

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 LAROCHE: 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?

LAROCHE: 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, eehhnn, 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.

LAROCHE: 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?

LAROUCHE: 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]
