

LaRouchePAC Internationale Fredags-webcast, 3. juni 2016:

Vi må rejse ud i rummet og virkeliggøre vores fælles bestemmelse

Ben Deniston gennemgår bl.a. de mange, internationale tiltag, med grafiske fremstillinger, der støtter alternativet til det anglo-amerikanske imperiums fremstød for global atomkrig, og Kesha Rogers fra Texas taler om afdøde tysk-amerikanske rumforskningspionér Krafft Ehrickes filosofi omkring menneskets indtagelse af rummet, og mennesket som et 'multi-globalt' væsen, der ikke er begrænset til blot én planet, m.m.

Engelsk udskrift.

WE MUST GO OUT INTO SPACE AND REALIZE OUR COMMON DESTINY

Friday LaRouche PAC Webcast

June 3, 2016

MEGAN BEETS: Hello! It's June 3rd, 2016. I'd like to welcome

all of you to our regular Friday broadcast here at LaRouche PAC.

My name is Megan Beets. I'm joined tonight in the studio by Ben

Deniston, and I'm also joined, via video, by LaRouche PAC Policy

Committee members Kesha Rogers, joining me from Houston Texas and

Diane Sare, joining us from New Jersey and Manhattan.

To start things off tonight, I'm going to read the question that came in to Mr. LaRouche from our institutional contact in Washington, and then turn it over to you, Diane, to deliver Mr. LaRouche's response, as well as some opening remarks, to start our discussion off.

The question reads: "Mr. LaRouche, the U.S. Senate passed a controversial bill known as the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act (JASTA) that would allow the families of 9/11 victims to sue the government of Saudi Arabia for its alleged financial support of al-Qaeda. The bill now goes to the U.S. House of Representatives for a vote. What are your recommendations to the House of Representatives?"

DIANE SARE: Well, I can report what Mr. LaRouche had to say about that, specifically, and then more in the background. He said that "We must state the case straightforwardly. It must be a clean bill with no loopholes, i.e., loopholes which would allow the Obama administration, or whatever administration that's covering up for the Saudis, to claim that there's negotiations going on with them that would prevent the families from being able to sue." He said, "It must not only be passed, but with a veto-proof majority. The issue is clear. The British and the Saudis were behind the crimes of 9/11 and should be held legally accountable."

I think this is extremely important with what I wanted to say, in terms of starting off the discussion this evening, which is that the American population is in somewhat of a quandary. They're in an unfair position because, thanks to our terribly

controlled news media, they're operating without full knowledge of the situation that they're in. They're thinking that we're in a presidential election campaign where they have to choose between Hillary Clinton, who is nothing but a lying, killer clone of Barack Obama; maybe Bernie Sanders, who's really just a fraud, and who has never met an anti-Russian policy that he has not supported; or Donald Trump, who is an FBI agent with a glorified toupee.

Actually, this is simply not the case. There's a much greater dynamic in the world right now, which is that the trans-Atlantic system is completely bankrupt. That means the British Royal Family and their Saudi and American puppets like Barack Obama, like the Bush family, are in a mad scramble to somehow maintain their grip, even as their system completely disintegrates. What Ben is about to present is the new dynamic of the planet, which is absolutely huge. It involves over half of the world's population and it involves over half of the world's population actually moving in a progressive, future-oriented, direction, which is something completely anomalous to most people and most people's thinking in the United States today.

So, what I just wanted to give a sense of is (1) the danger, in terms of the urgency of yanking down Obama by exposing his collusion with Saudi Arabia and Britain, the very people who committed the atrocities on September 11, 2001 in our country, so that we don't have thermonuclear war; and (2) that the United States can be brought to join this greater paradigm, which is actually what's affecting everything inside the United States,

not the local affairs as you see them.

I'll just say, people may recall that our Defense Secretary

Ashton Carter a couple months ago actually said that we should quadruple our defense spending in Europe. He said that we had to

be prepared for a threat from Russia – which is not threatening

us. But, what we are in fact doing is aggressively moving against

Russia, by supporting NATO military drills in the Baltic nations.

Germany has sent 1,000 troops into Lithuania for these drills.

NATO is erecting anti-ballistic missile systems. They have already been placed in Romania. Now we're talking about placing

them in Poland. These systems can easily be converted to carry {offensive} weapons; they're not just {defensive} systems. You can equip any of these rockets with nuclear warheads.

Putin has addressed this very directly. I'll just share what

Putin had to say about that. He talks about these compact launch

pads. "At the moment, the interceptor missiles installed have a

range of 500 km (310 miles), soon this will go up to 1,000 km (621 miles), and worse than that, they can be re-armed with 2,400

km (1,491 mile) offensive missiles even today, and it can be done

by simply switching the software, so that even the Romanians themselves won't know. How can this not be a threat to us? It certainly is. That is the reason why we have to respond now, and

if yesterday some areas in Romania did not know what it is like

to be a target, today we will have to take action to ensure

our security. Let me repeat, these are response measures, a response only. We were not the first to take such steps. The same will be done with regard to Poland. We will wait for certain actions to be taken in Poland. We are not going to do anything until we see missiles on the neighboring territory. And we have the necessary resources. You saw, the whole world saw our capabilities in term of our medium-range sea- and air-based missiles." He's referring to what Russia just did with regard to Syria, the phenomenal accuracy of missiles launched from the Mediterranean and elsewhere on wiping out ISIS targets. "We are not violating anything, but our ground-based Iskander missile systems have proven themselves as superb."

This is what Putin is now saying, and then our Defense Secretary Ashton Carter went on to give a raving speech in a U.S.

Naval Academy Commencement Address, where he talked about the great technological superiority of American weapons, which is simply not the case. Kesha will elaborate further [that] since Obama has dismantled out space program, we simply do not have the science and research to produce accurate and effective defense weapons systems. It's simply a fraud. I'm sure we are spending a lot of money. It's probably like our health care system, where we're spending more money than anyone else on the planet, and doing the worst job of producing anything.

I'll just say that there was just this study that came out from a fellow at Dartmouth College, and the Bush School of

Government at Texas A&M University. Secretary of State James Baker III, at the time when negotiations were being held with Gorbachev for the reunification of Germany, was {lying to Gorbachev at that time} [in 1990] – that the United States was already engaged in plans for expansion of NATO, even as we were telling Gorbachev that we were not, in terms of the conditions to reunify Germany.

So, it is no wonder that Putin is responding in this fashion. The aggressor is NATO and Obama, as tools of a bankrupt British Empire system. And what Americans need to know, and what the world needs to bear in mind, is the strength of the new paradigm, which is actually huge. It is the actions of Putin and Xi Jinping which are the reason why we've not plunged into thermonuclear war earlier. I think, as you'll see, they definitely have the upper hand in this situation. This is something that Americans should actually be acting in concert with, as opposed to the myopic focus of the current U.S. election campaign.

BEN DENISTON: Thanks Diane. We were discussing with Mr. LaRouche and Mrs. LaRouche yesterday, and had some discussions earlier in the week, and I think maybe just to reference what Mrs. LaRouche defined as just two stark directions the world is going in. On the one side, as you're saying, you have this insane, frankly imperial-style push, still, as long as you have Obama as this Puppet-in-Chief for the British, they're going for this threat of war drive. Every step they take is just further

and further to insanity.

I think part of what we're facing in the United States is people are not going to understand what's really going on unless they look at the global picture, and unless they look at the global picture from the right perspective. I think you're absolutely right. These elections are a joke unless you see them in the context of where the world's actually going right now. Obviously, the United States plays a critical role, but you're not going to define what the United States does, or where the United States goes, from within the United States. People have to look at what's happening in the world, to know how to act here in the United States to actually achieve something.

So, we want to take some time today and just put a little bit of depth – and I think we're going to be doing more of this in additional shows, additional segments in the future – but we want to put some depth on this new paradigm that is emerging. I just want to reference some of the developments, some stuff recently, some stuff from the months and years, but look at it together as one picture of an emerging – I would really call it this "win-win" paradigm to reference the refrain and the concept of China's President Xi Jinping, where he said that what China is pursuing is a "win-win" policy.

What we've seen recently, over years, but also just in the recent days and weeks, is a real consolidation of other

nations

coming around that policy, coming around the idea of a win-win principle. Maybe different nations are approaching it in different terms, or they have different words for it, or different expressions, or maybe stated in different languages, but I think there's a clear unification around this principle

–

that we have to move beyond the idea that every nation is competing for some finite set of resources, and the gains of another nation are somehow implicitly and inherently going to be

a loss for your nation. In other terms, sometimes, this general

"geopolitical view," as some people discuss it and think about it

– the idea that the world is this big game being played and you

have to ensure that you get the biggest slice of the pie, and any

gains made by another nation are somehow going to be detrimental,

because that's less potential gains for you.

You've seen a very clear and explicit break from this, not

just in words, not just in statements, but in actual action from

this new paradigm, centered around China, China's alliance with

Russia, and increasingly, cooperation with India. And you're seeing a clear commitment to the idea that the future of mankind

depends on cooperation in common progress, in common development

– that progress and development in joint cooperation between nations benefits both parties and other parties involved in, in

the nearby area: this idea of win-win cooperation. It's not

win-loss cooperation. Just because you win doesn't mean the other guy loses. We need to rise to a real mature understanding of how mankind progresses, what the nature of progress is for the human species – that mankind creates wealth, creates progress, by creative development, and the only way we're going to have a stable, progressive, future-oriented world – or any world at all, frankly, at this point, at the level of thermonuclear technologies – is a policy based on this principle, this recognition: that we can no longer tolerate the suppression or the denial of progress of other nations, and we must embark on policies that ensure cooperative development among nations.

These are nice ideas. We could talk about this. Everybody's heard politicians saying these kind of things. Maybe not in the U.S. so much even, these days. The point is this is actually happening. These are not just "nice ideas." This is where the world is going. This is happening now. This is the dynamic taking over the world. This defines what we have to do in the United States to ensure that we can be part of this process.

On the first graphic here we have displayed [Fig. 1], a lot of this centers around China's pivotal role with their One Belt-One Road program, comprised of a land-based revival of the Silk Road orientation, as a real development corridor, bringing development into the interior regions of Asia and Eurasia, but also coupled with their Maritime Silk Road initiative. This has kind of been a keystone of an expanding development of Asia as a whole, bringing in more and more nations, again, not in a

competitive way necessarily, but in a way of a win-win policy.

I do want to illustrate, just give a quick sketch, on some of the developments that have been occurring. But I'd like to premise this by just referencing some of the recent statements by the leaders of these nations. Again, Russia, China, and India coming along as a critical third partner in this whole process.

Just to highlight a few things, the President of India was in China just this past week; and while he was there, he gave an address on India-Chinese relations. And just to quote what he said, he said: "India and China are poised to play a significant and constructive role in the 21st Century. When Indians and Chinese come together to address global challenges and build on their shared interests, there is no limit to what our two peoples can jointly achieve." He went on to say, "Both sides should work with the aim of insuring that we do not burden our coming generations, by leaving our unresolved problems to them." So, that was the President of India speaking in China.

Also earlier this week, you had a former Chinese ambassador to Russia travel to Moscow and speak about Russian-Chinese relations. And he just said quite frankly, bilateral relations between Russia and China are now at a 400-year high. You hear politicians in the United States, you're lucky if they talk about a 4-year perspective or a 4-year analysis; let alone a 400-year assessment. This former ambassador to Russia from China said there's obviously differences; anytime you have two major

nations, you have differences. But he said, these are of a secondary level; and he said it's his assessment, as somebody who deals with top-level relations between these two nations, that the Presidents of the two nations – Xi and Putin – have a clear conceptual understanding, a clear conceptual agreement. So that's significant; again, reflecting this orientation.

Just this past Tuesday, the Premier of China was speaking to media editors and newspaper editors for various Asian publications; and then speaking to an Indian editor, he really emphasized that Chinese-Indian cooperation not only benefits China and India, but all of Asia. So again, here's the Premier of China, you had the President of India saying similar things; the Premier of China saying similar things. It's a reflection of Russia being a part of this. These are clear statements just in the recent period of this move towards this integration perspective. China's Premier also said – as an interesting note – that China welcomes India's leadership and role in this new development project linking India, Iran, and Afghanistan; we can see this on the next image here on the map [Fig. 2]; centered around Iran's Chabahar port. This new proposal for water transport, shipping, the development of this port; the development of the rail lines and related industry, and stretching up into Afghanistan. So, this is a new development project that India's partaking in; Iran's partaking in; and is going to bring critical development also into Afghanistan. And this is just typical; this kind of project – if you look at it in the old paradigm, maybe China could say this threatens our interests, because it's insuring other nations are gaining

more

power and that might be more threatening to our geopolitical role

in the region. But no, this is a different paradigm; this is a new paradigm.

That kind of thinking applies in the US and London still; it

still dominates the trans-Atlantic. But you go to Asia, and the

Chinese Premier is saying, great; this is excellent. We encourage

India's role in this type of development; we want more of this.

So, I think this project is just one of a number of projects that

I think are moving closer and closer to what the LaRouches defined with their Eurasian Land-Bridge perspective. A lot can be

said, but just to highlight a few things. You have this Chabahar

port project, linking India and Iran into Afghanistan. You have

the One Belt, One Road, including the New Silk Road program going

through the heart of the Eurasian continent. You also have just

within the past year, the completion and upgrading of some of these rail lines; where now you can travel directly from China all the way to Germany, faster than you could by shipping route,

by direct rail connections through the whole heart of Asia into

Europe across Eurasia. You have the prospect of regular upgraded

rail connections and transport from China down into Iran, now that the Iran sanctions are lifted; and we have the prospect of

Iran playing a larger role in the development of this region.

These are just a few examples of building off of China's One Belt, One Road, further related development projects; just reflecting the overall orientation towards growth, infrastructure investment, scientific investment, development throughout the Eurasian continent, led by these nations.

I think also indicative of this whole New Paradigm orientation, very interesting and illustrative of what we're talking about; you also have in the last two years, the creation and emergence of another economic development bloc – the Eurasian Economic Union – highlighted here in yellow. Of which Russia is the largest component of this economic agreement, this new economic zone which includes Russia, Kazakhstan, Belarus, Armenia, and Kyrgyzstan. So, this is kind of central north Asian bloc of economic development.

So again, if you're thinking like a British geopolitician, you might think this is a competition to China's One Belt, One Road program. Here you have Russia coming in, working with these other nations in the northern regions, trying to expand their economic development; while China is leading the way with their One Belt, One Road program. But in Asia, in the New Paradigm, in the way these leaders are thinking in a real sane, human fashion, they're not thinking about it in those terms. You had President Putin recently explicitly saying that they're looking towards integration and cooperation with the One Belt, One Road

program

explicitly. He said they're even working on specific projects as

part of the Eurasian Economic Union, which will directly integrate into the New Silk Road, the One Belt, One Road program.

It's not competition; it's not a geopolitical perspective. It's a

perspective of win-win cooperation of development, or progress;

and this is what has the trans-Atlantic powers, these geopolitical mindset people all freaked out.

Just to highlight a few other things, you have space.

You

have a Renaissance of space exploration in Asia, while the US is

decaying under Obama's cancellation of the manned space program

and his cuts and his complete lack of leadership in space; you have rapid progress being made in Asia. Just within the recent period, you have two new space launch centers, advanced space launch centers now open in Russia and China; as indicated here.

[Fig.3]

You have major water projects; massive south water north

projects, which is remarkable. They've made manmade rivers of a

large scale, directing water from the abundant waters of the south to the water-starved regions of the north. And they've made

major steps in managing and developing their water system as a nation as a whole; and they've got plans to further that with some of the more challenging aspects going further west with some

of the western routes. So, they've already accomplished certain

parts of this; and they're taking further steps.

But again, they're looking at positive developments for the whole region; they've recently said that they're looking towards helping the development of the Mekong River valley down in Southeast Asia. Where you have the Mekong River running through Laos, Thailand, Cambodia, Vietnam – this region here – and there's been recent droughts, major water shortages and difficulties; largely just from lack of development, lack of doing what the US did under Franklin Roosevelt with the TVA [Tennessee Valley Authority]. Lack of developing basic dams, irrigation reservoirs, water management systems to actually manage this river valley as a whole to insure regular, steady water supplies are available to the people. So, China's saying they want to look into helping to facilitate that process as a new project.

You have India now re-raising the prospects for another massive water transfer program – their river inter-linking project; where they can actually interlink some of the major rivers and again manage their water system as a national territory as a whole in a much more efficient and much more productive program.

And I'd just like if you look at these projects together, and this is just a sample of some of the stuff that's either in process, or is becoming likely, or is being coming discussed and could be a future orientation. If you look at this together, you're looking at the greatest and development and management of the water cycle in this entire East Asia, South Asia, Southeast Asia region, to be the greatest management of water that

mankind

has ever undertaken in the history of our species on this planet.

So, these are the kinds of things you see happening, in a win-win cooperative paradigm. And I want to end with just one last project; something very close to Mr. LaRouche specifically, because he's played a major role in supporting this. Which is the Kra Canal proposal; and this is a canal for water transport that's been proposed to cut through the Kra Isthmus in Thailand.

To facilitate greater trade between, as you can see here, the South China Sea and obviously stretching into the Pacific and China and Japan and Korea and into the Indian Ocean. From which,

India is obviously a major player there; but then also, those routes obviously go up through the New Suez Canal – constructed

by Egypt in a remarkable amount of time – and up into Europe. These major anchor points of world trade – in the Pacific with China, Japan, Korea on the one side; and then in the Indian Ocean

and over into Europe on the other side. This entire trade process

suffers a massive bottleneck currently, as all this trade has to

currently go through the Malaccan Strait; which is this narrow passage between Malaysia and Indonesia.

Right now, something on the order of one-fourth of all global trade goes through these narrow straits; not one-fourth of

the trade in this region, or one-fourth of the Asian trade.

One-fourth of all trade globally goes through this region. I've

seen different estimates, I'm not sure; that might be one-

fourth

of total ships or one-fourth of tonnage, or one-fourth of value,

I'm not sure exactly. I've seen other estimates say that it's 40%

of global trade; I think it probably depends upon exactly how you

count. But this is a major chunk of all trade occurring on the whole entire planet; going through this one congested, some parts

very shallow and narrow, region down around Singapore in the Malaccan Straits. And this has been known now for many years to

be major bottleneck constraining cheap, efficient, rapid trade between these sections of the world. So, in the '80s, Mr.

LaRouche became very involved in this proposal to make a new canal through this relatively narrow passage; this narrow isthmus

in Thailand. And enable a dramatic increase in the volume; reduction of the cost; increase in the speed of trade through these regions. Despite having been fought for for many years, now

in this new paradigm, this is now being put on the table again.

You just had an official advisory board of the Thailand

government endorsing this program. China has made it clear it would like to do this program, and maybe even finance the whole

thing if it goes forward. You have official experts in the United

States recognizing the importance of this program as kind of a keystone; relieving this bottleneck, and another major component

of facilitating this vast expanse of economic growth, trade, and

development in this whole region.

So, this is a very exciting, singular project, but it's emblematic and I think an example of the whole perspective we're talking about. And again, I think the theme is win-win. You have China, you have Russia, you have India; they've had conflicts, they've had wars, they've had tensions. But you have leaders now in these nations – typified by Xi Jinping, typified by Putin, Modi's role in India. They're now saying, we as mankind, as nations, as participants in humanity, need to move beyond this geopolitical approach to our existence on this planet. We have to move to a policy where we recognize growth, development, progress; all these things we're talking about here are necessary for everybody. Not just for us. We can no longer tolerate the suppression of this kind of development for others; we have to go to a global system centered around this kind of development. And again, that's not just being talked out, as you saw here, as you see what's going on with these developments.

Again, this is just a sketch; you could spend weeks going through what's happening in the world. And by the time you got done, you'd have a whole other set of things to catch up on; because a lot would have happened since the time you started. But this is now the center of what's happening in the world; and this defines how we need to think about what's happening. This is what has these London-Wall Street imperial faction people freaked out.

Because how have the British existed? Well, it existed on geopolitics; they've been the geo-politicians. They've been existing based upon looting; if there's nations they can't loot directly, I'm sure there's perpetual conflict between different regions. And especially under Obama, the United States has come under this geopolitical imperial orientation.

And to just come back to what you said Diane, the opposition from this imperial faction couldn't be clearer. They're taking step after step towards what would be thermonuclear annihilation in response to this emerging New Paradigm. This NATO summit coming up; the exercises being started now by NATO. Putin couldn't be clearer or saner in his response; saying, we've been talking about this for years. You guys are making clear overt military threats to us with your expansion of NATO, with the development of more advanced weapons systems closer and closer to our borders. What do you expect us to do? We have to respond for our own safety, and for the safety of the world, quite frankly.

So, I just think the situation couldn't be more stark; but I think especially here in the United States, we have to uplift the level of discussion to this global perspective. What's happening in Asia now, what's happening between Putin and Russia and China, increased collaboration with India; that is now increasingly becoming the defining factor for the world situation.

ROGERS: I think that what we're seeing going on in the world right now, and what you just laid out, really puts the perspective on the table of the decades-long fight of Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche now coming to fruition. I thought that it was important that you brought up Mr. LaRouche's fight around these development projects; around the Kra Canal in the '80s. And the fact of the matter is, at that very time, he was also fighting for the development of space exploration; around the "Woman on Mars" Mars mission, and the importance of mankind in space.

Now, I think what we're seeing right now can really be characterized from the standpoint of what the German-American space pioneer Krafft Ehrlicke described as the emergence of mankind into a poly-global world. And I think when you think of this conception of a poly-global world, where mankind is not confined to the limited resources of one globe, but moves out into the expansion of space; that's what we're seeing happen right now. What Russia and China represent is a move away from — we're not just talking about one globe; we're talking about one globe that has been dominated by a British Empire, a policy of murder. A population reduction, and defying this conception of the creative nature of human beings and the human mind. When you think about Russia and China are doing to pull together over 50% of the world, this is quite remarkable; and it can only be looked at from the standpoint of a new species of mankind. It's a real force of good versus evil; and the evil is completely being destroyed and losing. Because the drive right now for thermonuclear war being pushed and perpetuated continuously by

the stooge Obama in the White House; who's been pushing the murderous policy to protect the British Empire, protect the Saudis. And to continue to push a policy that's going to lead to not just a continuation of a confinement to one world; but a one world where people are on the verge of being exterminated and blowing themselves up, unless we change our attitudes now. And I think the matter is, is what Diane and you both presented; which is that we have a real clear choice and opportunity before us. I think it's very important as to the very important fight that our international organization is leading right now, that we have to put an end to Obama, to this drive for thermonuclear war, and to NATO and what it represents in terms of its escalations and provocations of war towards Russia and China.

But I think to continue to look on the optimistic, positive side, which most of the world is moving toward, we have to give the United States and American people a sense of what we must be participating in, in terms of our mission to join in this drive toward peaceful cooperation and progress. I think it's very important to note that today is the 51st anniversary of the first American to walk in space – Ed White; which was June 3, 1965.

As I was stating, you take the conception laid by the German space pioneer Krafft Ehrlicke; what he conceptualized was not something that was confined to one people or one nation. But

that

was going to be the intention that was going to unify all people

in a common interest that our destiny and mission as mankind was

to break with the confines of Earth that put limitations on man,

and that bestialized human beings and pit human beings against each other; to find our common interest in the development of space. And you're seeing more and more people starting to recognize this intention and this need for cooperation. It was just reported today that at an international air show in Germany,

the head of the European Space Agency, Johann-Dietrich Wörner, actually made the point of manned missions being indispensable for space and planetary research. He said because human astronauts can access and act independently – unlike robots. He

also talked about the need for building permanent lunar bases; and he called this a Moon Village. And he said that this Moon Village can be constructed with a lot of material already existing on the Moon; and that the Moon Village would be a stepping stone to reaching other planets such as Mars and so forth.

Now, I wanted to say in that context, that I attended an

event last night, and the speaker was speaking on the Curiosity

mission; which most people remember landed on Mars in 2012.

What

I brought up at that time was that the excitement around the fact

that – as Mr. LaRouche conceptualized it – that the mind of man

and the extended sensorium of man had now been put on Mars; but

that there are limitations to that. And the speaker recognized

those limitations and he said something to the effect of what Mr.

Wörner said in Germany; which is, we have an obligation as mankind to actually go out into the reaches of space. To colonize

the Moon; to colonize Mars. And to build these colonies because

of the limitations that are put on mankind. And he said that we

have to look at it from the standpoint that this is our destiny.

This is exactly what Krafft Ehrlicke recognized as he presented a principal work called {Lunar Industrialization and Settlement; Birth of Poly-Global Civilization}. In the work, he

summarizes "the major aspects of lunar industrialization and settlement, and identifies that scientific and evolutionary facts

leading to a definitive justification of why man must industrialize space. Changing our present closed world into a present world. He also establishes the philosophy of the extra-terrestrial imperative as a defense of justification for a

long-term based on mankind's ability to transcend the limits of

one small planet." And that is what Russia and China are representing; the transformation and transcendence of this one small planet being controlled by an imperial policy which is ready to be ended and to be destroyed, {if} we do the right thing

and we take the right actions.

If you look at this from the standpoint of the continued

aspect of what you presented, Ben, as the objective of what China

put forward as a win-win strategy of cooperation. They're continuing to do that, as the Chinese space leaders have just

put

forth an additional perspective to that win-win strategy of cooperation, international collaboration on the future Moon missions. The first Chinese astronaut presented that a study is

being conducted to justify the importance of lunar exploration;

and Russia and the European Space Agency are already discussing

collaboration on lunar missions. The intention is that there would be astronauts sent to the Moon by China by 2036; and he presented this speaking at a conference on manned space exploration in Russia. I think that that is quite extraordinary,

because when you look at the fact that Obama has continued to push a murderous policy against our space program, and to continue to drive and perpetuate an extermination war for mankind. The question is, why are the American people still stuck

in a completely insane world of lies and fraud; thinking that an

election actually has some real bearing on the future of mankind,

when it doesn't?

What is going to determine the future is that the United

States has to join with this perspective of a poly-global world,

a world not confined by limitations; as Krafft Ehrlicke laid out.

I think what we're going to witness – and Megan has presented this on many occasions – within the next two years with China's

mission to the far side of the Moon, puts a real perspective on

the development of space. And building the permanent colonies; but more importantly, it puts a perspective on that which is

going to determine what the future of mankind is going to be. It's not going to be this election; it's not going to be this bankrupt British Empire and Wall Street system. It's going to be the emergence of a new human species that – as Mr. LaRouche has defined – is actually focusing on what type of future do we want to create and must we create for our children and grandchildren. And that's the way that Russia and China and 50% of the world is joining them; they're not taking up these projects just because they want to build infrastructure and new projects. No lower intention of our perspective as a species can be taken up, except for the one which actually transforms the conception of who we are as a human species. That's what this political election is missing; that's what we've been missing in society as we've sat back with our eyes closed, blindfolded. Doing nothing about the injustices, the murderous policy, the war and so forth that has been dominating our society for far too long. Now that you're seeing that this drive for evil is about to end now, we should be a part of participating in that perspective for mankind; which is the alternative that's being presented right now.

SARE: Well, I think that's great. And to return to what was brought up at the very beginning, one of the flanks on this matter is the question of the Saudi role and Obama's protection

of them in the 9/11 attacks. If you think about all of the wars that the United States has been engaged in since September 11, 2001, if that could be addressed in a sharp fashion; and if Obama were to be brought down, jailed, impeached, indicted. That obviously would have a dramatic impact on what the future of the United States looked like, and the potential for our nation to be a welcome partner in this phenomenal change of direction for the world.

DENISTON: Yeah, that's definitely the critical flank we have. And I know, Diane, that you've expressed the importance of this obviously in New York in particular; obviously the major epicenter of these attacks. But the other aspect of this is, Obama has to go; the idea that we're going to wait for the election or something. This is bigger than that; this is about freeing the United States from this 9/11 dynamic as a whole. You look at this British-Saudi operation; it wasn't just something in and of itself. It was the event that was used by these British assets, who were created well before the event and had been operating well before the event, for these types of activities. Something that LaRouche has been going after since the '80s in terms of these covert, irregular warfare-type operations the British have created; including these Saudi fundamentalist factions.

I was just looking back at Putin's statements recently; how he was referencing the threat Russia is being faced with in

regards to this NATO advancement. And he again referenced the US pulling out of the ABM Treaty in 2002. What was the ostensible reason for us doing that? 9/11. Now are we worried about ballistic missiles coming from the mujahideen in Afghanistan? Is that why we had to pull out of the ABM Treaty; because we worried about Osama bin Laden out of some case we can't even find, operating ballistic missiles? It's been the cover to really pursue this whole insane perpetual war policy; this police state policy in the United States. The things you hear – "It was Bush, not Obama. So, how are you blaming Obama?" Obama is actively covering up for the worst atrocity committed against Americans on American soil in American history; and he's protecting that. And he's protecting the continuation of that as a process to ensure that the United States continues to act in this post-9/11 mode.

So I think breaking this issue, like you're saying, there's nothing else that needs to happen but that at this point.

BEETS: And on that, I think people are beginning to wake up to the war danger, which is becoming impossible to ignore especially in places like Europe. You had on Thursday night, a significant television segment on German TV which was titled "The Backers of 9/11; The Secret of the 28 Pages". Which centered on an interview with former Senator Bob Graham; going through exactly how the Bush and Obama governments have covered up

what

was clearly known to be Saudi government involvement in funding

9/11. And poses the question that not only do the past 15 years

have to be re-examined and understood from a new perspective; but

also raising the question of what this means for Germany. And I

think that's very important from the standpoint of what you just

raised, Diane. What are the flanks; what are the things we can pull? And we have this petition featured on the LaRouche PAC site

right now, which is beginning rapidly gain signatures internationally; which is called "The Warsaw Summit Prepares for

War; It's Time to Leave NATO Now". And I would encourage everybody to get on the site, sign it, and circulate it. I do think this discussion has been very important, because it really

does pose the question to the American people: Are we going to continue in this perpetual state of childhood, adolescence? Closing our eyes and sleepwalking into what would be the biggest

disaster for mankind in all of history – complete extinction warfare – will we permit that? Or will we choose a more beautiful and better future? Which I think you laid out beautifully, Kesha. And it reminded me, I just finished the memoirs of the astronaut Michael Collins last night; the third,

sometimes forgotten member of the Apollo 11 crew. And he says at

the end of the book, I wish every member of government could get

out into space and look down onto our planet; because borders completely disappear. And you begin to realize that the so-

called

"conflicts" between people on Earth amount to nothing and that we

have a common destiny. So, I think what you laid out there, Kesha, really is what people need to be thinking about.

We need to forget our commitment to this dangerous insanity and silliness; and decide that we're committed to building a future.

So, unless there's anything else, we could leave it there for this week.

DENISTON: We have a lot more coming. I know there's going to be a rather exciting conference in the San Francisco Bay area, coming up in the middle of next week; June 8th. So, I think we'll look forward to getting reports on that, and more focal points of focus on getting the United States shifted to the direction we need.

ROGERS: If you're in the area, you should attend this.

DENISTON: Absolutely. It's to be seen as another follow-on after the excellent conference we had in Manhattan just recently. There's a lot going on; we're going to be doing a lot more. And again, this petition; we can post a link to it in the description below. People should be circulating it, signing it; getting as many signatures as possible. This is certainly a critical flank right now in the build-up to the upcoming NATO summit.

BEETS: Good. Thank you Diane and Kesha; thanks Ben.
And I'd
like to thank all of you watching; so stay tuned to
larouchepac.com.

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 the 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-LAROCHE: 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-LAROCHE: 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-LAROCHE: 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-LAROCHE: 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?

LAROCHE: 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?

LAROUCHE: ... 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?

LAROUCHE: 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?

LAROCHE: 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]

Hvad er videnskab?

2. juni 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – Mennesket skriver historie lige for øjnene af os i dag, fra dag til dag og endda fra time til time i takt med, at alle de forskellige,

gensidige forbindelser mellem Rusland, Kina og Indien bliver stadig tættere og stadig mere talrige, og som trækker 70 eller flere nationer tættere sammen, hvilket faktisk omfatter godt og vel halvdelen af menneskeheden – som **Helga Zepp-LaRouche** sagde i sit interview med TASS den 31. maj.

Det er som en ring af sammenkædede magneter, der trækker hinanden ind i en stadig tættere kæde. Tænk på den **genoplivede interesse for Kra-kanalen**, der forbinder Det sydkinesiske Hav med Det indiske Ocean (via Den thailandske Golf og området omkring Andamanerne i Den bengalske Bugt).

I sin nuværende inkarnation er dette et projekt fra Lyndon LaRouche og Japan. Det vil forbinde Indien med Sydøstasien og Kina; det vil revolutionere disse farvande; Lyndon LaRouche har sagt, at det vil blive en af de største revolutioner i moderne historie.

Den 31. maj sagde den kinesiske premierminister Li Keqiang til asiatiske redaktører, at

"Hvis Kina og Indien arbejder sammen og smeder synenergi, vil det kaste nytte af sig ikke alene for det kinesiske og indiske folk, men også til Asien og videre endnu."

Med henvisning til Indiens nylige annoncering af en aftale om en handelskorridor med Iran og Afghanistan, via Irans Chabaharhavn, sagde Li, at Kina "hilser den velkommen".

Indien og Kina samarbejder for første gang omkring Tibet, hvor Kina tidligere har været særligt ømfindtlige mht. Indien i betragtning af Dalai Lamas tilstedeværelse i Indien, samt det derværende betragtelige, tibetanske samfund.

Ligeledes den 31. maj talte den forhenværende kinesiske ambassadør til Rusland, Li Fenglin, ved en todages konference i Moskva om de kinesisk-russiske relationer. Han sagde her, at den bilaterale relation stod på sit højeste i 400 år, men at Kina ønsker, at Rusland skal have større tiltro til den.

"Det er min fornemmelse, at Putin og Xi har en begrebsmæssig forståelse af, hvordan vi bør samarbejde, men at der er forståelsesproblemer på mellemliderniveau",

sagde ambassadør Li, der talte perfekt og idiomatisk russisk.

"Det gør ingen ting, at vi har forskellige fremgangsmåder. Det er helt normalt for sådanne store og forskellige lande at have forskellige fremgangsmåder. Det væsentlige er, at disse ikke fører til modsigelser."

Alt dette minder os om, hvorfor (den amerikanske) LaRouchePAC-leder Kesha Rogers fra Houston, Texas, så viseligt valgte afdøde tysk-amerikanske rumpionér, Krafft Ehrlicke, som den personlighed, der skulle være omdrejningspunkt for hendes kamp for at genoplive USA's rumprogram.

Krafft Ehrlickes fremgangsmåde er, i lighed med Lyndon LaRouches, ikke den mindste smule 'praktisk' (dvs. begrænset af, hvad der 'tilsyneladende' kun er muligt), men alligevel viser sig at være ekstremt virksom, som det er blevet demonstreret, så det er hævet over enhver tvivl. **Krafft Ehrlicke** var en af de ledere inden for udforskning af rummet, som også tidligere Konstantin Tsiolkovskij og Hermann Oberth var det, hvis mod og intellekt bragte mennesket til nye verdener, som endda overgik det, som Christoffer Columbus gjorde.

Krafft Ehrlicke var en forsker; men hans forskning udgør ægte videnskab, og ikke den afskyelige, matematiske erstatning for videnskab, der i dag undervises på vore skoler, og som repræsenteres af Obamas degenererede forsvarsminister, Ashton Carter. Ashton Carters falske version af videnskab gav os F-35-flyet, til sandsynligvis \$200 mio. dollar stykket, og som ikke virker, og aldrig kommer til at virke.

Krafft Ehrlicke forudså derimod, blandt mange andre dristige, videnskabelige præstationer, med præcision Apollo 13-missionen i 1970 i en artikel, skrevet i 1948. Typisk for ham stod der i

hans artikel fra 1948, at han havde skrevet den i 2400 med et tilbageblik over de seneste 350 år, til den første, bemandede Marsmission i 2050, med navnet "Ekspedition Ares". Terence Norton, lederen af denne mission, havde været nødsaget til at svare på den indvending, at de i 2050 til rådighed stående teknologiers begrænsninger – her hovedsageligt det forhold, at der kun var kemisk propulsion til rådighed for rumrejser – forøgede sandsynligheden af en "afvigelse fra den normale plan", og hermed også missionens fiasko, og endda missionsmandskabets død. Hvad var så hans svar? Var det at annullere missionen? I sin rapport til "Rumfartsstyrelsen" skrev han:

"Når man betragter problemet fra et hvilket som helst standpunkt, rejser spørgsmålet sig: På hvilken måde kunne man imødegå udfordringen med afvigelse fra den normale plan, ved hjælp af de til rådighed stående ressourcer? Tilbyder en sådan ikke særlig sandsynlig situation ikke chancer for at vinde for sig, de storslåede resultater af menneskelig dristighed; eller, betyder en manglende evne til at kunne overkomme denne situation den visse død, et sted ude i rummet, for alle ombordværende?"

"En undersøgelse af de følgende sider vil vise, at den tekniske gruppe har øget sikkerhedsfaktoren til et tal, der er langt større end det tal, der ansås for at være maksimum, da projektet blev startet op. Resten kan overlades til gruppens karakter og åndrighed. Det må åbenhjertigt indrømmes, at mulige farer, som ikke kan forudses, findes, men gruppen er fast overbevist om, at mod, ressourcefuldhed og opnåede præstationer hos de mennesker, der er blevet udvalgt til at foretage rejsen, med succes vil imødegå rumrejsens udfordringer."

En anden faktor var virkelighedstro, grundig og omfattende træning, træning og atter træning – meget af den i selve rummet. Bemærk, at meget af den tekniske gentagelse, der var indbygget i "Ekspedition Ares", var identisk med den, der var

at finde i Apollomissionerne: nemlig, en ophobning af forskellige moduler, der kunne overleve uafhængigt af hinanden, hvor hver af dem var skræddersyet til et specifikt formål, men samtidig til generelle formål.

Og, ligesom med Apollo 13, forekom der et uheld med "Ekspedition Ares" og en "afvigelse fra den normale plan". Ligesom Apollo 13 måtte missionen opgives, men ligesom med Apollo 13 blev hele besætningen reddet og kom tilbage til Jorden.

Kesha Rogers ved sandelig, hvad hun taler om.

**USA og Europa har mere brug
for
samarbejde om Den Nye
Silkevej
end Asien har –
Interview med Helga Zepp-**

LaRouche

Onsdag, 1. juni 2016 – Schiller Instituttets grundlægger Helga Zepp-LaRouche, der i Kina har fået tilnavnet "Silkevejsladyen", og som, sammen med Lyndon LaRouche, er den fremmeste promotor af denne politik i Europa, blev interviewet af TASS den 31. maj 2016 om at træffe valget mellem enten en ny, global krig, eller økonomisk udvikling og samarbejde.

TASS: Hvordan vurderer De det aktuelle, internationale samarbejde?

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Der er to radikalt modsatrettede bevægelser på planeten netop nu. På den ene side mødes kombinationen af præsident Putins meget succesrige militære flanker, såsom hans intervention i Syrien, der skabte potentialet for fred, og så hans forskellige diplomatiske interventioner i Asien, parallelt med Kinas initiativer for Den Nye Silkevej.

Disse indsatser repræsenterer allerede et win-win-perspektiv for flere end 70 lande.

På den anden side finder der en ekstremt farlig konfrontation sted fra USA's, Storbritanniens, EU's og NATO's side imod Rusland og Kina, der har bragt verden ind i multiple kriser, der er farligere end på højden af den Kolde Krig.

TASS: På hvilke områder er dette mere aktivt, og hvor er det ikke?

Zepp-LaRouche: Med hensyn til Syrien, så er samarbejdet mellem [den russiske] udenrigsminister Lavrov og [den amerikanske] udenrigsminister Kerry, såvel som også Genève-samarbejdet mellem Rusland og USA, meget positivt. Men så længe USA imidlertid ikke opgiver sin politik for 'regimeskift', er situationen fortsat farlig. Præsident Putin har vist sig at være en fremragende strateg.

Dette giver tiltro til, at det ikke vil lykkes krigshøgene i NATO at lokke Rusland ind i en fælde og give NATO et påskud til at lancere et førsteangreb.

TASS: Omkring hvilke spørgsmål må vi optrappe samarbejdet mellem Vesten og Rusland, og hvorfor?

Zepp-LaRouche: Kendsgerningen er den, at hele den transatlantiske sektor er bankerot og tæt på at eksplodere på en større måde end i 2008. Den japanske premierminister Abe understregede, efter et meget vigtigt besøg i Rusland, klart dette ved det nyligt afsluttede G7-møde, men blev afvist af præsident Obama, der hævdede, at "den økonomiske genrejsning går fremad", hvilket er absurd i lyset af centralbankernes negative rentesatser og debatten omkring "helikopter-penge" (ubegrænset pengetrykning, *-red.*).

Vesten har derfor mere end Asien brug for den form for økonomisk samarbejde, som samarbejdet om Ét bælte, én vej/den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union byder på, og som integrerer Eurasien fra Vladivostok til Lissabon, men som også inviterer USA til at deltage i dette perspektiv. Vi kan kun undgå en katastrofe, hvis det lykkes os at overvinde geopolitik og nå frem til et nyt paradigme, baseret på et partnerskab for global udvikling og menneskehedens fælles mål.

TASS: Hvorfor forhindrer Vesten i den grad samarbejde med Rusland, på trods af den åbenlyse terrortrussel, cyberkriminalitet og andre internationale udfordringer?

Zepp-LaRouche: Næsten alle betydningsfulde konflikter stammer fra det anglo-amerikanske imperiums indsats for at bevare en unipolær verden, på et tidspunkt, hvor denne verden de facto allerede er ophørt med at eksistere. Flere og flere kræfter i verden indser, at de må træffe eksistentielle beslutninger, og at deres nationers interesser er meget bedre tjent med at standse sanktionerne og konfrontationen imod Rusland og Kina.

Den kendsgerning, at Rusland og Kina har skabt et meget

stærkt, strategisk partnerskab, med Indien som en tredje partner, har flyttet den strategiske balance i verden. Flere og flere lande ser det som langt mere gavnligt at samarbejde om fælles udvikling end at befinde sig under åget af en militær konfrontation. Vi befinder os på et punkt i historien, hvor der må vælges, og det, der tæller, er lederskab af den art, som vi har set komme fra præsident Putin.

INTERNATIONAL APPEL

Warszawa-topmødet forbereder krig –

Tiden er inde til at forlade NATO nu!

Det forestående NATO-topmøde i Warszawa den 8. – 9. juli forventes at blive endnu en provokation mod Rusland. Ved at underskrive denne appel siger vi "stop" denne optrapning mod atomkrig, før det, der er uigenkaldeligt, indtræffer!

Download (PDF, Unknown)

30. maj 2016: Følgende appel cirkuleres internationalt,

inklusive på den internationale LaRouche-bevægelses websider:

Det forestående NATO-topmøde i Warszawa den 8. – 9. juli forventes at blive endnu en provokation mod Rusland. Ved at underskrive denne appel siger vi "stop" denne optrapning mod atomkrig, før det, der er uigenkaldeligt, indtræffer!

Dette er en alvorstung time. En ny missilkrise er under opbygning, som et spejlbillede af den, der i 1962 førte til, at Sovjetunionen deployerede atomspræghoveder på Cuba, på USA's dørtærskel. I dag er situationen omvendt. Dengang bekæmpede NATO Warszawa-pagten; i dag organiserer NATO et topmøde i Warszawa!

Vi, der underskriver dette, observerer, at NATO gennemfører en provokerende "inddæmningspolitik", som følger: (se pdf)

1.

Det sker i verden – Infrastruktur, Videnskab & Teknologi, nr. 8

Korte artikler fra hele verden. Indeholder bl.a.:

- Sverige og Tyskland tilslutter sig Kinas Chang'e-4 mission til Månens bagside
- Rumænsk kosmonaut roser samarbejdet med Kina
- Telemålingssatellitter er nøglen til "Rum-Silkevejen"

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Afrika savner grundlæggende infrastruktur.

Et interview med Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Helga Zepp-LaRouche besvarede den 6. maj spørgsmål fra det camerounske tidsskrift "Intégration's" korrespondent i New York, Celestin Ngoa Balla, der havde deltaget i Schiller-instituttets konference i New York den 7. april.

Intégration: De har lige arrangeret en konference i New York. Hvad drejede den sig om? Hvad blev der sagt? Og hvad skal vi forvente som det næste?

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: I Midtpunktet for denne konference i New York stod krigsfaren, de fantastiske gennembrud under udbygningen af Den nye Silkevej i forskellige lande, fremtidens videnskab og dialog mellem kulturerne. Det bedste er at kikke ind på vore internetsider og selv se det. (www.schillerinstitute.org, newparadigm.schillerinstitute.com). Og vi vil fortsætte med at arrangere flere af den slags konferencer.

Intégration: De holder foredrag over hele verden, men ikke i Afrika eller Cameroun. Hvornår kommer de og besøger os?

Zepp-LaRouche: Jeg har allerede deltaget i konferencer i Khartoum (Sudan) og Abuja (Nigeria), og jeg har arbejdet siden begyndelsen af 1970'erne på et udviklingsprogram for Afrika. Det skyldes altså ikke mangel på interesse, men på lejlighed.

Intégration: Hvorfor prøver De at fremme en ny økonomisk

verdensorden?

Zepp-LaRouche: Fordi den nuværende verdensorden, der almindeligvis kaldes 'globalisering', er fuldstændigt bankerot – finansielt såvel som moralsk. Nødvendigheden af en ny, retfærdig økonomisk orden er endnu mere påtrængende i dag, end den var for 50 år siden, da den blokfræ bevægelse krævede en ny økonomisk verdensorden. Den store humanitære krise, der kommer til udtryk ved, at mange millioner mennesker nu om dage flygter fra krig, sult og fattigdom i Sydvestasien og Afrika og sætter deres liv på spil for at forsøge at komme til et Europa, der lukker sine grænser, er en sønderlemmende dom over alle dem, der prøver at opretholde et system, der kun gavner nogle få og skader milliarder af mennesker. Menneskeheden er ankommen til en skillevej, hvor vi enten finder et nyt mønster, der tager hensyn til alle de menneskers interesser, der lever på denne planet, eller hvor vi styrter endnu dybere ind i en mørk tidsalder eller sågar en tredje verdenskrig.

Intégration: Har den internationale konference om korrupsion ikke givet nogle retningslinjer for denne nye økonomiske verdensorden?

Zepp-LaRouche: Jeg kan ikke se, at denne konference har udrettet noget i praksis, der kan ændre noget ved det nuværende systems korrupsion. Tænk bare på den uhyre mængde af forbrydelser, som det transatlantiske finanssystem er delagtigt i, sådan som de såkaldte 'Panama Papers' afslører det, hvor bankerne systematisk har arrangeret skatteunddragelse og andre illegale aktiviteter, hvad der kun er toppen af isbjerget; eller manipulationerne med LIBOR-renten, hvor folk bedroges for trecifrede milliardbeløb; eller bankernes hvidvaskning af penge, som for eksempel HSBC. Så disse retningslinjer er indtil videre blot tomme ord.

Intégration: Tror De, at vi kan forvente regimeskift i flere lande, især i Afrika, hvor man har dette fænomen med 'præsidenter på livstid', der kan sno sig uden om ethvert

tilløb til demokrati?

Zepp-LaRouche: Tragedien er, at mange statsmænd i Afrika, der har sloges for almenvellet, er blevet myrdede og erstattede af stikirenddrenge for det koloniale system, som stadig eksisterer, for eksempel i form af de økonomiske fondes kreditbetingelser. I sin bog 'Confessions of an economic hitman' beskriver John Perkins rigtigt godt, hvordan dette system arbejder helt op til i dag. Og man bør også huske på, at velklingende ord som 'demokrati' og 'menneskerettigheder' ofte bruges som synonymmer for udenlandske indgreb for at bringe sådanne folk til magten, der tjener det transatlantiske finanssystem.

Intégration: Camerouns statschef Paul Biya har ofte krævet en marshallplan for Afrika. Tror De, at det er nødvendigt og muligt?

Zepp-LaRouche: Absolut! Det er mere end nødvendigt i betragtning af den ekstreme fattigdom i mange regioner og lande i Afrika. Og det er en realistisk mulighed for den nære fremtid. Kina er begyndt at bygge Den nye Silkevej og Den maritime Silkevej, som allerede mere end 60 lande arbejder med på. Min organisation, Schiller-instituttet, har udarbejdet et 370 sider langt studium over, hvordan Den nye Silkevej bliver til en verdenslandbro, og den indeholder et stort afsnit om afgørende udviklingsprojekter i Afrika, der vil forvandle situationen fuldstændigt. Det er først og fremmest store infrastrukturprojekter, som er en ufravigelig forudsætning for udvikling af landbruget og økonomien, men også vandprojekter, energiproduktion og -fordeling og nye byer.

Dog vil jeg ikke kalde dette for en 'marshallplan', for forlængelsen af De nye Silkevej til Afrika bør ikke have nogen bismag af Den kolde Krig, men udgøre et win-win-perspektiv for samtlige deltagere.

Intégration: Den internationale presse har givet Dem tilnavnet 'Silkevejskvinden'. Hvad er grunden for dette tilnavn, og

nøjagtigt hvad er dette silkevejsinitiativ?

Zepp-LaRouche: Jeg tror, jeg har fået dette øgenavn, fordi jeg i 25 år har arbejdet for Den nye Silkevej. For det var det, min ægtemand og jeg foreslog, da Sovjetunionen brød sammen i 1991. Dengang kaldte vi det for Den eurasiske Landbro eller Den nye Silkevej, og det var et forslag, der skulle forbinde Europas og Asiens befolknings- og industricentre med hinanden gennem udviklingskorridorer og derved åbne det eurasiske kontinents indelukkede områder. Vi har siden da bogstaveligt talt arrangeret hundreder af konferencer og seminarer i hele verden om dette emne.

Den gode nyhed er, at Kinas præsident Xi Jinping i 2013 udnævnte Den nye Silkevej til Kinas officielle politik, der i den antikke silkevejs tradition skal forbinde folkene med hinanden gennem udveksling af varer, teknologi, kultur og ideer. I løbet af de to et halvt år siden da har projektet opnået et enormt tempo, og det er for tiden det eneste positive aspekt på planeten.

Intégration: Vi må spørge Dem: Hvad betyder initiativet med Den nye Silkevej for Afrika, eller hvilket bidrag kan Afrika yde til silkevejs-initiativet?

Zepp-LaRouche: Når man kikker på et kort over Afrika, kan man se, at den grundlæggende infrastruktur mangler. De få jernbanelinjer og veje er ikke meget bedre end i kolonitiden, hvor de kun tjente til udplyndring af råstoffer.

I det væsentlige vil det altså betyde opførsel af integrerede højhastighedsbaner, motorveje, vandkanaler, men også investeringer i fremskreden teknologi og uddannelse. Det vil ikke blot overvinde fattigdom, sult og sygdomme på meget kort tid, men også frembringe et spring til den mest moderne teknologi og gøre det muligt at lære af den kinesiske økonomiske model, der i de sidste 25 år har frembragt dette bemærkelsesværdige økonomiske mirakel.

Denne model hviler netop på den samme økonomiske model, der også var grundlaget for den tyske økonomiske model i

efterkrigsårene. I princippet kan denne model anvendes overalt, når man fremmer den bedst mulige uddannelse af befolkningen og kreativiteten.

Afrika kan anvende sin enorme menneskelige kapital til gavn for hele menneskehedens udvikling. Jo flere mennesker, der studerer projekterne og tankegangen bag Den nye Silkevej, des hurtigere kan den sættes på programmet. I nogle lande er der allerede studiegrupper, der mødes én eller to gange om ugen for at studere teorien bag den fysiske økonomi, der går tilbage til Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz og videreudvikledes af min mand Lyndon LaRouche.

Intégration: Hvorfor advarer de hele tiden om, at en tredje verdenskrig truer? Hvem ville have gavn af en sådan katastrofe?

Zepp-LaRouche: Som enhver let kan erkende, bedriver De forenede stater og NATO for tiden en indkredsningsspolitik over for Rusland og Kina, der har nået et meget farligt punkt. Grunden til det er, at det transatlantiske finanssystem er fuldkomment bankerot, og at nogle oligarkiske kredse ser deres magt truet af Kinas fremvækst.

Ingen vil få gavn af det. En tredje verdenskrig med termonukleare våben vil føre til menneskeartens udslettelse.

Intégration: Og som middel mod dette foreslår De det, som De kalder for en 'kulturel og videnskabelig renæssance'?

Zepp-LaRouche: Nuvel, man har også brug for et nyt finanssystem til at erstatte det nuværende, bankerotte system med et kreditsystem, med en Glass-Steagall-bankopdeling, sådan som Franklin Roosevelt indførte den.

Men den nye økonomiske orden vil kun virke, hvis det lykkes os at forandre den nuværende ondartede og hæslige kultur, der præger menneskenes tankegang i en meget destruktiv retning.

Vi må genoplive de bedste traditioner i alle kulturer og så føre en dialog mellem de bedste produkter fra alle civilisationer og kulturer. På den måde vil menneskene atter

kunne begynde at lære af hinanden. Chauvinisme og fremmedhad vil forsvinde, og gennem denne genoplivning vil jorden så være gjort rede til skabelsen af en ny renæssance.

Intégration: Hvordan vil denne videnskabelige og kulturelle renæssance udtrykke sig? Hvilken rolle spiller Afrika her?

Zepp-LaRouche: Der er ganske tydelige pionerområder inden for videnskaben, der vil føre til en helt ny platform for den videnskabelige aktivitet. Et sådant felt er udforskningen af kernefusion. Der er gennembrud lige på trapperne, både hos Stellarator-modellen i Greifswald i Tyskland – hvor det i februar lykkedes for videnskabsmændene at opretholde et flere millioner grader varmt plasma i en tiendedel sekund. Og målet er inden 2020 at kunne opnå et stabilt plasma i 30 minutter, der er meget varmere end vor sol – og et nyt gennembrud er også på vej i en anden reaktortype i Kina, den eksperimentelt fremskredne superledende Tokamak (Experimental Advanced Superconducting Tokamak EAST) i instituttet for fysik i Hefei. En videnskab på fusionens grundlag vil betyde energi- og råstofsikkerhed for hele menneskeheden. Et andet område er udforskningen af verdensrummet og rumfarten.

En kulturel renæssance betyder, at samfundet endelig bliver menneskeligt igen, hvilket i fortiden kun har været tilfældet i korte perioder: Gupta-perioden i Indien, bestemte dynastier i Kina som Song-dynastiet, Abbasidernes tidsalder i Den arabiske Verden, den italienske renæssance, den gyldne tidsalder i Timbuktu eller den tyske klassiske tid. En ny renæssance vil betyde, at denne tænkemåde bliver målestokken og grundlaget for nye gennembrud af kreativitet inden for alle områder af videnskaben og kulturen.

Anmærkning

1. Interviewet gennemførtes på engelsk og udkom den 16. maj i fransk oversættelse i Intégration.

Se:

<http://www.journalintegration.com/index.php/dossier/item/477-h>

elga - zepp - larouche - en - regardant - la - carte - de - l - afrique - on - observe - un - manque - flagrant - d - infrastructures - essentielles