

Vi må organisere et Nyt Paradigme omkring menneskets skønhed.

LaRouchePAC Internationale fredags-webcast, 5. august 2016

Zepp-LaRouche: »Men hvorvidt de eksisterende løsninger i tide bliver gennemført, afhænger i realiteten af befolkningens moralske kvalitet; især i USA og Europa. Og da jeg er overbevist om, at der findes en evne til det gode i mennesker, appellerer jeg til jer; påkald dette i jer selv. Sid ikke som tilskuere på sidelinjen og betragt historiens gang. Vi befinder os i en brydningstid af apokalyptiske dimensioner, der formentlig er lige så betydningsfuld, som overgangen fra Middelalderen til Moderne Tid var. Vi må lade denne aktuelle, kollapsende epoke bag os og erstatte den med et Nyt Paradigme, der er mennesket værdigt, og som manifesterer menneskets sande karakter som værende potentielt skønne, kreative; som næstekærlige væsener. Mennesket har potentiale til at blive genial; mennesket er af natur godt, og den blotte kendsgerning, at så mange mennesker ikke er gode, siger intet om menneskets natur. Det siger noget om omstændigheder, der har kaldt det onde frem i mennesket, snarere end at fremme det gode.«

WHEN MAN IS CONFRONTED WITH A GREAT EVIL,

THERE IS A CAPACITY IN HIM THAT BRINGS FORTH AN EVEN GREATER GOOD – LEIBNIZ

International LaRouche PAC Webcast, August 5, 2016

JASON ROSS: Hello! Thank you for joining us. This is our regular Friday webcast at LaRouchePAC.com. A special welcome to our new viewers! This is our weekly roundup, where we discuss the state of the world and our best options for changing it. I'm your host this week, Jason Ross. We'll be joined in this episode by two special guests, two leaders of the LaRouche movement. We'll be hearing from Mrs. Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the President of the Schiller Institute, wife of Lyndon LaRouche, joining us from Germany; and by Diane Sare, who is a leader of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee, joining us from the greater New York area. Mrs. LaRouche has recently returned from a successful trip to China, about which we will hear more very soon.

To situate today's discussion, let me briefly discuss some of the major developments on the subject of warfare and on economy. On the war front, Obama is now engaged in a second war in Libya, again without Congressional authorization or a UN mandate. He is saying that he's attacking ISIS, which was not a problem in Libya, prior to his disastrous war there earlier and his attacks in Syria, creating an unlivable situation in the entire region.

Meanwhile, as Russia is collaborating with Syrian Armed Forces for retaking Aleppo from precisely such types of terrorists, this is being denounced by the media in the West as

"Russian meddling to prop up," as they always put it, "the Assad regime," as they say "in Syria." It's part of a broader orientation towards warfare with Russia, to prevent a new paradigm from taking the world.

As we've seen with the recent release of the 28 pages of the Joint Congressional Inquiry into 9/11, the Bush and Obama administrations have been covering up for almost a decade and a half now, Saudi Arabia involvement in 9/11, Saudi support for that attack. In light of this being known now, the wars in Iraq and other places, seem even more cynical and more oriented towards geo-politics, since we know what the real situation was, regarding 9/11.

And briefly on the economy: As a recent series of "stress tests," as they call them in Europe, have shown, leading European banks are ready to collapse. This was not really a secret before the stress tests, but now it's being discussed more openly, leading to a growing chorus of economists and others, calling for precisely the kinds of measures that the LaRouches have been advocating, namely, an end of the universal banking model, and a return to a Glass-Steagall type separation between commercial and investment banking. This is not to be seen as a banking reform in itself, but to make it possible to use the banking sector for real economic recovery.

Briefly on the U.S. election: I can say that Lyndon LaRouche's assessment, in the past couple of days, is that the

system is finished; that there is no solution in the game that the American and European elites are trying to play; that the financial sector has to be cancelled in large part, cleaned up, as Roosevelt did. Neither of these two candidates are winning in the United States. At most, the only success they can achieve, would be to cause doom. Hillary Clinton? A stooge for Obama; is going to push for increasing warfare, as expressed by her policy of her campaign team right now. What's needed instead, is a bulwark of positive ideas of what we ought to do.

Let's bring in our special guest Helga Zepp-LaRouche. Thank you for joining us tonight, Helga!

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes. Hello!

ROSS: As we can see in some pictures to display for you now, Helga has just returned from a trip to China, where she was a participant in this year's G-20 process, specifically with her participation in the T-20 Summit, the "Think 20" Summit, which was being held as a prelude to the Heads of State G-20 Summit coming up in early September. As you can see, Helga was one of the panelists at this discussion forum.

In your speech there, Helga, you pointed out that the G-20 is the most powerful combination of nations on the planet, having a unique and appropriate forum to discuss the existential challenges facing civilization. You called upon the world "to take up a new paradigm that can lay the basis for the next 100 years of the human species and beyond," and pointed to the New Silk Road being led by China, as an "expression of that vision."

You called for that to be coupled with projects "to have the optimal impact on the cognitive powers of the populations of the respective countries, to facilitate the best possible increase in the productivity of the world economy," such as through "crash programs for the development of thermonuclear fusion power."

So, Helga, could you please tell us about your participation in the T-20 forum, about the responses of others to your initiatives and discussions?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: This coming G-20 meeting, beginning of September, which will be sponsored by China, will take place in Hangzhou, is coming at an extremely important moment. That was also expressed by many of the participants, representatives of different think-tanks from mainly Asia, Europe, Australia, Japan, South Africa, other places, India. People were expressing, to different degrees, an awareness of the fact that you have an absolute coincidence of many crises, and that therefore the fact that China is the one which is designing this G-20 meeting, if there's anybody who can come up with a positive approach, it is China. At least that's what I would also say was confirmed by the different speeches.

One goal the Chinese expressed, for example, was to move the G-20 process away from crisis-reaction, to a more doable global governance structure. In other words, bring the world in such a shape that you're not just running away from one crisis to the next, like the response to 2008 – the financial crisis – or

other crises. I think that this will be very difficult to accomplish, because to move away from crisis-reaction, to a more global governance, a new relation among nations in the world, would require that the trans-Atlantic countries – the Europeans and the United States – would be willing to look at why is the world so much in disorder.

There was actually quite upsetness [sic] and heated presentations by some of the participants, pointing to the fact that you have an unprecedented coincidence of crises. The Eurozone, after the Brexit, is on the way of disintegration. Other countries may follow the example of Great Britain, leaving the EU. There was much awareness of the fact that the 2008 financial crisis was never really remedied, and that we are now in front of a new crisis, which some participants, more privately, said they fear would be much, much worse than that of 2008.

Then, terrorism out of control, especially in France, in Germany, in Belgium; the whole refugee crisis; the coup [attempt] in Turkey, which had just taken place shortly before. Generally, there were many people expressing complete outrage, or dismay, about the fact that there is such a strong anti-globalist/globalization movement, the rise of populist movements. They were really upset. They said this is bringing everything in[to] question, what we've been working for.

But what I thought was the most striking, is that these same speakers who were expressing quite an outrage about all of this,

{totally} lacked the ability to make the right analysis and diagnosis of why is the world order so completely out of whack and out of order. While people were reacting to all of these phenomena, there was a complete lack, at least on the side of most Europeans and most Asians other than, let's say, the Chinese, to investigate what are the wrong beliefs, what are the wrong assumptions. If there's not even a question of asking why we have this accumulation of crises, then, naturally, they can't come to decisions, and they can't come to the correct perspective of remedy.

The Chinese said many things which were very useful. For example, they put a lot of emphasis on that we have to bring the world economy on an innovation basis; that everybody must join in the fruits of innovation, as the only basis for "sustainable" development. But the Chinese gave this word a new meaning, and that no one must be left behind; that also the developing countries should have immediate access to the fruits of innovation. That is, naturally, a very good approach, which however I don't think will be shared by all the participants from Europe, or, potentially, even the United States.

I think it was a very important meeting. There is some hope, because I think China has a clear sense that you need a new paradigm. But everything will really depend on will the Europeans, in time, be able to reflect on why is the EU disintegrating; why do [we have] all of these problems, including the non-performing debt? There was a lot of talk about the Italian financial crisis. Will the Europeans be willing to

correct their erroneous views? I did not see much [of this] demonstrated at this meeting, but we will see. It's less than four weeks until this Summit will take place. One thing is for sure: the crises will get more acute as the days pass.

ROSS: It seems that there was, from what you're saying, an understanding among the people, that there is a serious financial crisis in the works. Could you say more about the contrast between the view of China, and the view of other leaders, that you saw at this Summit? What more does the world need to learn from China? What are some of the blocks that you're seeing, in terms of people's abilities to understand things?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, I think the Chinese approach is the only one on the table to overcome geo-politics. The Chinese new model of relations among nations, is reflected in many different aspects. One of them being what they call the "One Road, One Belt" initiative, which, for Western ears sounds a little bit funny, but that's how they call the New Silk Road perspective, domestically in China. That has, very clearly, the idea of a "win-win" cooperation. They are inviting every country on the planet to cooperate in these projects. They want to work with the European nations. They want to work with the United States. They want to invite all developing countries. And they explicitly do not have a geo-political confrontation [policy] of "China vs. the United States," or "China vs. the West," but they want to be {inclusive}.

It's very interesting, that one of the speakers –

actually

the professor who gave the final speech – explicitly said that this is a Confucian idea; that if you want to have benefit, you

have to make sure that the other one has a benefit as well. That

is actually what {can} constitute a harmonious development among different nations of the world.

I think that the idea of inclusiveness, of overcoming geo-politics with a win-win cooperation for the extension of the

New Silk Road to every corner of the world; the idea of having an

innovation-based approach, where everybody can share the benefits, especially developing countries, so that their development is not being held off – I think these are all extremely useful conceptions, which I think are in real stark contrast to the kind of United States being the only one setting

the rules; sticking to the unipolar world, which, obviously, means confrontation in many parts of the world.

I must say that, unfortunately, some of the Europeans, especially the Germans, were all on this green-economy perspective, which really is a British policy, because it goes back to a paper which was published by Hans Joachim Schellnhuber,

who is a leading energy advisor of the Merkel government, who published in 2011 this paper about the great transformation of the world economy; requesting the de-carbonization of the world

economy. And Schellnhuber had said that the carrying capacity of

the world would only be 1 billion. Now, what to do with the other 6 billion people living on the planet is obviously a question he didn't want to answer; but there is such a thing as

the correlation between the energy flux density used in the production process and the number of people which can be maintained. This is one of the key principles of the physical economy as it was developed by my husband, Mr. Lyndon LaRouche.

Therefore, if you want to go to only very low energy flux densities like solar and wind – renewable energies – but without nuclear, which is what the German government has decided

to do; that is terrible. So, I think that the conflict between

ideology and reality clearly was visible in this conference as well.

ROSS: You're mentioning the economic conceptions of your

husband, Lyndon LaRouche, whose ideas are becoming increasingly

well known in China. You're also quite well known in China, and

I know that while you were at the conference, there were some interviews that took place; I think we can show on the screen one

of these interviews that was with the {Beijing Review} which was

just published in yesterday's edition. Could you tell us, what

is the interest in China in your activities, in the LaRouche outlook?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, first of all, the ideas of my husband,

Lyndon LaRouche, have been studied by many scholars since at least the '90s; maybe even earlier. There are quite a number of

scholars who have gone in depth into the question of physical economy, of studying the whole question of physical economy

going

back to Leibniz, going back to Friedrich List, Henry C Carey. Friedrich List is one of, if not the most known economist in China. I think these scholars have recognized from a very early

time, the affinity between what they call the Chinese economic model and the ideas of Mr. LaRouche. I personally was in China

many times since the '90s; because we had promoted at that time

the question of the Eurasian Land-Bridge, the New Silk Road. Which at that time was declared to be a long-term strategy of China until the year 2010; but then the Asia crisis intervened.

George Soros speculated against the currencies of the Asian nations, bringing them down by 80% in one week in the cases of Malaysia and Indonesia and so forth.

So this whole process was interrupted; but now, it's fully

back on the agenda in the form of the New Silk Road/Maritime Silk

Road initiative which was announced by Xi Jinping in 2013.

This

initiative is now the most dynamic policy on the whole planet; because more than 70 countries have joined already in different

infrastructure projects, high-tech cooperation. It is expected

that by the end of the year, about 100 nations will cooperate with this new economic model, which is not only infrastructure,

R&D, high-tech projects; but also has developed an entire parallel banking system in the form of the AIIB, the Asia Infrastructure Investment Bank, the New Development Bank of the

BRICS, the Silk Road Fund, the Maritime Silk Road Fund. And all

of these banking institutions obviously function completely differently; they're not oriented towards a casino economy, but they're oriented towards infrastructure financing, and therefore are really the kind of industrial banking, or financing of agriculture and other projects of the real economy, which unfortunately the trans-Atlantic sector has completely abandoned – especially since the repeal of Glass-Steagall. Therefore, it's now a very important lifeboat in case of the collapse of the financial system of the trans-Atlantic sector; which may happen sooner than most people think is possible.

The good news is you have this parallel, or as the Chinese would say, this complementary banking system; so it's not completely without hope that the Europeans and the United States could associate with this system, if the non-sustainability of the present system becomes obvious – which could happen at any moment.

ROSS: It's interesting, while the Germans are bringing this deadly Green ideology to China, at the same time you were in China there was a conference in Hannover marking the 300th anniversary of the passing of the great German thinker Gottfried Leibniz. And a number of Chinese scholars participated, and some of their themes were on the relationship between Confucianism and Leibniz's outlook on world affairs. The theme of the overall conference, as stated by one of the Chinese-born main speakers,

was about how concern for others is the necessary outlook to have in life.

Let me ask just one more question about the G-20; and then I want to ask you about Deutsche Bank. Do you see that this is the kind of forum that can be effective in making these sorts of policies a reality? In other words, is the G-20 a sort of discussion group that can make headway on getting these policies implemented?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, I don't know. As I said, it is the present organization of the most powerful nations. Naturally, there were also some representatives from some smaller countries who were expressing that they did not feel totally represented by this combination of the G-20; and it remains a big question. I think the Chinese will have the best intentions to bring in a New Paradigm; to address the questions from the standpoint of moving mankind into a new era at a point of utmost peril. But I don't know if this format will be suitable to accomplish that, given the fact that it's one thing to have nice summits and obviously it is important to have them; but the real questions are decided in what will happen to the financial crisis. As I said, to turn the G-20 process from crisis reaction to a more stable perspective for the entire human species would require that

the

Europeans and the Americans are willing to address the fact that

their financial system is bankrupt; and implement Glass-Steagall.

Get rid of the non-performing debt; stop the casino economy – what we have proposed. Fortunately, there is some motion for Glass-Steagall in the United States and also in some European countries; but presently the G-7 governments are not expressing a

willingness to do so, so that will create a real conflict.

Naturally, on other issues which you mentioned in your introduction, the conflict between the United States and Russia

in Syria and over the question of who is a terrorist and who not;

these are question which will be decided outside of the framework

of the G-20 summit, which only deals with economics and financial

matters. Even if these other issues naturally impact the financial system.

I think it will be very important to mobilize the populations of Europe and the United States to recognize that we

have to move into a New Paradigm of international cooperation.

Because the problems which are facing mankind right now are so big, that I don't think – if you don't come to a solution which

is inclusive – we have to move from geopolitical confrontation to the common aims of mankind; such as fighting I think the G-20

probably will say something useful in terms of addressing overcoming hunger and poverty. From various discussions I had, I

think there will be such an agenda; but will it be realized?

Because it means to get rid of \$2 quadrillion in outstanding

derivatives. So, will these nice words be accompanied by the actions which will make it possible? Which is ending this present system of globalization based on high-risk speculation;

that is the crucial question. So, therefore, I think we should

not sit there and wait to see what happens, but we have to mobilize the populations in the respective countries in the United States and European nations to make sure that the existing

solutions are being implemented. Such as the Four Laws defined

by Mr. LaRouche.

Immediately, Glass-Steagall is the first step; then move to

a credit system in the tradition of Alexander Hamilton; then go

to a science driver based on space cooperation and colonization;

and create a new international credit system to facilitate the kinds of projects defined in the New Silk Road. I think we have

to mobilize the population to get active; because this is not a

moment to sit on the fence and just watch what these so-called "elites" do, because this was another thing that came up in various forms. That the populations have lost trust in these elites representing this globalization system. Therefore, the responsibility to remedy the situation must shift to those who have concepts of how to get out of the situation. Which is what

we are doing in New York with the Manhattan Project, what the international Schiller Institute is doing; but I think we need your support – you, who are watching us right now. I want to appeal to you, to get active with us to help to implement these

solutions.

ROSS: Good! Thank you very much for joining us, Helga. I really appreciate your time.

Now, we're going to be hearing from Diane Sare, a leader of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee and the founding director of the Schiller Institute New York City Community Chorus. So, thanks for being with us, Diane. Hello.

Let me start by asking you to help our viewers understand how to approach the context of the election; how we can shape what the United States does, which in many ways, many people think that the election is the most important way to shape that.

But in reflecting on what Helga had discussed about the potential

for the G-20 to have ideas about eliminating hunger, poverty; but

where will the ability to take on the derivatives bubble come from? And where will the ability to stop the push of geopolitics

and war come from? The US is really essential to change that.

Let me ask you if you could share with us what is your assessment, what is Mr. LaRouche's assessment about the selection, about Hillary Clinton, about the threat of war in particular?

DIANE SARE: Well, the so-called election is really a fraud.

I think what Helga Zepp-LaRouche has just outlined is the major

"game in town" to put it in American lingo; and the truth of the

matter is that the major player in world politics today is Vladimir Putin. It is not Obama; it is not the United States, although we are, I'm afraid, a deadly menace because we have the

wrong policies. What we've been discussing recently here in Manhattan, because Manhattan in a sense is the center of this electoral process; both Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump are based in this area. Both of them are highly destructive individuals; and Americans should simply not fall into the trap that they somehow have to choose between one or the other. In fact, we heard recently that only 9% of the American population have indeed voted for one of them; so you have 91% of the population whose "vote" is for neither. That in and of itself is not sufficient; we have to actually identify the root of this evil, and we have to put the solutions on the table.

ROSS: Well, the Four Laws is something we've been discussing in this broadcast today; that history isn't made only through opposing things. In mid-2014, LaRouche had issued this policy document on "The Four Laws to Save the USA Now". Let me read a concluding section of this, and then ask you to comment on this. LaRouche ends: "Mankind's progress, as measured rather simply as a species, is expressed typically in the rising power of the principle of human life over the abilities of animal life generally; and relatively absolute superiority over the powers of non-living processes to achieve within mankind's willful intervention that intended effect." He says, "Progress exists so only under a continuing progressive increase of the productive and related powers of the human species. That progress defines

the absolute distinction of the human species from all others presently known to us. A government of people based on a policy of zero population growth and per capita standard of human life, is a moral and practical abomination." He concludes saying a fusion economy is "the presently urgent next step and standard for man's gains of power within the Solar System and later, beyond." That's how he concludes this document that opens with some of the necessary steps: Glass-Steagall; national banking; Federal credit; a commitment to a fusion driver. And he puts this all in the context of what economic value means to the human species.

So, I was wondering, Diane, could you say more? How do you see the purpose, the nature of the human individual and the relation of that to economy?

SARE: Well, I think the key is as Alexander Hamilton, his understanding; and Lyndon LaRouche – I do think our viewers should really be aware – is a great scientific thinker and has made great unique contributions in this field. Specifically, the relationship of human creativity to generating the conditions where a growing population can have a higher standard of living from one generation to the next. What they understood is that the source of wealth is not money; it's not property; it's not even labor – we are not animals. The source of wealth is the potential to make a creative discovery which exists in the mind of each human individual; which transforms our relationship to the Universe and our power over the Universe. For any society

to
be just – and that I think is the importance of Leibniz and
the
relationship of Leibniz to the framers of our Constitution;
for a
nation to be just, it has to embody a commitment to that
principle of creativity in the individual citizen.

ROSS: You know, maybe Helga might actually like to
speak on
this, too. When these proposals get made, for example the
proposal by Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche on having an emergency
recapitalization of Deutsche Bank on condition that the role
of
that bank would change in a different context of economic
activity. Sometimes, some of our supporters have a very
difficult time believing Mr. LaRouche would ever call for the
helping of a bank as it seems. Would either of you like to
say
more about that proposal and about what is the true role of
the
banking sector in a productive economy? Why would we need
say,
for example, Deutsche Bank? What role can banking play
usefully?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think we were all very surprised at
the
waves of almost hatred came out when we made this proposal.
People reacted in the strongest terms, saying "Let them go
bankrupt! Why should we save this bank? Or, why should we
save
any bank, for that matter?" Which naturally has to do with
the
fact that the populations who have been victimized by these
policies for the last really decades, but especially after the
2008 crisis; experience that the rich becomes more rich, and

that
the middle class vanishes – becomes poor; and that the number
of
poor becomes bigger and bigger, and their livelihood is being
eaten away. People just have a sense to just get rid of these
banks. But naturally, the question is, what happens if you
have
an uncontrolled collapse? That is what we are looking at
right
now; where it's staring at us that you could have right now a
collapse of the system which would create instant chaos. And
that chaos is probably as dangerous as the danger of
thermonuclear war; because once you have a collapse of
production, supply, there is no food anymore in the store.
Which
could happen if one of the "too big to fail" banks would go
bankrupt. You have now so many mines, it's like a minefield
with
a thousand possibilities to blow up.

The idea to have an orderly process of unwinding these
very
complicated instruments – the derivatives have so many
counterparties that you need an approach. You need to have an
approach to bring some kind of orderly reorganization in this
to
prevent a chaotic collapse. We are not proposing to save
Deutsche Bank or any other bank for that matter, as they are;
but
the idea is to put a control commission or insolvency
commission
or some kind of administration in there which does an orderly
unwinding of these outstanding debts and their complicated
involvements with many international contracts. Nobody has an
overview anymore about these matters, not even the central
banks
have an overview. Then put a different business plan in such
a

bank; the reason why we were referring to Alfred Herrhausen, who was the last decent industrial banker of Deutsche Bank, is because you need to get people an idea of what we are talking about. There was once a different kind of banking philosophy, namely that banks are not a thing in themselves, but they should be the servants of industry, and agriculture and trade. Right now what you have is, the bankers think they are the kings of Olympus; that they should have bonuses of two to three digit million sums every year. For what? I cannot see that they do any work which is productive; but they somehow have developed that they should have all of this wealth and bonuses and millions. And that the effects of their policies should be discounted. But there was once an idea of banking – in Germany it was such bankers as Herman Abs; the postwar reconstruction period which contributed to the economic miracle of Germany in the postwar period. Or Alfred Herrhausen, who had the idea that banking must provide for the well being of the people; that the idea of giving credit is to promote the productive part of the economy and to further productive relations among different nations. That is what we have to get back to; but people have such a short memory that nowadays people have no memory of how it was. How was the Franklin D Roosevelt Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which was exactly such a mechanism, that you have a certain state role in providing for the productive capacities of labor.

That was also the philosophy in the reconstruction of Germany after the Second World War; and Herman Abs and Alfred Herrhausen are the kinds of bankers who should be a role model,

because banking is necessary. You have to have some kind of distribution of credit lines, because we have to reconstruct the real economy; so the idea to just close down the banks is an impulse which is understandable, but it does not address the problem. Because we have to rebuild the economy, we have to have a banking system where credit lines are given for those kinds of things for which you would invest if the economy would be in good shape. You have to have physical principles, you have to have the idea that these credit lines should increase the productivity of the industrial capacities and the labor power.

We have a gigantic job of education to do, because the dumbing down of the labor force as part of the general population has become such a crucial factor. That you have many people, who maybe they can write and read comics, but they are functionally illiterate from the standpoint of comprehending difficult texts or difficult physical conceptions of the economy. There are many people in the youth age who, from the standpoint of industry, are completely unemployable. What you need is a kind of approach like the CCC program of FDR; where you have training programs. You have to increase that creativity in the population which makes them want to know new things; to be part of an innovation-based economy. Which is why I was emphasizing the Chinese; fortunately, they have this idea. They put an enormous amount on the best qualification of their youth, their students.

They have the idea of not using up old industries from the so-called West; but they want to leap frog always to most advanced technology. They have an enormous emphasis on the development of thermonuclear fusion power of other advanced scientists. And among the scientist community, there is a general understanding; if you want to get something done in science, go to China. It's no longer go the United States or go to Europe; and that has everything to do with the Green policies and these ideological policies, which have more to do with control rather than promoting excellence or scientific progress.

So, I think that the idea of going back to the paradigm of Alfred Herrhausen is much more a pedagogical device; because you have to get people to understand that banking is necessary, but it must be based on completely different principles.

SARE: I'd just like to follow up with what Helga said in terms of the US elections and people's hatred for Hillary Clinton; which is similar to their hatred for bailing out banks, although in the case of Hillary, they're more correct than they might realize. We just had here, as people know, the Democratic Party convention; where even in the somewhat scrubbed coverage that you saw, you could see huge numbers of people who were frowning, scowling, who had signs up about not having a war – "Walk the Walk". There's a great deal of anger at Hillary Clinton. People perceive her correctly as a stooge of Wall Street; as she identified herself last year, when one of my associates – Daniel Burke – asked her at a meeting whether she

would support the reinstatement of Glass-Steagall. She refused to answer. Mr. LaRouche said that was the beginning of her disintegration; although it was not the beginning of her becoming a stooge, of selling her soul to the Devil, so to speak, and her decision to work with Obama. I just want to fill this out, because there's not a difference between someone who would support these criminal bail-outs and bonuses that Helga was talking about for these bankers, these speculators who have destroyed the entire trans-Atlantic economy and the living standards of all the people here; but also those who are pushing war. In the recent days, several of Hillary's spokespeople have come out calling for the overthrow of Assad explicitly. She herself has commented that she knows for a fact that Vladimir Putin is somehow behind the hacking of the emails among the Democratic National Committee. How she knows that, what her evidence is, I have no idea. She has not been forthcoming on it.

There's an op-ed in the {New York Times} today titled "Spooks for Hillary", written by Michael Morell, who describes himself as a 33-year career CIA operative. In fact, he was the Deputy Director during the September 11th attacks. First of all, that in and of itself I would say, is a complete indictment of his own powers of morality and judgment; because as we know from the 28 pages that were just recently released, both the CIA and FBI had quite intimate knowledge of the activities of the people who became the hijackers on that day. They were tracking many of

them two and three years before the September 11th attacks;
and
they decided not to pursue these leads, because Saudi Arabia
was
an ally of the United States. So, first of all, who would
want
to be publicly associated with such criminal agencies and brag
about that as if that gives them any kind of authority? Then,
he
goes on to say that the reason he's endorsing Hillary is
because
"Mrs. Clinton was an early advocate of the raid that brought
bin
Laden to justice, in opposition to some of her most important
colleagues on the National Security Council. During the early
debates about how we should respond to the Syrian civil war,
she
was a strong proponent of a more aggressive approach. When
some
wanted to delay the bin Laden raid by one day because of the
White House Correspondents' Dinner, she said 'Screw the White
House Correspondents' Dinner!'"

So according to this CIA careerist, who presumably was
involved in the cover-up of the Saudi role in 9/11 and the
activities of the hijackers going into this, Hillary Clinton
is
the qualified candidate. Then he goes on to attack Vladimir
Putin and says Putin is manipulating Donald Trump. It's
outrageous. Seymour Hersh has exposed the Osama bin Laden
[inaud; 47:36] as a complete media-video-public relations
stunt
done by Barack Obama; where the location of Osama bin Laden
was
revealed by a Pakistani physician who wanted to get the reward
that was being offered by the US State Department. So, they
had
all of the details of his whereabouts; the security was taken

down so we could march in and film the capture and killing of Osama bin Laden. And Barack Obama could take credit for it.

So, you have Hillary Clinton on record as backing that premeditated assassination of Osama bin Laden; you have her on record giggling after Qaddafi was killed, saying "We came; we saw; he died" or whatever it was. This is a form of pure evil;

it's a terrible sell-out of the American people. And it is actually a cover for Obama continuing his war policy now; which

you referenced at the beginning of this discussion – the new war

in Libya. Where apparently, Obama gave a speech yesterday, claiming that the United States is conducting the most precise air campaign ever waged. We're invited by a Libyan government that has not even been officially confirmed by its own parliamentary rules. This is a war that has not been approved by

Congress; and Obama is engaging in this against our Constitution.

You then had the questions of who we're supporting in Syria; the

alleged "moderate" Syrian rebels, one group of which that we are

claiming to be an ally – this al-Zenki group, who just decapitated a 12-year old and filmed it. And now it's been found

that they used poison gas in an area; and when our State Department spokesman, Mark Toner was asked about this and whether

we would continue to provide funds to what I would class a terrorist organization, he said well, one incident here and there

doesn't necessarily make you a terrorist group. So, if you're using chemicals to exterminate groups of people, or beheading children, don't worry; you most like will not lose your funding

from the US State Department.

This is what Hillary Clinton actually represents.
What Mr.

LaRouche further stressed – which I think is the important question for Americans and the viewers – is we have to look at what action created Obama. How do we get the Obama Presidency?

What was the role of the British monarchy, through certain of Her

Majesty's creatures like George Soros; the Jew who claimed that

the high point of his life was working for the Nazis in Hungary,

taking all of people's possessions as they got herded off to the

boxcars for the concentration camps? People know that Soros played a major role in funding the Obama campaign; he has given

Hillary Clinton's campaign millions of dollars, and that would imply ownership of this.

I would just say that it is really high time for the American people to stop going along with these kinds of criminal

policies. There is an entirely New Paradigm out there which is

largely the creation, the work of Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche has been

the inspiration of this. The United States could choose to leave

the insanity of – frankly, the way the United States is functioning, it's almost like we're in a real live Pokemon Go game, which they're calling an election. We could actually step

out of that and into reality. I would say that people should know that within the next couple of days, we're going to be launching a campaign here in Manhattan, producing several thousand copies of a broadsheet which will have the

documentation
on Hillary Clinton's criminal background and her commitment to
a
war drive against Russia and China; which I think will have
quite
an impact here. The material in that will be available on the
LaRouche PAC website very soon.

ROSS: I'd like to just ask Helga if you have any
other
remarks you'd like to add?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, I think most people have a sense
that
things are really getting out of control. That the
coincidence
of all these things happening at the same time gives many
people
the feeling that there's nothing one can do; that there's an
unbelievable process of disintegration going on. Naturally,
if
you look at the two candidates of the United States, there is
a
rather perplexed reaction in the rest of the world that the
United States should not have come up with some better
candidates. The rest of the world looks at the European Union
and says the European Union is no longer a model; it used to
be a
model of integration for ASEAN, for Latin America, for the
African Union. But no longer; the elites obviously can't
handle
the situation that is credited by the people and so forth.
So,
while I could describe these symptoms more, I would like
actually
to say that we are in a moment which is really an
extraordinary

moment in history. At this T-20 conference, one Chinese speaker said this is moment like 1989; referring to the point when the Berlin Wall came down, which was the prelude to the German reunification and the collapse of the Soviet Union. So, it's one of these monumental, apocryphal moments in history, where it is impossible to make a prediction. We cannot responsibly tell you this will be the outcome of this period of history. All I can say is – and Jason, since you mentioned Leibniz, who was an important influence in the American Revolution, the Declaration of Independence, the whole idea of the pursuit of happiness goes back to Leibniz. He said something which I think we should think about, and that is that the nature of human beings is such, and the nature of creation is such, that when man is confronted with a great evil, there is a capacity in him that brings forth an even greater good. I think it is very important that each of becomes conscious about that; and you consciously actualize that greater sense of good in yourself, each of us in ourselves.

Because I am absolutely certain that the solutions are at hand; it's not a reason to be desperate. Because it would be relatively easy to implement Glass-Steagall; you just have to move it from the Glass-Steagall formulation in the platforms of the Democratic and Republican Parties, to move it into actuality.

And do a similar reform in Europe and then have the United States

and Europe join with this parallel economic system which I described before with the AIIB, the New Development Bank, and so forth. Then move to a New Paradigm; do what Franklin D Roosevelt did with the New Deal, with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, with the rebuilding of the economy in the '30s. This can all be done today. So, it's not that we are without solutions; we have a clear perspective, because you have all of these nations working together already in different degrees on this "win-win" perspective for a New Silk Road.

So, a lot depends upon the subjective; because it's not that we have an objective breakdown crisis, we have that. But if the solutions which exist can be implemented in time, really depends upon the moral quality of the population; especially in the United States and in Europe. And since I believe there is this capacity for the good in human beings, I appeal to you; invoke that inside yourself. Don't sit on the fence and watch history.

We are in an apocryphal change, which is probably at least as big as the transformation from the Middle Ages period to the new modern times. We have to leave this present collapsing epoch behind us and replace it with a New Paradigm which is worthy of the dignity of man and is the true character of human beings as being beautiful potentially, as being creative, as being loving.

The human being is potentially a genius; human beings are good by nature, and just the fact that today so many people are not

good
doesn't say anything about the nature of man. It says something
about conditions which have evoked the evil in people rather than
promoting the good. I think history is not determined by objective factors; we don't have what the Communists used to call
a "histo-mat" – historical materialism – or "dia-mat" – dialectical materialism. I think that the subjective factor in
history is much more important, and many times really decides it.
I want to say that both to give you confidence about the nature
of man; but also to appeal to you to get active with us. So, contact us and we will move mountains.

ROSS: Many opportunities to do good right now. Thank you
both for joining us; and thank you, viewers. To find out more about these things, "The Four Laws to Save the USA Now" – the document by LaRouche as displayed during this webcast – is available through a link in the video description, and at lpac.co/four-laws. Please subscribe to this channel if you haven't already; "like" this video. If you have questions or comments, leave them; and {donate} to LaRouche PAC. We rely entirely on the support of individuals like you to finance our operations and to achieve this victory. So, help; let's win this
one. Thank you for joining us.