

'Hvis Deutsche Bank kollapser, og hele systemet med det ... så taler vi om intet mindre end overlevelse midt i ubeskriveligt kaos'

Paris, 30. sept., 2016 (Nouvelle Solidarité) – En fransk analytiker siger, at, om Deutsche Bank bliver reddet eller ej, så er der ingen garanti for, at systemet ikke falder. Charles Sannat, en skarp, uortodoks finansanalytiker, der ikke mangler humor, analyserer i dag på sin blog, »Insolentiae«, hvad konsekvenserne af DB's bankerot, og også af en eventuel bailout, vil være.

Sannat gennemgår markedernes og oligarkernes argumenter. Vil DB blive reddet? Ja, »Da Deutsche Bank stort set er i systemisk størrelsesorden, så vil, hvis den falder, hele verden falde med den, og derfor bliver den reddet.«

Har vi midlerne? »Ja, selvfølgelig ... Det er nok bare at trykke penge, og Mario Draghi varmer allerede maskinerne op i kælderen.«

Hvad med derivaterne? »Jamen, det er kun på papiret (potentielle engagementer såsom f.eks. en garanti), i virkeligheden er det noget mindre problematisk. Hvor meget mindre? Svært at sige, men hvem bekymrer sig? ... vi skaber de nødvendige penge.«

Hvad med inflation? »Frygt ikke. På kort sigt er det ikke penge, der vil cirkulere i systemet«, men blot for at fylde hullerne op, dvs., det er en »likviditetsfælde«.

Det virkelige problem er et »politisk problem« for Merkel, siger han. Det er umuligt for hende at gå tiggergang til ECB om en billion euro for at redde DB, hvilket vil smide hele det der med »germansk strenghed« ud af vinduet«!

Sannat spekulerer, at det, de vil gøre, er at gennemføre det alligevel, ved at gøre det til et europæisk problem og bringe andre insolvente europæiske banker ind, som Santander fra Spanien, de italienske banker osv., og så gøre det til en europæisk bailout.

Bør vi gå i panik? »Hverken mere eller mindre end sædvanligt«, siger Sannat. Dette er et godt eksempel, der viser, at »intet er blevet løst« og at gå bort fra banker og ind i håndgribelige aktiver: guld, jord, lidt kontanter – »og glem ikke et par poser ris og dåsemad ...«

»Hvis DB kollapser, og hele systemet med det ... så taler vi om intet mindre end overlevelse midt i ubeskriveligt kaos. Det er grunden til, at jeg tror, de vil redde bankerne én gang til, minimum, og så starter det hele forfra igen om to år.«

Billede: »Ligningen om de blinde, der fører de blinde« (hvorved de alle uvægerligt trimler ned i grøften). Pieter Bruegel den Ældre, 1568.

Lyndon LaRouche: Vi må have en revolution i ideen om videnskab for at overleve!

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 30. sept., 2016 – Under en diskussion i dag med LPAC Politiske Komité, Basement-videnskabsteamet og

andre, erklærede Lyndon LaRouche, at, med mindre vi kan udvikle menneskers intellekt på en ny måde, gennem at gøre nye opdagelser af videnskabelige principper, så vil vi ikke overleve. Evnen til at skabe nye former for videnskab er nøglen til menneskeheden, og dette er for lidt kendt, som et resultat af århundreders kulturel degeneration, hvor al fokus, i heldigste fald, lå på gimmicks og færdigheder. Der har været en vedvarende, induceret degeneration af det menneskelige intellekt, til en tilstand, hvor nye ting aldrig overvejes. Vi må genoplive videnskab – og udforskning af rummet er én nøgle. Dette er det umiddelbare, vigtige spørgsmål over alle andre. Menneskeheden er blevet bedøvet af sin kultur, og nu er tiden kommet, hvor vi må komme i gang med ægte videnskab. Uden det klarer vi det ikke.

Vi har evnen til at ændre reglerne for eksistens på planeten, og vi må derfor have en mere intens kampagne. Vi må genoplive Einstein-princippet. Dette er, hvad mennesket har brug for. Gør det umulige! Einsteins mest avancerede arbejde, som kun få forstår, handlede om, hvordan menneskeheden kan udvikle menneskeheden ved at vedtage de rigtige regler. Vi må nu komme ud af det, vi har ligget under for, med det, som fortiden har gjort ved os alle.

Vi må revolutionere *ideen om videnskab*, for det er, hvad USA og Europa har mistet. Visse dele af verden, som Kina, har været i gang med at undersøge ting af en højere orden. Kina er f.eks. i færd med at udvikle projektet om Månens bagside, og dette er meget vigtigt. Dette aspekt af det kinesiske, videnskabelige arbejde er det bedste til at formidle til folk, ånden af denne presserende nødvendige ændring i metoden til tænkning. Månen har stadig karaktertræk, der stort set er ukendte for os. Kina udforsker disse ukendte faktorer, og denne mentalitet må være fokus for vores indsats for at genoplive ægte videnskab. Vi må bevæge befolkningen ind i nye områder, der giver dem evnen til atter at tænke.

Selvfølgelig må vi tage os af afgørende spørgsmål som faren

for en atomkrig, Deutsche Banks kollaps og det umiddelbart forestående kollaps af hele det globale finanssystem, med mindre Glass-Steagall omgående implementeres – men, med mindre, man fæstner opmærksomheden på dette dybereliggende spørgsmål om at ændre menneskeheden formindskede kreativitet og indlede et nyt, videnskabeligt udsyn, så findes der ingen fremtid.

Hvilket eksisterende potentiale må vi have udviklet, hvis vi skal give menneskeheden en fremtid? LaRouchePAC Internationale Fredags-webcast, 30. sept. 2016

LaRouche: »Det vigtigste spørgsmål, som mennesket står overfor, er, hvilke er de eksisterende potentialer, på hvilke menneskets fremtid beror? Hvilke er de videnskabelige opdagelser, der må gøres af den unikt kreative art, som er menneskeheden, og på basis af hvilke vi kan skabe en sand og vedvarende fremtid for den menneskelige art?«

Engelsk udskrift:

**WHAT ARE THE EXISTING POTENTIALS WHICH MUST BE
DEVELOPED IF WE ARE TO GIVE MANKIND A FUTURE?**

LaRouche PAC International Webcast

September 30, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good afternoon! It is September 30, 2016.

My name is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us here for our weekly LaRouche PAC webcast on Friday evening. I'm joined in the

studio by Jason Ross and Benjamin Deniston of the LaRouche PAC science team, and via video by Diane Sare and Michael Steger, both of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee.

We spoke with Lyndon LaRouche just a short time ago, and Mr.

LaRouche's opening remarks are as follows: He says, "The most important question facing mankind is what are the existing potentials on which mankind's future depends? What are the scientific discoveries that must be made by the uniquely creative

species that is mankind on which we can create a true and sustainable future for the human species?" Not a practical question, but a truly scientific question in a truly scientific

sense. Now Mr. LaRouche's remarks come right in the wake of the

absolutely victory, the deafening defeat that we have delivered

to Barack Obama with the resounding override in both Houses of the United States Congress – both the Senate and the House – of

Obama's veto of the JASTA bill. It's widely acknowledged that the LaRouche Movement, those of you who are watching this broadcast here today, played a central role in that victory alongside the 9/11 families. I think it's clear that the courageous and consistent and sustained leadership of Mr. LaRouche himself on this, has delivered this historic defeat of

Obama.

Now we know, as Obama's disgustingly arrogant response to this override that was handed to him demonstrates very clearly, where he said, "This is the most embarrassing moment in the history of the United States Senate," and so forth; you're dealing with a narcissist here. And a narcissist, when delivered this kind of defeat, is very dangerous. And we're seeing the danger of the escalation to the point of nuclear war of Obama's personal desire to confront both Russia and China; the refusal to allow the peace process in Syria to work. And also the total breakdown of Deutsche Bank, number one, and the entire rest of the financial system. It's been said that this is a zombie bank walking which is creating a zombie economy; this is way worse than the Lehman process. So, the next step is obviously the immediate restoration of Glass-Steagall.

However, as Mr. LaRouche was emphatic today – and we are going to have his remarks written up and circulated widely for you to read verbatim – the solution to this is not a practical question. We need to throw in the garbage can all the failed ways of thinking; and we need to create an entirely new outlook on mankind's relationship to the Universe. So, we're going to have a somewhat in-depth presentation and discussion on some of those questions here today. We thank you for joining that discussion, and hope to have full participation. So, I'm going to hand it over to Ben to get that discussion started.

BENJAMIN DENISTON: I think Mr. LaRouche definitely raised

the bar in our discussion with him this morning; and I think it's a very apt and useful intervention into the way many people are thinking about the situation, because as you said, we've had a huge victory with Obama being just slammed on his attempted treasonous veto of the JASTA bill and protection of the Saudis. So, this is a major victory, but coming out of the discussion with Mr. LaRouche, I think it's a victory for our cause as a movement that Mr. LaRouche has uniquely created; and our mission as a movement, which is to move mankind forward from the highest level. This is not just a victory in terms of DC politics; it's not just a victory in terms of party debates and the normal terms of politics people think of in the United States today. It's a victory in terms of our mission as an organization to go from the highest historical, scientific level, understanding what the heck is mankind on this planet. What are we trying to do; what is our mission as a species here? That's what we're fighting on; we have to deal with these kinds of issues, and we have to defeat these terrible forces that are holding mankind back – Obama is exemplary, the Saudis are exemplary. But victories against these evils are victories for the cause of real progress; real economic progress as Mr. LaRouche understands it.

As he said earlier today, real economics as he understands it, is very different than what normal people think about

economics. It's not just about money issues, or even production or products or something like that; but if you're talking about economics, you're talking about the human species. You're talking about how do we progress; how do we move mankind forward? Progress for mankind has always been, and will always continue to be if we continue to exist, fundamental creative revolutions in what the human species really is. It's not about how much you produce, the productivity of your labor force, how much credit you're spending, how much money you're putting in. Those are components, but if you're talking about real, fundamental human progress, economic progress, the core goes to how is that mankind uniquely completely changes the nature of his existence on this planet in this Universe more generally? That's something mankind does; the entire history of mankind, when we haven't been held back by empires, oligarchical systems, degenerate ideologies as we have largely dominating today. Mankind's nature is complete revolutions where in effect, it's as if we really create the human species anew on a higher level. So, that's our mission as mankind today; that's what the fight is today.

From the discussion and Mr. LaRouche's emphasis, he is emphasizing that this has to be upfront and center. That's what we're fighting for; that's our mission on this planet. That means science; that means real science. That means going into space; that means what China is doing with their lunar

program.

Bringing mankind into the Solar System as a real creative force

in the Solar System in the way mankind has never done. What China's doing with their lunar program, their current focus on the lunar far side; a completely mysterious area in many degrees.

A region that is absolutely unique in the immediate vicinity around the Earth; that will give us completely new insights into

the Universe more broadly. These are the kinds of pursuits that

enable mankind to come to these new, higher levels.

One thing I wanted to put on the table today, a subject

that's been a longstanding discussion with Mr. LaRouche and our

science team, is this issue of the Galaxy, the galactic system.

This defines a new frontier, the new domains of scientific revolution that are the substance of what mankind does to completely transform his existence. I think it's apt in the context of this victory to assess what these new future discoveries can be; what we should be looking towards.

Because

as he said earlier today, it's not just about repeating something

you've done before; it's always something fundamentally new.

And

the Galaxy is something fundamentally new, really. We don't understand how the Galaxy works, and we know coming to a higher

understanding of that – a real scientific understanding of that

– is the kind of thing that will transform what mankind is in the most fundamental sense in this Universe.

So, we're living in this galactic system; and again,

this

determines more about our lives here on Earth than people tend to

realize. This is still a very slow realization; only a handful

of the population – small layers in the scientific community – are really pursuing and presenting that. The conditions here on

Earth that we live in and experience are not Earth conditions; they're not even Solar System conditions. They're galactic conditions. Just to highlight one example we've discussed before, we're living in a galactic climate. If you look at the

Earth as it exists today, the largest scales of climate change that occur, are a function of our relationship to our galactic system, for example. We're used to the Earth as it is today. For much of modern civilization, the Earth has been relatively similar to how it is today; but the conditions that we experience

now are a function, to a very large degree, of our current galactic relationship.

For example, we've cited that on very long timescales, the

motion of our Solar System into and out of the Galaxy's spiral arms, for example, determines some of the largest variations we

see in the climate record. The reason why we have ice-caps at all, for example; you look at a map, you see Antarctica, it's covered in ice. You ever see it not covered in ice? You ever gone to the islands of Antarctica and visited lakes there, fished

on Antarctica and seen the wildlife there? No, no human being has ever experienced that; it used to be like that. It used to

just be a land-exposed continent like the other continents.

Why

is it not like that now? Because of a function of our

galactic

position, we're in a large-scale glacial period that the Earth periodically goes through as a function of our galactic relationship currently. So, the conditions that we experience,

that we're used to, that we see on Earth, are largely a function

of these larger processes; that being just one example.

We had discussed on one of the New Paradigm shows recently,

a new paper that came out that demonstrated this in a new way.

Demonstrating more clearly that the conditions of the atmosphere,

the water cycle, the cloud systems – which play a huge role in climate – are being hour-to-hour, day-to-day affected by this galactic influence. Even just a one-day perturbation of that galactic influence, you can immediately measure the effects.

So

when the Sun gets more active and shields the Earth from this galactic radiation effect for just the course of a couple days,

within days after that, you can measure changes in the cloud cover, changes in the water cycle of the atmosphere. So, this galactic input, this radiation, this effect of what we call the

atmospheric system of the Galaxy, is a continuous input that determines the conditions we experience here on Earth.

That's just an opening example to start to get people to

think about the fact that we're part of this much larger system.

We're not living on Earth and there's some galaxy out there; we've living in the galaxy. The galaxy is what we're a part of.

It's a larger system, but the point is, it's a larger system we

don't yet understand. To draw an analogy, it's like looking

at
the Solar System before the time of Kepler. The Earth was
part
of the Solar System, but it was not understood; we did not
understand the principle of the Solar System. It took a real
creative revolution, a creative discovery to understand that.
We
have not yet done that for this larger galactic system. We
have
not yet gone through the type of creative discovery that
really
elevates mankind to a new level of fundamental relationship to
the universe by understanding these higher order principles of
the galactic system.

A lot can be said, but just to point to another
example, we
have some sense of the Solar System's orbiting through the
galaxy, moving through the galaxy. We have some sense,
according
to the records, that that determines climate change;
potentially
evolution, the development of life are also things that have
been
related to the relation of our Solar System to the galaxy.
Those
are large topics I'm just citing; a lot could be said on this.
We have a sense of these records, and the relation of these
records; but the actual fundamental basic principle governing
the
orbit of our Solar System around the galaxy, or any star
around
the galaxy is not understood. We don't even understand the
basic
principles of the orbital relations of stars in the galaxy.
This
has been cited as a reason to invoke this whole investigation
of

so-called "dark matter"; it's another subject that would take some time to get into. But the point is, we can't even explain the orbital periods of stars around galaxies with our current understandings of the way galaxy are organized and the principles governing galactic systems.

Not to be too linear about it, I think it's worth drawing a direct relation to science and astronomy before the time of Kepler. Where, for example, you had the attempt to extrapolate from prior conceptions, prior knowledge, a certain way of modelling the Solar System and explaining certain observations. You had models of the Solar System done by Ptolemy, done by Tycho Brahe, done by Copernicus – something people may be more familiar with. But in a sense, all of those attempts to explain the motions of the planets, to explain the Solar System at those times, were extrapolations from a certain assumed method of thinking the way the universe functioned.

What Kepler did was fundamentally different, by actually making a discovery. He didn't just extrapolate, extend further, prior conceptions of how the solar system worked – how they thought it worked, how they assumed it worked, based on certain assumptions. He introduced a discovery, something that {he} generated, uniquely, as a creative thought, and that was what allowed mankind to know the solar system, not an extrapolation from observation, not an extrapolation from data, but an actual {discovery}.

I think that really goes to the core of what Mr. LaRouche has spent decades trying to address, which is that issue of {real creative discovery}, as opposed to {description}, as opposed to what gets discussed often as science today, which is much more empirical descriptions of observation, maybe coming up with certain formulas or certain descriptive relations that describe phenomena, {versus} the idea that there is something fundamentally {different} about what the human mind can generate as a completely new idea, which does not come from the observations, {per se}. Kepler is a very good example of that. Einstein is a very good example of that.

That's the kind of thinking that we need, if we're going to move the human species forward. I think that's Mr. LaRouche's point. We're at a point now, where, if we're going to move mankind in his natural, creative, human direction, it requires these kinds of revolutionary discoveries of the very fundamental organization of the universe. That does not come from the type of so-called "science" that's often taught today, which, I think, is why Mr. LaRouche is highlighting Einstein as such a {critical} figure at this point, one of the last people who really had an insight into this fundamental difference between real human creative discovery and mere description, mere observation. A lot can be said about that.

I just want to cite one more example, before getting into maybe some discussion about this. Recently we just got, I think,

a very interesting new, initial, preliminary of many of the stars surrounding us in our galaxy. This comes from the so-called Gaia satellite. What that Gaia satellite is doing now, is mapping very precisely the positions and the motions of a billion stars surrounding us. We'll have to wait a few years for the full map to be created. But this is a very exciting, very interesting mission that's going on right now. We're going to have a map of the motions – direct observations of the motions and the directions – of a billion stars surrounding us. This is going to give us the best observational data we've ever had about how our galaxy functions, how any galaxy functions, really. We're going to have direct measurements of a substantial – still small, but substantial – sections of our galactic system as a whole. We will then be able to measure, with more accuracy than ever, how things are moving, where things are moving, what structures are there, how different structures are moving.

But, if we don't then continue to then put the emphasis on the issue of actual creative discovery, that's not going to do the trick. That's going to take us one step. I think the most apt comparison is Tycho Brahe had made the most accurate observations of the motions of the planets up to his time. But when he tried to explain the solar system, and how the planets moved, he

just

had another iteration, based on the same assumptions as his predecessors, as Copernicus, as Ptolemy. Even though he had the

data, he didn't make the "discovery," to put it in very simple terms. Kepler did. Kepler was able to use that same data to actually make a discovery. He needed the data to do it, but it was something that {he} was able to generate in his own mind, that was the discovery, that was what allowed mankind to really

change the way he exists in the universe, by moving to an understanding of the {principles} organizing the galactic system.

I think these are the kind of examples and reference points

that we can look to today, for the kind of challenge we are facing now. We're part of this galaxy. This galaxy represents higher-order principles of organization of the universe as we understand it – the universe that we're a part of. Mankind, uniquely, can discover these things, but only when we recognize

that it's not just coming from observations or descriptions, but

it is the issue of something unique about the human mind and creativity, that is the real substance of science.

I'm certainly no expert on Einstein, but Mr. LaRouche has

put a large emphasis on the importance of Einstein's work. As far

as I understand it, [Einstein is] one of the last – if not the last – leading scientist who really waged a fight on this issue,

who really had some insight into the fact that there is something

remarkable about the fact that the human mind can come to know the fundamental, unseen, organizing principles of the universe. I

haven't seen Einstein reflect on his own work in this way, but I think it's rather interesting to just look at his work and the implication of his work on Relativity, where he shows that your basic ideas of space, of time, are not the way the universe is organized. To take it maybe closer to Mr. LaRouche's work, your sense-perceptual interpretation of the universe does not give you a direct understanding for how the universe is actually organized.

But there is something within mankind that's not from sense-perception, that's not just from observation, that's not just from descriptions of data, some potential that mankind has, to come to know the causes, the principles, that are not accessible to sense-perception. At the very heart of it, that is the substance of what enables mankind to be a unique species on this planet. We talk about economics and growth and progress. It is those kinds of revolutions, not economic growth, [but] complete revolutions in what mankind is and what mankind can do on this planet, [that] fundamentally transforms the nature of our existence.

If you look at what level of society existed 1000 years ago, 2000 years ago, 10,000 years ago, to today; that's not just an incremental process of finding and exploiting new wealth, or something. That [progression] is a function of complete revolutions in the very fundamental way mankind relates to the universe. That is our mission today. That's something that's been

attacked and written out of science, written out of education, largely, today: this critical issue of actual creative discovery.

Again, I think Mr. LaRouche has defined this and illustrated

this better than anyone else I've ever seen: the intimate relation between {that} process and what really moves society forward, what really moves mankind forward.

The challenge that Mr. LaRouche put to us today, I think, is

that we're at an historical moment. This is an historical victory. It's not completed, it's not over. There's still a {major} fight going on. But this opens up the potential to actually have some positive solutions. But those positive solutions are not what people normally think about, in terms of

"positive solutions", in society today. It's not just about taking on the banks and giving some of their money to other people and redistributing the wealth. We're fighting on a much higher level. It's about how do we actually move human society forward, and what does that mean? That means these kinds of issues: the genius of Einstein, the genius of Kepler; looking to

the new areas – the galaxy, the far side of the Moon.

I know that's a very brief and general coverage of a lot of

stuff. But I think that's some of the framework that we should discuss, because I think that's the real challenge we have, uniquely, as this organization – the LaRouche organization – to

fight on that level. I'm sure that other people have some thoughts, but I think Mr. LaRouche definitely intervened with a

very provocative and challenging focus today, and I think this is

maybe a way to open it up and get the discussion going.

DIANE SARE: I just wanted to take a couple examples, because it is very provocative. In Einstein's letters, he makes the point. He said, of course there's a place for empirical evidence in science, but the more important the discovery, the smaller the role of empirical evidence is. When you think about, for example, Kepler, or his conception of the universe – which is a real challenge to think about what each one of us is, potentially, as a human being, and a great deal of faith in Reason, or what it means to be created in the image of the Creator – Kepler had an idea in his mind of a view of the solar system from the vantage point of standing on the Sun, as if you were on the Sun at the center, or slightly off-center, since we don't have circular orbits of the solar system.

Now think about, in his day, what that looked like. Not only had we never gone to the Moon, we didn't even have an automobile! I mean, you're talking about the 1600's. So, how is it that Kepler has a conception of the solar system, as if perceived from the Sun? And then his ability, in his own mind, to develop a conception of what that would mean, in terms of the relationships among the planets, which Cusa, who was even earlier and did not have the benefit of Tycho Brahe's observations, yet Cusa had a certain very clear hypothesis, simply through Reason, about the way that the solar system could be ordered or had to be ordered,

just based on his ability to try and think as if he were the Creator. How might the Creator of the universe think about what this is?

Similarly with Einstein, we had a discussion on one of the Thursday night Fireside Chats. The caller clearly had read Einstein, and he said this seems more like an essay or a philosophical discussion, than what he would typically think of as "hard science," because, similarly, Einstein was dealing with Reason. In other words, we have not, so far, had a train that goes anywhere near the speed of light, and if one did, I'm not really sure how well you could see it, if you were standing on a bank, trying to watch what was going on in such a train.

But Einstein was able to construct "experiments" {in his mind}, which may have been provoked by something was observed or a phenomena that was not explained. The other thing that he said, which I found very provocative; he was writing a letter to a friend of his who was, I think, a physicist, and he said, "You know, I really admire the work that you do, because the best you can get, in scientific experiments, is 'Maybe.' That is, you can get an outright 'No,' like you have a hypothesis, you try to construct it, you try to demonstrate it, and the thing flops, and then you know that the universe definitely doesn't work {that} way. But, you could construct an experiment, and then you get the result that you're hypothesizing, and then you say, Okay, well it

seems that, perhaps, the universe does work {this} way." And Einstein then, of course, says that "The best you get is a 'Maybe,' which always will ultimately will become a 'No," because, as science advances, then, ultimately, you will discover that what seemed to be true in your initial hypothesis, actually is not the whole truth at all."

Therefore, Mr. LaRouche's challenge to us today about developing new types of science. In other words, there are principles which, even to conceive of them, would require a leap beyond, and then the ability, almost, to look back on ourselves, as if from above, or as if from some future point, to determine what should be the next step.

JASON ROSS: I really liked what you had brought up from Einstein about how discoveries will rely less on empirical data; you had brought that up as something that he was saying, because it's a great example. None of the things, many of the things he predicted, it's not that things had been observed and no explanation was available, which he then came up with an explanation for. He did some of that. But the other thing he did was to forecast events occurring, forecast scientific experiments that could be performed that had never been seen before. People couldn't explain why Mercury's orbit moved the way that it did until Einstein; that was already a problem. But nobody had seen light bend around the Sun and wondered why it occurred. Nobody had noticed that the kind of light emitted changed depending on the gravitational field it was emitted

in.

These weren't problems that needed a solution; they were things that Einstein – from very simple principles – realized would have to come about.

I think another thing that's very important about him is that he was active in many other fields. In other words, he had a very pervading sense of justice and of honesty, a disdain for authority in the sense that he should come to his own conclusions about things and then stick with them once he came to them. This is what made it possible for to do things like discard the notions of space and time that people had. This wasn't an easy thing; it was a difficult concept to get, it was shocking to Einstein as well. But he realized that it had to be the case. He also was very adamant in his day – see, people alive and maybe some of our viewers can recall this; during Einstein's life, he was known as an outspoken political figure. He made commentary on political events all the time, and as far as the coverage that he got in newspapers, a lot of it was about what he did with science; but a lot of it was about his stands on things. For example, he said that academics should just refuse to testify at the McCarthy hearings. He said, "Don't use the 5th Amendment as an excuse, use the 1st! You should be able to say what you think and discuss ideas without being called to account by the government for it. What is this, Nazi Germany?" He saw the anti-Communist crusades being conducted as being very similar to

something he saw in Germany; where the Nazis began by taking out the Communists.

OGDEN: It earned him a very extensive FBI file.

ROSS: Yes, an 1800-page FBI file, full of mostly crap.

Well, if you're trying to make someone good look bad, you're going to have to fill your file with a bunch of crap. It was astonishingly incompetent by the FBI, although maybe it's par for the course for them.

The other thing, take racism, for example. This is something that he spoke frequently about; that he made an exception to his general tendency not to go to ceremonies at colleges to get honorary degrees. He had had enough; he found the ceremonies sort of obnoxious. But he made an exception to go to what billed itself as the first institute for higher learning for blacks in the United States – Lincoln University. He went there to get his honorary degree and lecture on relativity and on racism. So, he was a committed overall person, who also had his standards – I'll bring up one more topic – in music and culture. His use of the violin is famous; his affection for music is well-known. He played his violin at events, benefit concerts. Once when he was asked to give a speech, he said, "You know, I'm going to play my violin instead; I don't really have anything to add to what the other speakers said." So, he pulled it out and performed.

He lived at a time – think about this – the early 1900s,

the first half of the 20th Century. This is a period that Lyndon

LaRouche has identified as a willful destruction of culture – both in science with the replacement of science by mathematics,

and culturally after the death of Brahms by a changing basis of

what it would mean to be culture or to be music. Where anything

goes, and Stravinsky's "Rite of Spring", which invites the audience to join him in a murder of a virgin to satisfy the gods,

is considered to be art in just the same way that Beethoven's Ninth Symphony, the {Ode to Joy}, the sense that all men are brothers, is art. So, a rejection of reason in the domain of culture; a rejection of reason in the domain of science.

I'll just end with one example on that, which is the field

of quantum study; where Einstein, although really pioneering the

field of quantum physics, towards the end of his life was seen as

an outcast because he held to the notion that fundamentally the

universe is real and that it's reasonable. Those concepts were

rejected in what became prevalent quantum mechanics, by his friend Nils Bohr, for example; who said that because of what seems to be a lack of determination or of cause when we look at

processes in the very small, we would have to abandon that concept. We would have to abandon the concept that there is a real world independent of our observations. In a very crude way,

what becomes science, is going right back to what Ben had mentioned about Tycho Brahe; science is set back to the idea that

what can we say about things that we observe. That was the view of Heisenberg, for example. What can we say about observations we might make? And throw away the idea that there's something real underneath it; something real that's susceptible to human reason and that should make sense to us as a human-like idea; the same way that was attacked in culture. So, I think those are several other reasons that Einstein absolutely stands out as a scientific genius and as an incredibly moral person, who allowed his convictions and his honesty to guide in other fields as well. Who didn't limit himself to being a scientist, but in fact used the notoriety he received from what he had done in that field to advance other causes that he thought the world needed to take on.

MICHAEL STEGER: Yeah, I think you'd be hard pressed to find someone, if they're a scientific genius, if they're not of a higher moral quality. The discussion so far I think has been very relevant, because over the course of the last 30 days, we have clearly gone into a different period. We are at a point that mankind has never been before. That's not simply from the standpoint of a timeline perspective; we are at a qualitative — these last 30 days have seen a qualitative transformation in the condition of mankind. But that cannot be measured from past events; it can't be measured based on anything mankind has ever experienced before. It has to be measured on where we're now

going to take this new condition of mankind. What is going to be

the direction? What is the scope or perspective of mankind's actions in the universe? What new discoveries, what new principles will be discovered that create the conditions for mankind to substantiate and develop an entirely new human species? The level of coordination on this planet now among nations is of an extraordinary level; one that's unprecedented.

That major nations on the planet today have a capability of coordinating the most broad and in-depth scientific and technological revolution that mankind has ever seen, among billions of human beings. That is something that is beyond unprecedented; it is a fundamental shift in the universe itself.

This recent expression of humanity within the US Congress only typifies what more is possible; because we are now in a condition. What China has established with its space program, and the capability that you have within the major nations; you see endeavors by India, by Russia, by nations of South America,

Africa, Europe. And really a revival of the United States towards this question of what is mankind in the universe. These

bigger questions ultimately, in the pursuit of discoveries as we've seen with Kepler and Einstein, ultimately have to shape the

policies themselves that coordinate the development of our nation

and of mankind as a whole.

This New Silk Road perspective is now becoming an entrenched

factor for a growing majority of the population on the planet.

Over 4 billion people are already encompassed by the policy.

This will likely take another billion people out of poverty over

the course of the next 20 years; and that would be at a slow

pace. If the United States immediately moves under these kinds of financial breakdown circumstances that are ongoing now; this system – as Mr. LaRouche said yesterday – the crash is on. It's coming; it's here. It's not something you have to argue; it's not something you have to look for indications. It's practically right in front of your face; that's partly why most people can't see it. There is that quality of shift, and under these kinds of circumstances, the question does come up. We are looking at, that what we know of mankind thus far is insufficient; we have to call upon the creative scientists and artists of our society and of the world to participate in a re-conceiving of mankind's new future. I think this is really the endeavor; if you look at individuals like Brunelleschi or Cusa.

We had a discussion with Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche a few weeks ago. This question of, it almost seems as if it comes out of the blue; a new quality of human identity emerges. Something that no one had ever even conceived of before, and yet once it's introduced and takes hold, it seems as if it's the most natural characteristic. Yet, it's a fundamental leap. The characteristic of mankind since the Italian Renaissance, the level of population growth, the potential density of mankind on this planet and in the universe fundamentally changed; it's an undeniable empirical fact that that had happened. Yet, the cause of it was the unleashing of mankind's new creative potential. I think

that's

the responsibility that we have as a nation and as a species for

the future of mankind; to unfold that characteristic of mankind.

I think what Ben raised on the galaxy ultimately captures it; because as the Solar System did for Kepler, the galaxy today presents that next unfolding of the universe in its discovery for

us. We are at a new era of mankind; and we must move so rapidly

to consolidate that potential, because it's something that requires constant creative input and discovery. It will never rest on its own. It will require from this day forward, a higher

quality of creative thought than mankind has thus far been capable of generating.

I think as we probably all agree, Mr. LaRouche has been the

key figure in initiating this potential and this possibility. But it's something that really lies upon all of us to continue and to advance. So, I'll leave my comments there; perhaps there

are some other thoughts.

OGDEN: One of the things that Jason mentioned, the role

that music played as an integral part of Einstein's identity, is

something that can't be overestimated. I think it's often very

underestimated, even though it's a well-known fact among some circles. I think the other thing that cannot be underestimated

is the role that the music program that's been initiated by Mr.

LaRouche and others who are on this discussion here today, has

played in changing the United States. One thing that's very clear, is that nobody really expected this great victory that occurred this week to happen; it kind of came out of the blue. I

don't think that the Obama White House really expected that Congress was going to grow a spine and stand up to him and deliver this kind of rebuke. I don't think the Saudis were expecting that they were going to have to pull out \$5 million and

all the stops and try to intimidate Congress at the very last minute. Where did it come from? I think it's an ingredient that

people might not understand when they have their heads in the practical world of politics. And it's very much what happened two weeks ago up in New York City. A series of concerts of the

Mozart {Requiem} and four African-American spirituals that were

performed by the Schiller Institute chorus; and performed in memory of the victims of 9/11, but also for the cause of justice.

To remoralize those people who, for the last 15 years, have been

so beaten down by the Bush-Obama paradigm; to remoralize them and

to create that surge of optimism for victory that was required to

secure what happened this week. We know that Terry Strada herself was involved in and was personally present at one of those concerts, and gave a very impassioned speech beforehand on

the necessity for securing all-out victory on the fight for JASTA

against Obama. But we were told by some of the members of the 9/11 Families this week, that the sound of those concerts was still ringing in their ears; and I think that is something that

has had an effect in New York City and a radiating effect across the entirety of the United States. Which is compounded by the victory that occurred this week, but it's inseparable; those two elements. I know, Diane, tonight in New York, John Sigerson – who was the conductor of that series of concerts – is going to be giving a presentation on the scientific rigor, the scientific principles underlying truthful musical performance with the unique Verdi tuning that those performances were presented at. I think this is going to be a sort of continual echo back and forth; the political victories and the musical accomplishments that have occurred and will continue to occur, emanating out of the Manhattan Project.

SARE: I think a part of the power of the music is like making a scientific discovery. When you participate in something which is actually beautiful in the most scientific sense of beauty, you are reminded of your identity as a human being. When we remind ourselves of that principle of what it actually means to be human, there are certain forms of injustice which simply are not tolerable. Things that would make us scared on a lower level if you think of yourself as an animal, or you think of your life's value being dependent on how much money you earn, or what your status is in society, or what kind of clothing you can wear; then you have a lot to be fearful about. But, if you are

reminded that what makes us human, what is actually lasting is a quality which is invisible; which is both in the domain of science as Einstein understood it, and in classical composition; then these other things seem trivial, and there are higher principles which become far more important. I think that's why music was such an integral part of the civil rights movement, for example; where people had extraordinary courage in the face of extreme violence and torture. Music, explicitly Beethoven, was crucial in the freedom movements of 1989 when the Berlin Wall came down. I think it is going to be crucial today for the United States to come into embodying what our nation was actually intended to be by the Founding Fathers. Because we are, after all, a revolutionary republic. You might not think that if you look at the last two administrations, but the intent of our republic actually was completely revolutionary; the idea of a nation which is not based particularly on a land area or a religion or some other construct, but on the idea of human creativity as being the generator of so-called wealth. So, I think that's true. Tonight we'll see what occurs, but John is very creative; and I think it's very useful that we're going to develop this process of our musical collaborators not only appreciating the work that we've done, but beginning to get insights as to why a group of political organizers would be able to pull off what is seen by many as a very high quality and unique quality of performance; which has to do with this kind of approach to the music, as opposed to the typical, lower level technical or whatever idea. So, I think this will be quite

interesting, and will further advance the work.

OGDEN: Well, I think that embodies and typifies exactly what the question that's been opened up today is. I know some of the work that Ben was presenting was to be a little bit more elaborated and something that you're working on writing, and I know will be explored further in some of these upcoming shows that we'll be doing on this channel. So, this is meant to open up a lot of questions, and to engage your mind in this process; not to have the answers to all the questions, but to ask them. And make these kinds of breakthroughs in terms of the discoveries that are yet to occur. So, as Mr. LaRouche said, "The most important question facing mankind at this moment is: What are the existing potentials which must be developed if we are to give mankind a future?"

So, with that said, I think we can celebrate our victories, but we can anticipate even greater victories in the future. I would like to thank all of you for joining us here today. Thank you to Jason and Ben, and to both Michael and Diane. Please stay tuned to larouchepac.com; and good night.