to be a keystone. I was wondering if you could maybe elaborate on that?

LAROUCHE: Simply, this is something which I'm very familiar with. I've spent a good deal of time particularly in Italy, when

I was working in that area with some of the people, the Italians

who were gifted Italians at that point; and with their whole system. And this is something which is natural.

But the point here always is, that mankind is not a self-developing personality. Mankind has a destiny of improvement, of man's powers in terms, that mankind is able to foresee the powers of mankind, to achieve effects which mankind

would not otherwise be able to accomplish. This is something which goes to a higher level than what we think of as given facts

or given kinds of facts.

Everything important about mankind can be reduced to the requirement that mankind {must} develop to a higher level of

self-development. Mankind does not create self-development, but mankind tickles the potential of self-development. And that's what we call the discovery of creativity. And the best example of that, the simple case of that, is Einstein. Einstein did exactly what has to be done: To discover what the future is, to discover what mankind's options are, to realize nothing less than something better which you can understand in those terms. That's what Brunelleschi did. That's the way it works, and that's the {only} way it really works satisfactorily. In other words, mankind does not come out and say, "I'm a great genius." And walk out and say, "I'm a great genius." What does that mean? What's the standard by which you discover what this so-called alleged genius is? And you look at Einstein, and you look at his major series of developments, and you see the same thing. You'll see the same thing {earlier}, in the work of Brunelleschi. It's all the same thing. It's the immortal conception of mankind, to always go to a higher level of creativity, not within the opinion of the existing mankind, but of a comprehension beyond, for man, beyond mankind's accessed knowledge, then. It's the future, the creation of the future to a higher level. This does not come from man itself. It comes from the destiny of mankind, as a discovering agency, which reaches a higher level than mankind has ever reached before.

Q: Hi Mr. LaRouche, I'm R- from Bergen County, New Jersey. I apologize if I am a little bit disorganized today. But it was

last night that I came across Jeff Steinberg's excellent presentation last night [in the Friday Webcast], and an article

from LPAC brought my attention to a new development in the Congress called H.Res.198, submitted by Mr. Yoho. And to me, I

would like to get your thoughts on this, but to me this is an extremely interesting development, where the purpose of the resolution is to define impeachable high crimes and misdemeanors.

Without reading a lot of it, it says that: "The absence of impeachment standards creates an appearance that [as read] impeachment is a partisan exercise, which undermines its legitimacy and deters its use; and whereas the impeachment power

in the House of Representatives is a cornerstone safeguard against Presidential tyranny..." etc. And then they go through and define the Presidential impeachable offenses, and it's pretty

amazing when you read down the list, because there's nothing in

the list that hasn't been violated numerous times, by the last two Presidents. For example, initiating war without Congressional approval, killing American citizens, failing to superintend subordinates guilty of chronic Constitutional abuses

– the list goes on and on and on. You can read through it and see, there are probably hundreds of instances, in which all of these conditions have been violated by the last two Presidents.

But it raised to me, the question of why has Congress held back? I mean, it looks to me like there is some kind of emerging

consensus, in some sense coming into existence, which is reflected by this H.Res.198. But I went back and re-read the Preamble to the Constitution, and I asked myself, has Congress actually defended any of these conditions in the Preamble to

the

Constitution? "In order to form a more perfect Union." Has Congress helped to form a more perfect union? I don't think so.

"Establish justice?" Have they been defending justice? Not with

regard to Wall Street, for example. "Ensure domestic tranquility"

– we're not seeing a heck of a lot of domestic tranquility these days. "Provide for the common defense?" are they doing that

with the rise of ISIS? "Promoting the General Welfare?" Well, they sure as heck have {not} done that. "Securing the blessings

of liberty to ourselves and our posterity?"

Bottom line is, it looks like Congress over the last 15 years has done nothing to defend the Preamble to the Constitution.

So my question to you is, according to the Constitution, does the Congress have the obligation to meet the requirements of

the Preamble, or is that an option for them?

Beyond that, it looks like, if these diverse elements, come into the existence in the Congress, as reflected by Yoho's House

resolution, it seems that LPAC, in that case, plays an essential

and very important and historic role in being a catalyst to bring

those elements together, to force these issues to be confronted.

LAROUCHE: Let's take the case of Thomas Jefferson. Thomas Jefferson was the force of evil working against the foundation of

the United States. And since that time, there have been a great

number of Presidents of the United States, who have, like Jefferson, maintained a commitment to this evil, or relative evil, at least. And this has been the dominant feature among the

Presidencies of the United States; and by the local states in particular. The Southern states in general are hopelessly degenerate in these questions.

And the very best of our Presidential system of recent vintage, is a number of Presidents, who typify the effort, to bring about – . But then you find out that the President of the

United States, while Franklin Roosevelt seemed to be a great genius, but when the new election came, he was replaced by the FBI, the development of the FBI. Once the FBI was set into motion, the corruption of the United States was, consistently, but irregularly, going in a direction: {downward, downward, downward, downward.}

Now therefore, in this situation, we have to operate on the basis, of understanding a universal principle which was already

grafted, in at least its raw essence, by the founding of the United States. And what you have from our great first leadership

of this thing, which led to bringing of the Washington institution as a President, from that point on, was being savaged

in one degree or another, ever since.

Now, if we understand what the original principle was, and understand the measures by which you can test the principle, that's the only solution that we have. We have to go back to the

original Constitution of Alexander Hamilton, in particular. Hamilton had the most precise insight into what these principles

meant. Like the four first measures on economics. And if you look at his four cases, and apply that, that would be sufficient

to demonstrate what the inconsistency is of most practices since that time from more or less evil, or just stupidity. So the point is, if we understand that principle, we have a guide to clean up this mess. Now, of course, Obama we have to get rid of entirely; the Bushes—you have to burn the Bushes. God says burn the Bushes. Get these Bushes burned out and {clean it up}. And we need to have a Presidency which finally says, no, {we are not going to go one step further, in this kind of monstrous behavior, which we have been doing as a nation up and down in various ways, during the best of time.} We've come to a point of crisis, and it's a crisis which deals with the question of the United States and other nations of the planet as a whole. We have to bring a new condition among nations. We're working on a fight on this for China; we're trying to rebuild India's prospects; we're looking at efforts in Japan; we're looking at new canal systems, which are major canal systems, and all kinds of things. We're also working on recognizing that mankind, is not a creature limited to the Earth as such—that we also have to respond, to what are the implications of the Earth existing within this system, including the aquatic system, like the Galactic System. And these are factors which mankind must take into account. The most efficient example is that of Einstein. Now Einstein was absolutely unique, among all the people of his time, absolutely unique. It was the time in the 20th century, when the 20th century was going through a process of early

disintegration

and degeneration; and it's been going more and more deep into degeneration ever since. So we have to stop the process of degeneration, which has been given to us, by recent authority, since Franklin Roosevelt's birth. And we have to {exactly} put

into a new conception of mankind, which is a knowledgeable accord

with what mankind should be. It's not a perfect one, but it's a

knowledgeably sound one, which will lead hopefully, to more and

more improvements of man's role inside the Solar System, inside

the Galactic System, and beyond. We have to discover the mystery

of what the purpose of the existence of mankind is in the universe, and follow that pathway.

Q: Hi Mr. LaRouche. [E-B-] I would like to ask you, if Sen. Bernie Sanders, the Senator from Vermont, becomes the Democratic Party nominee for President, would you be able to support him? Would you be able to work together with him, if he becomes President?

He is saying that we must bring back Glass-Steagall, and that we must divide the wealth of the nation evenly. He's against the rich corporations getting away with the tax loopholes

and not paying any taxes at all or very little taxes. And Senator Sanders is for the working class families and for the middle class. So I'm just wondering, do you think he would make

a good President? Would you be able to work together with him and advise him?

LAROUCHE: Absolutely not! Absolutely not. He's a fraud.



We've got another candidate up there, who is much capable, and much more intelligent, who is also hesitating on the edge on this thing. But the problem is that we don't have any prospect, a functional prospect, to create a new Presidency. Now we could create that. And I'm aware of means by which we could create that, with the existing institutions of government, that is the foundations of our Constitution. And I think O'Malley would be a more likely candidate than anyone else on the screen right now.

There are other people—you know, I've supported Ronald Reagan; I was actually a part of his team, for a time. And then they got me out of there, because they wanted to get me out; they wanted the Bushes in there. And since then we've been living in the Bushes. Which means that everybody who's been functioning since Ronald Reagan was shot—he did survive—but he was shot by a member of the Bush family. And therefore everything has been backed down.

I was assigned, I was in the last two terms of the organization. And I was sent in to become, together with a great Einstein tradition figure, with two of us—Teller. Teller and I were actually collaborators in this thing. And we had been collaborating ever since, for most of the decade. And so we went with this, and we came up with a good program. But what's happened is that—what happened with Reagan, when Reagan got shot, is that the Bush family interest took

over,  
heavily, and since that time we have not had a good Presidency  
in  
any sense, since that time. We had Bill Clinton, who was the  
only approximation of that, and he had problems of getting his  
own government into shape. He never did get a full  
government,  
because his Vice President was a foul ball. And I worked with  
him, closely on some of these projects. And so I know what Bill  
Clinton was capable of, and I understood what Reagan was  
capable  
of. But that was a turning point. And that was the turning  
point  
that I experienced.  
And since that time, {there has been no good President}, or  
Presidential candidate of any function in the United States.  
And  
our issue now is, to define what the requirements are of a  
valid  
President of the United States, which is not an offense  
against  
the foundation of the United States, from, shall we say, the  
great leader from New York.  
And he {founded} this nation. He actually pulled it  
together, and got George Washington to pull it together, too.  
And that's how we got a United States. And we have been  
generally drifting up and down, ever since ever since the  
course  
of time.  
But we can do it. {We can do it.} We have better resources  
than ever before. But only a few of them have them. Our job  
is  
to spread, the knowledge, that we have, and to spread it to  
more  
people, to create a unity of understanding, among the people  
of

the United States and elsewhere.

Q: Hi, Lyn, how's it going? We've been doing a lot of work in Brooklyn on this Italian question, back to the Italian standard we were discussing before. And quite generally we've been working to push the Verdi tuning more prevalently amongst a lot of the older Italian opera singers. In fact, one of these Italian opera singers we met with earlier in the week, when briefed on our mobilization around the Verdi tuning, she was very moved; it wasn't like—she didn't just respond to the fact that the Verdi tuning was just a better way of singing. But she got very moved because she knew that, "Ah, now you guys can do the {Va Pensiero}. And I can help teach you the {Va Pensiero}." So she was moved on that level, that now we can actually communicate the {idea} of the piece itself. That same type of resonance around the music question, around the Verdi tuning is similar to what we're getting in the response around even concert we're doing with the {Messiah} in Brooklyn. From the business owners and the people generally in the population, that when we present it from the standpoint that we are going to use this, use the music question as a counter to the homicides, the suicides, the police shootings, the mass killings, people are responding in a similarly moving way. And I just wanted to get your feedback, on what the effect generally this is going to have on the population, generally?

LAROUCHE: Yes, I understand. The point is the Italian

standard. Now I had exposed in Italy, and was a participant in a celebration in honor of this work in Italy. And I was a participant in the centenary, in effect, of that period. And what the Italian standard, as defined by that standard, is probably the highest level of principled development of musical development, known to me. If anything matches that, it's not known to me. And so Verdi is the standard for {all good modern music}, as far as I know. The perfections are great. Now the next thing, you would have other things—the Spanish thing is complicated, it's a mess; the French language is a mess, to deal with in music: it's too much grunting and groaning involved there. And grunting and groaning is not good for the musical mind. And so what Verdi represented {is} the standard which should set, {by Verdi's strict standards}, as such, is the standard for {all good music known to me}. If it's known to someone else, we'll have to talk about that. But Verdi's standard, as I experienced it, at the celebration of his achievements—he was then dead, of course; and so, we went to his headquarters where he had lived; it was still his headquarters. And we had a great assembly among Italian musicians, and some Italian musicians who were also functioning from the United States and so forth. And we had this great event, celebrating the work of Verdi. And that standard is still the best. After the Italian, you have some German work, in terms of poetry and things like that which are better. The French language is a grunting language and it's a very bad language the

way it's used. "Uhhnh, eehnnn, hmm." Spanish similarly; Portuguese similarly. It does not produce good music. And there's some German music which is good, but Verdi is better. The Italian Verdi is much better. That's my knowledge.

Q: [follow-up] Just to follow up on that, what would you say the overall impact is going to have is going to have on the population when we do more of this?

LAROUCHE: We're going to do it. And you know what we're going to do? We're going to take Manhattan – you may be acquainted with that locality. But that locality can be the proper place within the United States as such, within Manhattan,

within the United States and bring in the Italian standard and the things that portend to the edge, of the Italian Classical standard. That's the way to go.

And my conviction is that if we do that effectively, and we do have some talent which can supply the training of some other

people, who have some skills of their own talent now, and can acquire an improvement, copied on that talent, we can actually change, not only the quality of music, in the United States, and

beyond, we can also create an improvement of the minds, of the musicians, now. Because by doing these things which are themselves beautiful, and true, you make people stronger. You make them richer, in terms of what their lives mean to them and

to the people around them.

So the idea of the retuning, of music – shut down all this crap! Take the real standard required, for competent musical composition, associate yourself with the best people in terms of

musicians, who could help to build the team, of a new musical school, which is founded on the basis of, for example, exemplary,

the Italian school of Verdi, and that itself, will make things  
{much} better. It'll make it much better in Italy, too.

Q: [strong accent] When I left Russia, I hoped the end of my life, I live in peace. I found war outside and inside, every time. So I remember now two people, Hitler and Stalin. I spent

50 years learning what happened to them. I'll just take three minutes, not more.

Hitler's performance was based on absolute stupidity, not one reasonable step. When Stalin routed him at Moscow in 1941,

then he understand that the war will be over. After that four years for Hitler, it was an effort to save his war, his Germany

and himself. In 1945, the war collapsed and he collapsed. But Germany remained. It was the strongest nation in Europe, and civilization, and what happened, that such a bastard, that he did.

In 1944, I was small, and my train was travelling from Moscow to the Crimea, across the battle of Kursk. We stopped. I

saw a German cemetery; it was about 2 miles wide and 10 miles long. The crosses, beautiful German crosses, I don't know where

they got the wood [to make them]; these were prairies. And on each cross, a German cask with bullets. That was what you call a

"weapons row" [s/l 50:28.4]. They got territory.

One stupidity after another; miserable country. And the one gigantic, giant, one-sixth of the Earth, and then what happened,

I find very similar now. It's striking similarity!

Again, somebody makes war, and has no idea how it will end.

To start you know; to finish, nobody knows. The Crimea, I lived

in Crimea, but I don't want to continue about that, but I simply want to tell you what's going on, reminds me of the same damned situation between Hitler and Stalin. A striking similarity. A lot of talk, a lot of things, and then a catastrophe. That war, 10 million people; in Russia, 18 million, Germany 12. It was a [inaudible] and one fool could do it! What's going on now, you know better than I do. Thank you.

LAROUCHE: Thank you.

SPEED: Lyn, that speaker is someone who, a couple years ago when you were very much emphasizing the danger of nuclear war, after Qaddafi, helped to convey a message. And I'd just like for you and everybody to know, that the idea that we are in the throes of the end of humanity if we don't get Obama out, is very, very well understood by many people in the world. I just wanted to make that quick comment, and ask that the next questioners come up.

LAROUCHE: It registers. I understand this.

Q: Hi Lyn, it's A— here, in New York again. We have, as everyone knows, a weekend of concerts of coming up, and the timing of this is no accident. The crucial importance of it, is obvious to us. I've been, this past week, doing flyer distribution and talking to individuals about the {Messiah} and I can't help but draw that, as confused and as concerned as people

are, the personal response I'm getting is a very welcomed and openness to attending. And I think we're going to have a very big turnout, at least from the Manhattan standpoint, and we still

have another week of talking to people and making these distributions.

And one of the things that's kind of funny to me, in not so much the distributions, but just in conversations with people, we're having a heat wave up here, and several people have said to

me – and I'm not kidding – “Yes, it's warm and that worries me.”

[laughs] And so, I said, “well, you know, we're singing Handel's

{Messiah}” – I can't even get into the global warming thing with

them! – I tell them what we're doing, and the response has been

very, very good. This is not just from Boomers, these are younger people; I think the church that we're using is unknown

to me, but very well known to people, and so, there is something

different that is radiating from them. And you oftentimes wonder

if it's you yourself that's kind of seeing this, but I don't think this was there before. And where we are with the silliness

that people believe, and the insanity of the President, even though they won't talk about it, is something that's affecting them. so they're drawn to something like the {Messiah}.

My question to you is, now, once we complete this, I think we're going to be in a very strong position, to catalyze people.

And what is it that we should be looking to do, to make sure that

that happens, and we can make Manhattan really grow?



LAROUCHE: Well, let's go back, that, in October of last year, I made a resolution, to free the United States from the local states within it. And my conception was to look at what was

focussed on Alexander Hamilton, and to take the Hamiltonian principle, which is a very useful one for all of these purposes,

and to say, let us create, again, something which is consistent

with the intention and the legacy of Classical musical composition. And what we did is, we found we were able to influence musicians, some of them who are first-rate musicians,

performers, and others who are capable to be trained, to join the

company of musical performers.

The idea is that, and this would go largely to the area of Manhattan and to certain areas around northern New Jersey, which

are that; and to some limited degree, to Boston and so forth, there. So, my view has been, we should go full speed for this kind of program, on Classical music and related kinds of things.

And with a great emphasis on the Classical composition work.

That's what we've been doing.

Now, we've got only in motion on this, because we are bringing people together, who are resolved to carry this out.

The leading group of people around this group, are fully qualified for that talent. We have had experiments, in education

experiment, absolutely qualified. We've had successes. We simply need to get more perfection and more breadth and more depth in new areas of musical work; and people are coming to it.

So this is particularly in the Manhattan region.

Now, my view has been, is the idea of the United States as being the ruling institution, I said, that's crap! I know the

Southern states of the United States, and most of them are crap.

I know it; and many of them who are intelligent, also know it. but they go along with the yokel local stuff, and that local yokel commitment destroys their ability to fulfill any mission that they want to really get to. So therefore, my view is, we have Manhattan and the Manhattan area; and we have a spread into

certain areas in New England and certain other locations. We can

take what we have, as there and potential, serious potential, work on that, and spread that from {that} region, into the rest

of the United States.

But the idea of the local yokel idea, in the state, is stupid. It doesn't work! It's wrong! You don't develop geniuses by training them to be fools. And that's the point. And

so, what we've got in the Manhattan area, with a certain group around the northern parts of New Jersey, and you know what those

regions are; and Brooklyn, of course, is always included in there; and we find that we have, in Manhattan and in the adjoining area, there, we have, we have the potential of creating

a choral organization, or a nest of choral organizations, which

can bring a new spirit to the United States, through this vicinity. And we know you can't do the job efficiently, if you

go at it in some other territories. You have to go in and {colonize}, these other states, and bring them to the reality of

the purpose of their life.

Q: Hello, Lyn! [Bob Baker] I wanted to attempt a question regarding the impact of the Manhattan Project into the other

parts of the nation. And from the standpoint, after a series of meetings with farmers and ag producers in Iowa and Illinois, last week, and the week before in Kansas and Missouri with cattlemen, what I've come to understand, as many people know, is that the state of the agriculture producers, is probably in a worse shape

now than it was in the 1970s:

Cattle prices have dropped 51%; in 1973, the price of corn was \$3.75 a bushel, and the price of good farmland was \$700 [an acre]. Today, the average price of good farmland is \$12,000-\$15,000 an acre and the price of corn is – \$3.75 a bushel.

So what you can see is, there's been a massive leveraging, and it's all coming from the Wall Street process, to where, now,

the majority of the livestock produced in the areas, is under contracts with big packing plants which are all connected to the

Wall Street banks. So in effect, what you've done is, you've moved the independent, owner-operator farm, into a process where

the farmer's building buildings, providing the land, supporting

the debt, and now he gets, a fee, to work on his farm for a big

packing plant of some kind; to raise crops for them or livestock.

What that's done is that's brought into the understanding of almost everybody agriculture, is that this situation cannot continue. And what you see is, you see the most advanced technology, things that you would just think about were only done by the rover on Mars, in terms of technology, is being used

by the average high-tech farmer today, in putting in his crops with the GPS modern technology. So it's very productive and very efficient – except they're becoming slaves to a financial system.

Now, as a counter to that, the Manhattan Project has influenced some people, farmers in certain areas; and in one case, farmers who were facing a situation where their local church was going to be knocked down, and they fought that.

Their ancestors came from Germany, they fought to keep it, and a couple

farmers, after being connected with your type of thinking and the

Manhattan Project and Classical music, set in motion to have Classical concerts in the church – which had never happened before, since it was erected.

And what happened is, the one farmer commented, he said, "I never saw so many grown men pull their hanky out" [pauses, emotionally moved] "and wipe tears out of their eyes."

I would like you to comment on that, in terms of the Manhattan Project's effect on the nation.

LAROUCHE: This is obvious, absolutely obvious. This is the course that we must take, there's no other course that's going to

work. Agriculture, everything, the whole thing is one thing. All

you have to do is say, "what did we lose? What was destroyed that

we had, in terms of earlier generations and earlier decades of the population?" And when you look at that, and you look at what

I saw while I was part of the Reagan administration, in that period, there's been a general trend of degeneration, of the opportunities and resources, of the people of the United States.

We have to {eliminate} that discrepancy between the two values, and go beyond that in terms of progress, directedly. We can do that and we {must} do that, and we must not accept anything {less}, than that direction of achievement. It has to happen fast, it has to happen now, it's necessary to bring the nations in general, like the nations of Asia, like China, like India, like other nations in other parts of the world; in Africa, in other parts of that world; in South America, to bring South America and Central America and bring them back into a productive role of mankind. {We must do that on a global scale.} We must bring those nations together for unification, of realizing, that is, actually realizing, {physically realizing}, the reconstruction of the productive powers of labor, and of the human mind: That has to be done! That is a mission which we must never abandon. And we must keep going, once we've gotten to that point.

Q: Mr. LaRouche, good afternoon. R— from Brooklyn. In the past, you've talked about the Galactic coordinates; I've found in talking to people, various persons, college graduates, that global warming is not happening; that the education is so bad, that I have to explain the Galactic coordinates. What do you think about this?

LAROCHE: Well, of course this is obvious. The point is, since the beginning of, well, shall we say, the Reagan administration, the first part of the Reagan administration, before the Bush family really got moved in there; and there's been a consistent degeneration. See the last time we had an

achievement was when I won a victory, in Manhattan, at the beginning in, in 1971, and we won then on that case, and we've been losing ever since. And when I came into the Presidency, under the Presidency of Ronald Reagan, was a part of a middle area, when we still had the potential at that point, of getting progress again.

But when Reagan was actually almost killed, by a member of his own Bush family, the trend has been {downward}, ever since.

And the rate of downwardness has tended to be predominantly, an

increasing rate of stupidity, the destruction of ideas.

So therefore, once we take that into account, we have a mission to perform. It's a mission in which mankind demands for

the sake of mankind as such. We cannot accept anything less. And

it is {achievable}! It is an achievable event!

Q: [follow-up] I take it that that if the Manhattan project is successful, we will have an effect on the educational system?

LAROUCHE: Absolutely. That's the only answer. That's the only possibility.

Q: Mr. LaRouche, it's W— from the Bronx. I just wanted to know, what do you think about Trump and a lot of his influence here in the New York City?

LAROUCHE: I think a Trump is an insult against elephants. He's a kind of animal we don't want, a Trump. And a Trump is also a piece of folly, even in the gambling business. Now, I hope that makes your day sweeter.

Q: [follow-up] Yes, thank you. Thank you. A lot of my

friends seem to like him, and I don't understand them.

SPEED: Wow – well, we all have friends like that. The ones we need to “unfriend”! [laughter]

Q: Or uplift!

LAROUCHE: How are you, young man?

SPEED: Well, I have a story for you. There is a recent movie made, and there is an earlier documentary, about the August

1974 walk, between the two towers of the World Trade Center. There was a Frenchman, 24 years old, who one night, with a team,

put a wire up between the two Towers; and he walked for 45 minutes between the two Towers. {Except}, when the police went

to apprehend him – and there is documentary footage of the actual policeman speaking in 1974, – he said, “well, he wasn't

really walking. The only thing that you can say is that he was dancing.”

Now, when this was said at the time, when I saw it, I just thought, well, there was somehow an athletic achievement. No! Because the wire-walker explained, in a brief discussion, he said, “no, well, there's a technical name for this, it's called a

catenary, but let me just tell you what I did.” And so he goes on

and never says more. But he had learned the technique – he was

not a member of a circus. He had studied various circuses, and

he also was a bit of an artist himself; he did a lot of drawings

of a lot of different constructions. But I only bring this up

because, what you were saying earlier about the rope dance and the fact that there are people who {knew} this, and that this is something that {is} known and is a physical knowledge that people have. I thought I would just tell you that. We're looking for the gentleman who did it; he happens to live in New York City these days, and to see what he might have to say about all this. So I just wanted to tell you that story. I guess, if there are no other questions, we have a choral rehearsal and other things we have to do this evening. So Lyn, I'd like you to give us some final remarks and we'll get to work.

LAROUCHE: OK, that's a good idea! Well, I think I have spoken my speaking on this question today. And I think it's something which, by its nature, is something which demands a continuity of realization. And so, I hope what we've done so far in terms of this particular session, that will be something which will lead to a profitable benefit for the people who were involved in this work.

SPEED: OK! Well, thank you. So on behalf of everybody here: Thank you very much, Lyn. Let's let Lyn know we appreciate what he just did for us. [applause]

---