

# Hvorfor har vi alt for længe tilladt et Imperium at dominere vores eksistens?

## LaRouchePAC Internationale fredags-webcast, 19. august 2016

Lad os sige, at, en skønne dag, f. eks. en søndag morgen, præsidenterne for hhv. USA og Kina og et par andre, efter et weekend-møde siger: »Vi har denne weekend besluttet, at vi, baseret på vore rådgivere samt den kendsgerning, at det internationale finansielle og monetære system er håbløst bankerot, som ansvarlige statsoverhoveder, af hensyn til almenvellet må erklære disse bankerotte institutioner konkurs og sætte dem under konkursbehandling. Og det er i vores interesse, at vi samarbejder om dette som nationer, for at undgå at skabe kaos på denne planet.«

Engelsk udskrift.

WHY HAVE WE ALLOWED AN EMPIRE TO DOMINATE OUR EXISTENCE FOR FAR TOO LONG?

International LaRouche PAC Webcast , Aug. 19, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening! It's August 19th, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden. You're joining us for our weekly broadcast here on Friday evenings of our LaRouche PAC webcast. I'll be your host tonight. I'm joined in the studio by Jason Ross, from the LaRouche PAC science team; and we're joined, via video, by

Kesha

Rogers and Michael Steger, both leading members of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee.

As we broadcast this show here tonight, the second edition – newest copy – of the weekly publication, {The Hamiltonian} is going to press. This is going to be flooding into the streets of New York City close on the heels of the first edition, which came out two weeks ago. Both Kesha Rogers and Michael Steger have articles that are on the front page of this week's copy of {The Hamiltonian}. Michael Steger wrote an article called "LaRouche Was Right. End Wall Street, Now", and Kesha Rogers wrote a very profound and beautiful article called "A Truly Human Culture – an Expression of the Creative Human Mind."

What Kesha addresses in this article is the inner relationship between the minds of Lyndon LaRouche, Albert Einstein, and Krafft Ehrlicke, and their conception of what a truly human culture is.

Joining us here today is Jason Ross, who has actually prepared a condensed presentation on the subject of some of the unique discoveries of Albert Einstein, which will add to our discussion here today.

But before we get to that, we've agreed to begin today's broadcast with a sort of travel back into time. Now that we are on the verge of a total consolidation of this new Eurasian system, which is based around the original idea of the Russia-India-China Strategic Triangle, which was championed by Lyndon LaRouche and also championed by Prime Minister Yevgeny

Primakov of Russia in the 1990s, we are finding ourselves in a completely unprecedented situation. It's, I think, very clear, as we approach the G-20 Summit, the Vladivostok Economic Forum, and also the United Nations General Assembly, that the entire strategic geometry of the planet has shifted and has realigned.

As is rightly pointed out in the lead of today's LaRouche PAC website, this is not just a "practical" realignment of nations, but, since we are talking about Einstein here today, this is almost the "gravitational effect" of an idea which was introduced almost 20 years ago by Lyndon and Helga LaRouche.

The video that you're about to see is a very short excerpt of a speech that Mr. LaRouche made at a forum in Washington, DC in 1997 in conjunction with the release of the {Executive Intelligence Review} {first} edition of the special report on the subject of the Eurasian Land-Bridge. This was a presentation that was made as part of a series of so-called "development conferences" that were held in Washington during those couple of years – 1996, 1997, 1998 – and I think what you'll see in this video is the fact that it was Lyndon LaRouche's "marching orders." It was sort of his creative vision of what the role that China, with the New Silk Road, and also the role that Russia would play in completely reshaping the strategic geometry of the world.

So, this is a short excerpt of that speech from 1997:

LYNDON LAROUCHE: There are only two nations which are respectable left on this planet, that is, nations of

respectable

power: that is the United States, particularly the United States

not as represented by the Congress, but by the President. It is

the {identity} of the United States which is a political power,

not some concatenation of its parts. The United States is represented today only by its President, as a political institution. The Congress does not represent the United States;

they're not quite sure who they do represent, these days, [laughter] since they haven't visited their voters recently.

The President is, institutionally, the embodiment of the

United States in international relations. The State Department can't do that; the Justice Department can't do it; no other Department can do it; only the President of the United States, under our Constitution, can represent the United States as an entity – its entire personality, its true interest, its whole people.

Now, there's only one other power on this planet which can

be so insolent as that toward other powers, and that's the Republic of China. China is engaged, presently, in a great infrastructure-building project, in which my wife and others have

had an ongoing engagement over some years. There's a great reform

in China, which is a "trouble reform." They're trying to solve a

problem. That doesn't mean there is no problem. But they're trying to solve it.

Therefore, if the United States, or the President of the

United States, and China, participate in fostering {that} project, sometimes called the Silk Road Project, sometimes the

Land-Bridge Project, if that project of developing development corridors across Eurasia into Africa, into North America, is extended, that project is enough work to put this whole planet into an economic revival. I'll get into just a bit of that, to make it more sensuously concrete.

China has had cooperation with the government of Iran for some time. Iran has actually been completing a number of rail links which are an extension of China's Land-Bridge program (or Silk Road project). More recently, we've had, on the side of India, from Indian leadership which has met with the representatives of China, to engage in an initial route, among the land routes, for the Land-Bridge program. One goes into Kunming in China. I was in that area, in Mishana, during part of World War II. Out of Mishana we had planes flying into Kunming, "over The Hump," as they used to say in those days. I'm quite familiar with that area.

But if you have water connections, canal connections, and rail connections from Kunming through Mishana – that area – across Bangladesh into India, through Pakistan into Iran, up to the area just above Tehran, south of the Caspian – you have linked to the Middle East; you have linked to Central Asia; you have linked to Turkey; you have linked to Europe.

Then you have a northern route, which is pretty much the route of the Trans-Siberian Railroad, which was built under American influence and American advice, by Russia. You have a middle route, which is being developed, in Central Asia, with China and Iran.

India is working on a plan which involves only a few hundreds of kilometers of rail to be added – there were a lot

of  
other improvements along the right-of-way – which would link  
the  
area north of Tehran through Pakistan, through India, through  
Bangladesh, through Myanmar, into Kunming, into Thailand, into  
Vietnam, down through Malaysia and Singapore, across the  
Straits  
by a great bridge, into Indonesia.

There's a plan, also, for the development of a rail  
link  
through what was northern Siberia, across the Bering Strait  
into  
Alaska, and down into the United States. There's a Middle East  
link – several links – from Europe, as well as from China, but  
from China a Middle East link into Egypt, into all of Africa.

So, what we have here, is a set of projects which are  
not  
just transportation projects, like the trans-Continental  
railroads in the United States, which was the precedent for  
this  
idea, back in the late 1860s and 1870s. You have "development  
corridors," where you develop, on an area of 50-70 km on  
either  
side of your rail link, your pipeline, and so forth. You  
develop  
this area with industry, with mining, with all these kinds of  
things. Which is the way you {pay} for a transportation link.  
Because of all the rich economic activity. Every few  
kilometers  
of distance along this link, there's something going on, some  
economic activity. People working, people building things,  
people  
doing things.

To transform this planet, in great projects of  
infrastructure-building, which will give you the great  
industries, the new industries, the new agriculture, and the  
other things we desperately need. {There is no need for

anybody

on this planet, who is able to work, to be out of work.} That simple. And that project is the means.

If the nations which agree with China – which now includes

Russia, Iran, India, other nations – if they engage in a commitment to that project which they're building every day; if

the United States – that is, the President of the United States,

Clinton – continues to support that effort, as he's been doing,

at least politically, then what do you have? You have the United

States and China and a bunch of other countries ganged up together, against the greatest power on this planet, which is the

British Empire, called the British Commonwealth. That's the enemy!

If on one bright day, say a Sunday morning, after a weekend

meeting, the President of the United States, the President of China, and a few other people say, "We have determined this weekend, that based on our advisors and the facts, that the international financial and monetary system is hopelessly bankrupt, and we in our responsibility as heads of state, must put these bankrupt institutions into bankruptcy reorganization,

in the public interest. And it is in our interest to cooperate as

nations in doing this, to avoid creating chaos on this planet."

The result, then, is that such an announcement, on a bright

Sunday morning, will certainly spin the "talking heads" on Washington TV. [laughter] But otherwise it means that the entire

system, as of that moment, has been put through the guillotine, and the head is rolling down the street. Alan Greenspan's head, perhaps.

That means we have at that point the impetus for building, immediately, a new financial and monetary system. Now, in putting a corporation which is bankrupt, into viable form, what do you do? You've got to find the business that it's going to do, which is the basis for creating the new credit to get that firm going again.

The Land-Bridge program, with its implications on a global scale, is the great project which spins off directly and indirectly enough business, so to speak, for every part of this world, to get this world back on a sound basis again.

OGDEN: As you can see, this is a very prescient speech, and in fact it was Lyndon LaRouche's active intervention, travelling to Russia, his wife travelling to China in this period, the publication of {EIR} Special Report about the Eurasian Land-Bridge, which has shaped the current situation we find ourselves in. One thing that's interesting to point out, is those maps that you were seeing. At that time many of those rail routes and other pipeline routes were merely proposals, but now many of them are actually in the process of being built.

I think it's clear, 20 years on, this is the emergent dominant system on the planet. At the same time, the



trans-Atlantic system is in completely blowout mode. You have an oncoming implosion of trillions of dollars of non-performing debt and derivatives exposures, which are being projected into every major bank across the trans-Atlantic system.

In the meantime, in the build-up to the G-20 Summit and into the United Nations General Assembly, you've got the role that especially President Putin is playing, in consolidating a series of alliances, mainly between Russia, China, and India; but also this emerging alliance between Russia and Turkey; and, very significantly, the very strengthened alliance between Russia and Iran, where Russia is now using bases in Iran as a point of departure for fighter jets to go in and fight against ISIS in Syria.

Putin, who is being honored as the Number One guest at the upcoming G-20 Summit in China, is certainly at the center of all of this. His career and Mr. LaRouche's career, over the past twenty years since that speech was delivered in Washington, have very closely paralleled each other.

I think we can open up the discussion with that as a basis.

KESHA ROGERS: Did you want to start, Jason?

JASON ROSS: You can go ahead Kesha, or Michael.

ROGERS: Okay. I think Michael might be having some technical difficulties, so I will go ahead and get started.

When we look at Mr. LaRouche has emphasized, first of all, going back to this video that you just showed, it's extremely important to look at this video as a characteristic of who Mr. LaRouche is, and his 40- to 50-year track record in economic development, and what he has been organizing around, from the standpoint of the center of economics being based on the human intervention, the human creative process. And what actually distinguishes him from all of the other so-called "economists" out there, because as you just said Matt, what we're dealing with right now is a breakdown crisis in the society that Mr. LaRouche has recognized going back to his first forecast of the late 1960s, 1970s. What were these forecasts based on? They were based on the fact that if you went along with a mathematical idea about how society should function, then you were completely misunderstanding – or should I say wrong in your understanding of what actually fosters progress in society. What fosters progress in society is not money per se; and this has been Mr. LaRouche's focus on the role of Alexander Hamilton. [That's] why right now as many people have seen, we've already put out one edition of a new newsletter that you just showed Matt, called {The Hamiltonian}. This is extremely important because now we're putting out the second edition of {The Hamiltonian}, which is having reverberating effects, particularly throughout Manhattan; which is the center of the fight for the nation. That is the fight where Alexander Hamilton led the fight for the development of our US Constitution against the British criminals like Aaron Burr, and against those who wanted to destroy what the United States actually represented.

But it goes deeper than that; because I think what we've discussed a lot around Mr. LaRouche's current fight in Manhattan and what we're doing with this {Hamiltonian} is what has defined the mission for bringing about the new Presidency. Michael wrote an article last week on the question of the new Presidency fostered by Mr. LaRouche's Four Laws and the bringing in of those Four Laws. The article that's in this week's {Hamiltonian} is by Michael around LaRouche's track record in economics and why Wall Street has to be brought down now. It is followed by the article that I wrote on the human creative process. I think we'll get more into that, but when we bring up this question of a New Paradigm for mankind and the identity of a renaissance, some of it becomes in most people's minds because of the society and culture we live in, a little superficial. It is based on this idea that a renaissance has a different meaning to it. When we speak of the idea of creating a New Paradigm for mankind, first and foremost, it is the idea of creating something that has not yet existed; something that the human creative mind has to bring into existence. When you go back and you start to look at the idea of what the conception of the Italian Renaissance was based on historically, it was the idea of putting mankind and the human creative process at the center of the Universe.

I think it's important that we'll get into this; that this is what has shaped the identity of Mr. LaRouche around his emphasis on the unique creative role of Albert Einstein and the unique creative of others such as was mentioned earlier – Krafft Ehricke. I think it's important for people to look at this, because the question now is that with the collapse of the society that we're seeing right now, the detrimental collapse of the culture, what we're seeing in terms of what's taken over the thinking of the population. The population is not capable of actually making decisions as human beings; they're making decisions based on what somebody tells them is possible or is not possible. I think this is a problem we're running into. How can you actually say that you have the ability to make decisions as a free citizen when you're making your decisions based on what you think is already possible and has been determined as precedents set and possibilities that are already a determining factor of what can and cannot happen.

So, I think that's important to look at as people are thinking about this insane election process. Instead of thinking about what is going to shape your future; is it going to be something that happens to you? Or something that you actually bring into existence? That's what Mr. LaRouche has been completely focussed on. The population has to have a sense that you're responsible for your future; you must bring that which does not exist into existence, based on your understanding that

human beings are not animals. We don't have to go along with the insanity of what we're told we have to accept.

So, I'll start with those remarks for now, and let you guys go on with more.

OGDEN: Well, we just got Michael back, so maybe we should hear him.

MICHAEL STEGER: Hi.

OGDEN: Great! Welcome back. We were just discussing some of the implications of going back and looking back at that video of Mr. LaRouche's speech in 1997. I think you actually had something to point out about the timing of that speech and what happened just immediately afterwards.

STEGER: Yeah, and part of the dynamic in organizing some of the layers of China at that time was that it was not clear to many in China at that time, or in Asia, that the western trans-Atlantic system had major failings and weaknesses. It was just two months after that speech was made that the Asian financial crisis erupted; dominating Southeast Asia and Japan — the so-called "Asian tigers". It really made it very clear that the entire financial system could go. It was just a year later that the whole LCTM crisis happened. So when Mr. LaRouche is referencing the bankruptcy of the financial system, that was very

apparent in just months to come to almost everyone on the planet;

as apparent as it was in 2008 when the financial system blew again. As we point out in the article in the new {Hamiltonian},

the level of insanity that now dominates 20 years later, creates

what is clearly the largest financial breakdown in modern history. This is a kind of financial bankruptcy only comparable

to perhaps the blow-out in Italy in the 1300s; which brought a Dark Age to Europe.

But what is remarkable is how much these nations like China

– it's just striking; and maybe this has already been stated – but the context of China and India collaborating on major routes

is an ongoing diplomatic process today. Far more engaged, far more serious than anyone can probably imagine; let alone the integrations of countries like Iran, Turkey. Everything that Mr.

LaRouche laid out about 20 years ago, is now on a far greater active collaborative effort among these nations. It is somewhat

a testament to the power of ideas and how that can shape history

at crisis moments; as we saw in '97 and what we see today.

OGDEN: I think one thing that is very clear from just looking at

Mr. LaRouche's role in the middle of this, is his emphasis on the

mission that has to bring nations together. In other words, this

is not just geopolitics in a cynical sense. This based around a

concept of what is the human species? What is real profit?

How

do we create a future for a growing population; and how do we establish the kind of optimism that mankind has a future towards

which the current generations can work? It's pointed out, I think a lot of what we're seeing right now is not just a projection of the past into the present. This is a reflection of

a future intention. You can look at what China is doing, for example, in terms of their space program. The fact that two years from now, you're going to have a Chinese probe going to where no man has gone before; to the far side of the Moon, to discover things that perhaps we don't even know are questions yet, in terms of man's relationship to the Universe.

When we were discussing some of these questions with Mr.

LaRouche yesterday, he had one thing to say which I just would like to quote verbatim from him which I think can provide the basis for a furthering of this discussion. What Mr. LaRouche said was the following: "Mankind is not based on the limitations

of individual human behavior; but, in fact, man as a species is

based on the individual powers of the human mind to go beyond what mankind had conceived of prior. Giving mankind a power over

the Universe greater than anything achieved heretofore."

We've

been putting a lot of emphasis on the personality of Albert Einstein, but for what reason? For the very reason that Albert

Einstein is paradigmatic of exactly that sort of individual, revolutionary characteristic of genius. That the genius takes what was believed prior to that point and calls it into question,

and overturns major aspects of what mankind had believed and had

put into practice up to that point; and revolutionizes mankind's understanding of the Universe and of himself. So, I think that's sort of a window into why the emphasis on Albert Einstein right now.

JASON ROSS: It's difficult to speak for LaRouche; and he's got opportunities to speak for himself on this site, too, which he'll continue doing. But the example of Einstein as a real {mensch} you might say, a real human being, what it is to be a person is essential for a couple of reasons. One, if you think about the role of LaRouche in history and the economic breakthroughs he made several decades ago now, you look at the courage that he had to stick with what he knew was right despite whatever opposition might come his way; despite what was effectively a life sentence in prison, to not compromise in the face of that. An economic forecasting record that's unparalleled and proposals for polices that are now – as you heard in that video, and as is taking place right now with China's One Belt, One Road taking the world. So, in terms of how Einstein fits into that, I want to take up something that Kesha had brought up about popular opinion. Because where do you get a freedom in your thoughts from? How are you able to be a free thinking citizen; or how are you able to come to conclusions that are your own, as opposed to having a basis in their popularity. Or whether you think other people might think them, or whether you



think you ought to look like you think them to get ahead somehow.

Is there an actual standard for whether something is true or not?

Yes, there is; and unfortunately and deliberately, that's really

not part of our culture or our education right now.

So, LaRouche has emphasized that the general understanding

of Einstein is false; it's wrong. Most people's images of who Einstein is as a person, his work to some degree, it's just not

true. And we've got to clean that up in order to make a case about what his approach was to the Universe, to mankind, to life;

and how that was important, it made it possible for him to make

the scientific breakthroughs that he did. But he was a whole person; he was an entire human being, including the role of his

violin – something that LaRouche has referred to a number of times.

So today, I want to go through a few things – somewhat briefly. We're going to have a "New Paradigm for Mankind"

Wednesday show this coming week on Wednesday after a hiatus of some period. So, we'll be able to get into this in a bit more

detail then, but I want to take up three things. First is briefly, some thoughts from Einstein; quotes from Einstein.

How

did he think about things beyond his scientific work also.

Second, I want to talk about his most famous discovery – relativity; and what that implies. And then third, talk about

quantum mechanics as an example of Einstein's courage against popular opinion; which is something that he had from a very

young

age. Then we'll see how that plays into these other concepts.

When he was 67, Einstein was asked to write down a

sort of

an autobiography; which he felt was like writing an obituary before he had passed. He was a nice guy, so he still did it. I'm going to read some quotes from this; it's called his "Autobiographical Notes". He starts off very early; he says, "Even when I was a fairly precocious young man, the nothingness

of the hopes and strivings which chases most people restlessly through life, came to my consciousness with considerable vitality. Moreover, I soon discovered the cruelty of that chase;

which in those years was much more carefully covered up by hypocrisy and glittering words than is the case today." So, the

vain chase for success, this isn't a real identity. He says, "It

was possible to satisfy the stomach by such participation, but not a human being insofar as he is a thinking and feeling being.

Thus, I came – despite the fact that I was the son of entirely irreligious Jewish parents – to a deep religiosity; which, however, found an abrupt ending at the age of 12. Through the reading of popular scientific books, I soon reached the conviction that much of the stories in the Bible could not be true. The consequence was a positively fanatical free thinking,

coupled with the impression that youth is intentionally being deceived by the state through lies. It was a crushing impression. Suspicion of every kind of authority grew out of this experience. A skeptical attitude towards the convictions which were alive in any specific social environment; an attitude

which has never left me." It's not some popular opinion.

He wrote that, "The contemplation of the huge world, the

vast riddle of the Universe around us," this to him was the proper goal of life. And that by considering it, you could be

really liberated from things that are merely personal or insignificant. He wrote: "Similarly motivated thinkers of the present and the past, as well as the insights which they had achieved, were friends that could not be lost. The road to this paradise of knowledge was not as comfortable and alluring as the road to the religious paradise; but it has proved itself as trustworthy, and I have never regretted having chosen it."

In his thinking process, Einstein – who was a musician with a deep love of Mozart in particular – didn't believe that thinking required words. He wrote: "For me, it is not dubious that our thinking goes on for the most part without the use of signs or words. And beyond that, to a considerable degree, it takes place unconsciously." He writes that "Through our experiences as we understand conflicts between our thought of how the world works and experiences which counter that, we develop a sense of wonder," which he says is the key to the development of new thoughts. So, how can that be developed? How can that be fostered? Well, he complained about the school in his day; he said there was too much testing and not enough freedom or actual thought for the students. I can hardly imagine what he would say about schools now. He wrote then that "It is, in fact, nothing short of a miracle that the modern methods of instruction have not yet entirely strangled the holy curiosity of inquiry. For this delicate little plant, aside from stimulation, stands mainly in need of freedom. It is a very grave mistake to think that the enjoyment of seeing and of searching can be promoted by means

of coercion and a sense of duty."

On the kinds of thoughts that make true discoveries, he said that there are two requirements for such a theory. One, it can't be contradicted by observations; and second, he said it has to have an inner perfection. About that, he wrote – sounding very much like Johannes Kepler, the first modern astronomer – Einstein wrote: "We prize a value more highly if it is not the result of an arbitrary choice among theories which – among themselves – are of equal value and analogously constructed." That is, to be right, an idea also has to be necessary; not just in keeping with observations.

In his life, he was a courageous man; he stood up against World War I; even when many great scientists like Max Planck had written a letter supporting the war, supporting Germany's cause in it. Einstein didn't; he wrote a letter opposing it, and even got Max Planck to rescind his support for the war. He stood up against racism in the US in many famous cases such as Marian Anderson, who when she went to perform in Princeton, wasn't able to actually spend the night anywhere; she was turned away by hotels. So, she stayed at Albert Einstein's house, which is where she'd stay whenever she visited that town. And his opposition to the FBI and the thought policing it was doing. When he was coming to the US, they had a list of questions for him; they wanted to do an interview, find out what kind of thoughts Einstein had. He said, I'm not going to answer

these.

If this is the condition for coming to the US, I'm not going to come; forget it. They gave in. So, I'll let those brief words from Einstein stand for themselves.

Let's take a look at the second part, which is a few thoughts about his famous discovery of relativity. As far as the context for this, ever since the general hegemony of Newton's outlook – which didn't have to happen, but it did – according to Newton, when we make observations, when we do science, things take place in a space that is indifferent to those things; it's just there. It existed before anything was in the Universe. According to Newton, space existed before God created everything; it was just the primordial space. Newton also believed that there was a time; a single time, a universal time that flowed on of its own accord, had no particular characteristics and was not dependent on or related to anything that actually took place over time. So, according to Newton, there was an absolute space, an absolute time; and objects in that space at various times. Now, this had already been shown to be wrong by Gottfried Leibniz, who in a debate with Newton, demonstrated that requiring an absolute space and then saying that God created everything somewhere in that space, as opposed to somewhere else; would be a decision without any good reason. And that God couldn't do something like

that; everything in the Universe had a reason for it, and that therefore there couldn't have been this space in the first place.

Newton used the same example to say that shows you how powerful

God is, because He could do whatever He felt like. So, He put the Universe somewhere. Anyway, Leibniz had already shown that

this Newtonian idea was wrong; but Newton gained hegemony.

So,

it has the result that people think of facts, of things taking place in locations at certain times. But Einstein showed that this actually isn't true; that there is no time that any event takes place. That the time an event occurs, depends on who is looking at it. Not in the way of uncertainties or anything like

that; but the time itself doesn't exist as one thing that's independent of who's doing the looking, or of their location.

What he did was, he created a new concept that resolved the contradiction between two concepts that were actually mutually contradictory. So, these two concepts were, first off, relativity; which existed before Einstein as a concept or equivalence. Leibniz believed this, for example; which was that

no matter where you are, or how you're moving – any of those kinds of particular conditions – mind is universal. Mind is everywhere; mind is everywhere in the Universe; mind doesn't have

a speed or motion or anything like that. Concepts that govern how the Universe unfolds – true physical principles – are independent of how you look at any particular fact or observation

that's occurring. So, you can't change mind by moving something

physically – more on that in a minute.

The second concept was that the speed of light is the same

for any observer; and that's not something that was immediately apparent. This was definitely debated. To contrast that, imagine that you're driving on a road and there's a car next to you that's moving at a similar speed. To you, it looks like the car isn't really moving; to a pedestrian, the car is moving at whatever speed you're driving. Light is different than a car moving, where you can catch up with its speed and make it look like it's still. For light, no matter how you're moving, light beams to you all appear to move at the speed of light. So, you can't put those two concepts together; you can't have relativity and a constant speed of light if you have one time and one space. Instead, what Einstein said was that the time between events or the distance between locations can actually differ based on how you're looking at them. So that simply being in motion – it's not perceptible except at very high speeds – but simply being in motion changes the lengths of everything around you, the time between events that take place.

I'll just briefly outline one example of this – we can get into it with some pictures and things on Wednesday. He shows a lot of examples of thought experiments using trains moving through train stations or embankments. He gives one example which is, let's say that as a train is moving, someone on the ground sees flashes of lightning hit both sides of the train at the same time. For them to say "at the same time", what it

means

is if you're standing in the middle, the light from both of those

flashes reaches you at the same time. You say, "I'm in the middle between these two points, therefore they must have happened at the same time and then it took the light a little bit

of time for me to see it." But you'd also recognize that if someone on the train was to see those same two lightning bolts,

which to you occur simultaneously, as the train is moving this way and you picture light moving at a constant speed from your viewpoint, the light that was at the front of the train is going

to be observed first by somebody standing in the middle of the train. Someone on that train would say that those lightning flashes didn't occur at the same time; that one preceded the other. What that means is that there's no simultaneity; there's

no ability to say anything took place at a certain time. Time now depends on who's looking at it. If there's no simultaneity,

then there's nothing instant that can take place in the Universe;

because there's no instant for anything to occur instantly in. So, for example, gravitational pull can't occur instantly; there

can't be an instant action at a distance. In fact, nothing, no

effect could go faster than light; including gravitational changes. It meant a couple of things. One is that you can't separate space and time; but the other thing is that it makes you

really have to reconsider what makes up reality. The idea that

objects at places in times are facts; that's not reality. The thing that's most real is the principles that you're able to



discover that don't change based on how you look at them, or how you're moving. Something like the way that light moves – that's a physical principle; no matter how you look at it, it's the same thing. It's a principle. A distance between two things? That's not a principle; that's not invariant. That can change, depending on how you look at it. So that the naïve sense that we get of the world around us, of our very concept of space, is just not right. Even though it seems totally intuitive and very popular, you have to force a different kind of understanding.

Now, there's a lot more to relativity than that, that's just a component of it. But it's undergone many, many tests over the decades. Things like starlight being deflected as it passes around the Sun; atomic clocks going in airplanes and rockets; light made by stars being a different color by virtue of their gravitation. Gravity waves, recently discovered somewhat directly by the SLIGO experiment, but a paper written about them in the '70s; having discovered indirect evidence for them from a pulsar. So, his thoughts have definitely stood the test of time on this. Nothing shows that he was wrong. So that says something about how we think about the world.

Just to say something about Einstein's courage, on the third topic is the quantum world. In 1900, Einstein later colleague, Max Planck had made a discovery that he was able to explain the

kind of light that hot bodies emit. Something that's hot and glowing like the filament in a light bulb; Planck was able to explain that based on an hypothesis that the way light was emitted from and absorbed by that hot body took place in pieces.

That the light energy had to interact with that body in individually in quanta, the plural of quantum. A few years later, in Einstein's so-called "miracle year" of 1905, he generalized this and said that's just how light is; it comes in

pieces. Light is not purely a wave; light is also somewhat of a

particle. The field developed, and one of the things that came

out of it that Einstein had realized, was a phenomenon called entanglement. To say it very briefly, it's the characteristic where you're able to make two particles, say two photons that have characteristics that are shared. In the case of photons, they have opposite polarizations. Or maybe you can make two electrons that have opposite spins. After you make them, here's

the thought experiment Einstein would say. Let's say you make two of them; you don't look at them, and they go to very different places. One's in Tokyo and one's in New York.

According to the theory, once you measure one in Tokyo and you get some sort of number for whatever its spin is; the one in New

York automatically has the opposite spin. So Einstein said, does

this mean that measuring something in New York changed something

in Tokyo, or vice versa? Could it have an instant effect somehow? How did it change the other particle that's so far away

from it? Nothing can occur instantly anyway, because there are

no instants. What's going on?

What it came to was a debate over decades, that was unresolved. Einstein believed that the way work in this field was going, was that people were giving up on reality; that they were saying that all we really ever know is an observation. That the world doesn't exist in a certain state independent of our measuring it. Not just because our measurements affect things — especially when they're very small; but that even God himself, so to speak, doesn't really know the state of say an atom. It simply doesn't have one; all that is really real is when you observe it later. So, Einstein made a lot of polemics against this, a lot of pedagogies about it, a lot of demonstrations; and although there have been experiments since the decades after his life that shed new light on it, I think the key thing to take from that is that Einstein recognized that there was something a bit unsettling about the way science was going. That people were willing to give up on the idea that things occurred for a reason. To Einstein, that was throwing away reality; bidding farewell to the idea that there is a real world. Some of his thoughts on that, you might have heard him say he'd like to think that the Moon is still there even when he doesn't look at it. But I think the thing to take from that is his courage; even when almost everyone was against him, he stuck to his guns on that.

So, in terms of concluding on that, or drawing a reflection from it, it's a constantly under-appreciated miracle that our minds are able to understand the Universe in a way that gives

us  
power over it. That unlike a koala bear or a grasshopper,  
that  
are unable to use their understanding of nature to change  
their  
relationship to it to transform their species, we're able to  
do  
that. There's something coherent between the way our minds  
piece  
together and understand the world around us through our  
thoughts,  
through our concepts. There is a harmony between those  
concepts  
and the way the Universe actually operates that gives us  
access  
to act on those principles to bring about new states of  
existence; and is the basis of economics. So, I think that in  
addition to a radical transformation and improvement in  
culture  
that's needed, people like to think that they've got a lot of  
scientific knowledge these days; because you own a smart phone  
and you think you know something about science. Or you say  
that  
everybody knows there's global warming and only anti-  
scientific  
people disagree with that. That's not a basis of knowing  
anything; and there's a lot of room for a dramatic  
improvement.

A real renaissance of taking Einstein's identity as an example  
and really developing a fresh and powerful view of science to  
solve many of the problems that we're confronted with right  
now,  
that without a different approach, might never be solved.

So, that's a very inadequate beginning about Einstein;  
but  
it's a job for all of us to do. To figure out who is this  
man;

what can we learn from his approach? I think we'll be hearing more from LaRouche and his thoughts on how he views his importance as an individual for us today.

ROGERS: I think that's very important. What I think is important to go back to in terms of LaRouche's role and what he said in the presentation that we showed earlier. And going to the understanding of what is actually happening with the role that Russia, under President Putin, and the role that President Xi Jinping is playing in relationship to what Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche had set into motion several decades ago with the development of the Productive Triangle, of the Eurasian Land-Bridge, the Silk Road Development Plan. This coming into motion now, and at that very time, during that presentation that we saw in the beginning of this program, made the point that these nations would be brought together in collaboration and form a coalition of nations representing nations such as Iran, China, Russia, India, and so forth, to put an end – once and for all – to the British Empire. And the intentions of the British Empire to destroy this very conception of what is the truly human identity; the identity of the creative human process. I think it's very important to look at that from the standpoint of the presentation you just gave, Jason. Because that's what missing.

What we're talking about is not a political fight from the standpoint of how do you bring down one political candidate over the other; but how do you destroy a system, particularly the British Empire, in all of its facets and what it represents,

that

denies this creative human process. Right now, what we're looking at from the United States is that as the rest of these nations are moving in the direction of creating a New Paradigm for mankind, moving with the Silk Road economic development plan;

where is the United States right now? The United States is continuing to go along with the evils and destructive policies of

the British Empire. This has been the case for decades now; this

has been the case under the murderous, insane agenda of President

Obama, who should have been removed a long time ago. Or the policies of the Bush administration, and the lies and the cover-up. Now, we have an opportunity. What we're discussing here is not just some nice scientific ideas, and let's look at Einstein and people think they have their different conceptions

and understanding and "Oh, I studied this in elementary school."

No; the idea is, what has been taken away from society? Why have

we allowed an Empire to dominate our existence and our nation and

culture for far too long?

So, I think it is the case that in 1997, when Mr. LaRouche

made the point that what we're dealing with is nations have to come together to bring about that truly human identity to destroy

this empire once and for all; that's what we're going to use Einstein to do. I'll just make that point.

STEGER: Just to add, because I think it's worth considering; there are so many developments that we're on the verge of. This coming six weeks have such a dramatic nature

that  
we've already seen a certain sense of in terms of a  
consolidated  
effort to end this British Empire system; the very key  
emphasis  
Lyn took up in 1997. That there is now an orientation to  
resolve  
the question of the Balkans, the Caucuses, Kashmir, the South  
China Sea; even North Korea are essentially on the agenda of  
these major nations. To end the potential of world war, and  
to  
really consolidate a new economic system. So, it is kind of  
striking that Lyn's emphasis is, as Matt you raised, on  
Einstein.  
Why the emphasis now? But it's clearly because in the minds  
of  
this collaborative effort among these nations and among any  
patriotic Americans, as we see in the performances we're  
developing in New York around the 9/11 anniversary, the  
question  
has to be the long-term development of mankind. Not one's  
children, not one generation ahead, but the actual ongoing  
development that now is possible to embark upon as a human  
species on this planet. And I think Einstein craved and  
desired  
no less. His discoveries and passion unleashed that kind of  
potential, which he probably saw as a young man himself, and  
that  
quality. It's not just simply a liberal emotion; it is of a  
scientific endeavor which Einstein really captured. I think  
Lyn's comments then and today also do as well.

OGDEN: Well, I think it's with a full amount of  
confidence  
that we can move forward and understand that the epic  
era-changing kinds of developments that are occurring around  
us

right now, are things that Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche have been in the middle of for decades, literally. They've had their fingers on the pulse of history right up to this point. Helga LaRouche pointed out yesterday that the speech that she gave at the Rasina Dialogue in India just a couple of months ago, seems like it's exactly what is now being undertaken by the Indian government in terms of their collaboration with China and Russia to project the Silk Road into the Middle East to resolve this terrible crisis that exists there. And Mr. LaRouche's continuing role in terms of the intellectual sounding board around which the rest of history is continuing to move. It's with confidence that we can look back at that speech and everything else that is on the record in terms of their role. It's an identity which we need to maintain within ourselves and those who are collaborating with us, that yes, your finger is on the pulse of history; the imagination of what the future can become is what is continuing to shape the actions in the present. And it's a moment of decision; it's the {punctum saliens} moment in terms of which direction does mankind go right now. We have a rich potential, and I think it's extremely clear; but it's also extremely dangerous.

I'd really like to thank Jason for giving a little bit of a foretaste of what's going to be elaborated much more, I'm sure, on the show next Wednesday. That's going to be broadcast, and we



would ask you to tune in to that. I also want to encourage people to continue to participate in the process of inundating Manhattan with this new publication, {The Hamiltonian}. This is issue 2, and it continues to be the center of our intervention into shaping the United States and answering the question that Kesha asked: Why is the United States not yet a part of this emerging dynamic on the planet? What must be done to cause that to occur?

So, I'd like to thank all of you for tuning in; and encourage you to stay tuned to [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com). And we'll see you next week.