

New Objectives On a Global Scale

Extracts from Lyndon LaRouche's [Aug. 8 Dialogue with the Manhattan Project](#).

Dennis Speed: My name is Dennis Speed, and on behalf of the LaRouche Political Action Committee, I want to welcome you to our ongoing dialogue of the Manhattan Project with Lyndon LaRouche. We're in the midst of a mobilization which particularly kicked in after August 6, the 70th anniversary of the bombing of Hiroshima, although Mr. LaRouche had called it much earlier. And in this mobilization, we've been making a very specific point: that Hillary Clinton needs to do something for humanity, and the United States, and that is, that we need her, and we need others, to take action to make sure that Barack Obama is as rapidly and efficiently removed from the power of the Presidency.

This is very important because we have been in this discussion, and this discussion has begun to progress. Mr. LaRouche will give an opening statement, and it will be followed by questions. I believe that people who've been here know, just come to the microphone and ask your question. So, Lyn, floor's open.

Lyndon LaRouche: Good to hear from you again, and we shall, without looking too much on me at this point, let's get the thing started. That we are presently faced with a crisis of the United States, and of many other parts of the world as well. We're threatened with a great rate of death, should it happen, if Obama continues to remain in the Presidency. Because his intention is to launch thermonuclear war on a global scale. That's his intention. He's already been moving in that direc-

tion, and therefore our question is: How do we get rid of *him*, in order to free the people of the United States from the great terror that Obama's present policy threatens to most of the human species as a whole?

So, this is the crucial issue and this is the thing to be kept in mind. This issue. Because that's the point. And what people will ask questions about here, will obviously be relevant, implicitly, to answering, implicitly, also, the questions which the citizens who step forward to raise a question, will help us to see more clearly.

Q: Good afternoon, Mr. LaRouche. How are you?

LaRouche: I'm not too bad for an old geezer. Go ahead.

Q: We're really glad to be here right now. My question is kind of an elementary one, and I just wanted to kind of get your ideas on this particular issue. We talk about the Guns of August. And for everyone

here, I'd like you to just give us an idea of what is actually meant by the "Guns of August," and how that title ties into what we're talking about on a large scale today?

It Depends on Us

LaRouche: You should remember, even if you didn't know it as such, what happened in the course of history, beginning with the last decade before the new century came into being, that is the Twentieth Century; and at that point, what was called the Guns of August, which meant that a series of steps of warfare, had been going along from 1890 to about the beginning of the next century. And what this represents was the march of

**Now we get a new chance,
to do what should have
been the case, in our
nation, in our economy.
This time, we have a
chance to bring it back.**

mankind from the beginning of the Twentieth Century, into what quickly became World War I.

And we're now faced with a challenge that a new world war, like so many other preceding world wars, is now come to depend on *us*. Because what Obama has done, President Obama has done, has brought the world up to a threat of thermonuclear war. Now, if that war, and that threat, were to be executed, there would probably be nobody left, no human beings alive on this planet. So, therefore, it's important that Obama be removed from the Presidency, in order to secure the human species.

We do not have to go to thermonuclear war. The world does not need thermonuclear war. Obama wants thermonuclear war. He's made it very clear. Our argument is: Obama should be removed from office *now*, in order to prevent him from launching thermonuclear war. And the danger of that launching is right now. It comes right in the person of Obama. Obama is on the edge of pushing over a process which would cause a thermonuclear war, worldwide.

What does that mean? That means that the conflict today is considered in terms of two points of reference: one is Obama, what his intention is. His intention is to launch thermonuclear war throughout most of the world. That's what the intention is. What's the alternative? Well, getting rid of Obama, and going back to the standards of the President of the United States, as we had experienced that, for example, with a great President, Kennedy, who, in his time, prevented the occasion of a killing thermonuclear war between Russia and the United States.

And so the time has come for two things: First, prevent this war that Obama is trying to bring on, and do it soon. Secondly, instead of having a thermonuclear war, we have to begin to organize cooperation among the major and other nations of the planet as a whole. We must go ahead, and understand what mankind is. Mankind is not an animal. No animal can invent the future. Only mankind, in the form of science, for example, can create the future. Mankind is a creature who lives on creating the future for mankind. And that's what we must achieve.

Wall Street Is Bankrupt

Q: I am R— from Bergen County, New Jersey, and this question is closer to the Glass-Steagall issue. Last week, in the *Wall Street Journal*, there is a gentleman by the name of Ken Griffin, who is a head of a hedge

Our argument is: Obama should be removed from office now, in order to prevent him from launching thermonuclear war. . . . What's the alternative? Well, . . . going back to the standards of the President of the United States, as we had experienced that, for example, with a great President, Kennedy, who, in his time, prevented the occasion of a killing thermonuclear war between Russia and the United States.



NASA
President John F. Kennedy addresses Rice University on his program to send a man to the Moon, on September 12, 1962.

fund called Citadel Investments, and he was being interviewed, and he came up with what I found to be very intriguing, interesting statement that I think is a summary of a certain attitude among the Wall Street entity. His statement was, in talking to the type of business hedge funds are engaged in: We don't manufacture cars, we manufacture money. [LaRouche laughs]

So, my question is—I mean, this struck me as a pinnacle of monetarism, as a way of life; it just sums it up very well. The belief in money alone as a source of value. Could you comment?

So anyway, my question is: Can you comment on more of the morality aspects of monetarism, and how it

Wall Street has to be cancelled. Every penny of Wall Street assets should be wiped off the books! And then, what we would do is create a Franklin Roosevelt-type of measure, a credit system to help in creating a program of employment, which will reconstruct the nation of the United States as a whole.



LaRouche PAC

LaRouche's Political Action Committee rallies at Federal Hall in Manhattan, March 19, 2015.

kind of poisons people's attitude; it has a very negative moral implication?

LaRouche: Put him back on the screen, now. I have more to say. I want to look at him, in order to address him.

OK, what you pose is very complicated—in some degree—question. And it needs a full explanation. These are very important things, because you've raised certain questions, which I do not agree with, but I think you will accept it quickly, when I identify these measures; and I think it important, before this audience, that they have a chance to understand exactly what I'm talking about, and what he's talking about at the same time. Because, I think we converge, in terms of our general intention. And I'm ready to take it on.

What Glass-Steagall Means

Now, look: There are many assumptions in what you say which are fair assumptions, but they're not necessarily accurate. Let me explain: The issue here is that Wall Street is totally bankrupt; it is *hopelessly bankrupt*; there's nothing that can save Wall Street.

The question is, since Wall Street is going to go

bankrupt anyway, put it in bankruptcy, but you have to have a step. Instead of having a monetarist conception of the U.S. economy, you have to have a human conception of what the economy is. That means that we want to have productive employment throughout our population, as a mode of existence, and that the government of the United States shall cancel everything except Glass-Steagall, and oppose anything that is not Glass-Steagall. And the United States government now has to create—after dumping these banking interests, which must be *cancelled, plain cancelled*. They are worthless, and therefore you cannot argue, that the people of the United States have to pay a bill for a worthless value, or less than worthless value.

So, therefore, that has to be done, which means that an extended application of Glass-Steagall, must replace *entirely* the Wall Street system. In other words, the Wall Street system must be put into the garbage pail. The

people who go bankrupt, all right, let them go bankrupt and let them stay bankrupt if they want to.

But we must take steps to provide the people of the United States with the means, monetary means, of reconstructing the ability of the people of the United States, to be able to be employed in ways which are reasonable for the service of the United States, as such. And we would assume that everything we would do, under those kinds of conditions would be consistent with a generous attitude toward the other nations of the planet.

But the United States has to be defended! Wall Street has to be cancelled. *Every penny* of Wall Street assets should be wiped off the books! And then, what we would do is create a Franklin Roosevelt-type of measure, a credit system to help in creating a program of employment, which will reconstruct the nation of the United States as a whole.

Cancel Wall Street

That is a simple way of dealing with this. That is the fact! That's what must be done. Anything that is not doing that, is absolutely wrong and is a threat to the ex-

istence, of the citizens of the United States.

Thank you very much for sticking on, on this thing, but I wanted this thing to be explained clearly.

Q: I had another question which is a slightly different topic. That when I talk to people, I don't talk to a huge number of Americans, but, when I do talk to them, it seems like sometimes that they're from outer space. I don't know where they're coming from, to be euphemistic, to be kind. My question is, do you think that Americans now, are more complacent that the Germans were in the 1930s? Can we call the U.S. in its current state, "fascism"?

LaRouche: No. It could be considered that, but I don't think we should be hanging around, waiting for that to happen! What we should do is simply cancel Wall Street. Cancel Wall Street! Because the United States must create a fund for productive purposes. We must rebuild our economy! The people of the United States are suffering greatly from the conditions of life today. We must take steps which would do mainly one thing, even from the beginning: We're not going to wait until success blossoms above us. We are going to make it clear, to the major part of the population as a whole, that we in the United States are committed to *cancel* the Wall Street system, and come up with a contrary system, which is the Franklin Roosevelt principle; same thing.

But we have a much more urgent problem than Franklin Roosevelt had to face, because the murderous characteristics are much more important today, than they ever were under Franklin Roosevelt.

However, once Franklin Roosevelt died—and I have a very special attachment to Franklin Roosevelt; but, when he died, what happened was that his death allowed scoundrels of various types to take over through the Truman Administration. And we never really recovered from that. We've gone generally sliding down, more poorly and more poorly ever, ever since President Roosevelt died.

And so, the point is, we have a big job: we have to take the same kind of program that President Franklin Roosevelt proposed, to create that kind of a credit system. And we have to get our people to work in forms of employment, which are suitable to the dignity of American labor, and the families of those people.

And that's my summation of my view on this thing.

This Race Thing Is Crazy

Q: Good afternoon. My name is Miss J—. The reason why I'm up here is because I want to know—I

have a couple of questions: Why is it that we blame President Barack Obama for the state that the U.S. is in, when he's not the only one to blame?

LaRouche: Because Obama is not a black person. That's got to be eliminated. I don't care what the color of his skin is, he's a bad person! And therefore he does nothing but evil. So therefore we don't need to make him a hero. He's not a hero. We've got plenty of people with perfectly black skins, who are much more preferable for doing this kind of job. And the time has come to break with it.

I mean, this race thing is crazy. There is no difference among the human race—*none!* There is no moral difference. Except that some people get kicked, and some people get less kicked. And the point is, yes, we have to clean this mess up. The South—you know, the third President of the United States was an evil man, and he created the slavery system in his tenure. And they continued to follow that bastard, through about three more Presidencies.

So yes, the United States has committed a permanent crime, against those who were called slaves, and those who were slaves in effect. And the racist character of this thing is the greatest abomination that the United States has ever suffered. And that has to be ended. We cannot have any discrimination in terms of race or anything like that! We cannot have it. Look, we've got a lot of yellow people, so-called—Chinese. The largest single unit of population on the entire planet, is yellow. And you want to go down through all the shadings of color of skin? *Skin color has nothing to do with human reality!* [applause]

Q: My next question is, how do you plan on getting the President out of office?

LaRouche: By impeaching him, throwing him out of office.

Q: Okay, I know that the impeachment process has been underway for over a year, so I don't know at what timeframe do you think—

LaRouche: We have to be more quick. [In 1967], we had a new law put on the books concerning the Presidency. And under the influence of that law, we threw a rotten President out of office, and we did it on a short notice. That law still exists. Obama is a suitable target for that law. Throw him out of office. Do it tomorrow morning, or the day after tomorrow. Do it soon. He's got to be thrown out of office, for the sake of the human species in general. Remember, what Obama represents,— Obama has built up a warfare policy, which

threatens the entire planet, the entire human population of the planet. We have to take him out of office. Now, the idea of shooting him is not a good idea; morally it's a bad idea. As a criminal, he should stay safe and alive in prison.

Congress Is Sleepwalking

And therefore, the point is, get this guy out of there. We don't need him, we don't want him; human beings don't want him. He's an animal, he's not really a human being. He's vicious, he's a vicious character! Look, how many people do you think he killed, offhand on his own right? There was no legality to that, there was no justice in that! He's a murderer! A public murderer. He murders all throughout the world; he organizes mass murder, throughout parts of the world in general. We don't *need* this guy!

The sooner we throw him out of office under the provision of the Constitution which now obtains, the better human beings' life will be.

Q: Good afternoon, Lyn; it's B— from New Jersey. In the last few weeks, I know there's been a major mobilization to break the sleepwalking going on particularly among Congress, in which we're trying to do that through interventions into the press, the news, the radios. I myself have been moving to get meetings with Congressional staff. In fact, I had a direct call from a congressman two days ago in answer to one of my requests, and arranged a meeting coming up the early part of this coming week.

But also, before Obama made this shift in Syria, I'd been writing to the newspapers, and I'd just like to give people a sense of potentially the way they can possibly intervene using Letters to the Editor. It goes:

“Hillary Clinton Must Come Clean on Benghazi Now”

“Former Secretary of State Clinton, and her chief of staff Cheryl Mills, faced with having to give sworn testimony before Congress in October, on events during, before, and after the Benghazi attack, should instead do so, publicly, now. The weight of existing public evidence and prepared under-oath questions shows she and other government officials were pressured by Obama to lie about that, then. Events now unfolding, require the truth. Although this will mean the end of her political aspirations, it could stop Obama, who, now unfettered by a recess Congress, is prepared to star a serial like ‘I Have Decided’ confrontation with Russia. Out-of-the-blue added sanctions, confirmation of his

new Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who has declared Russia our greatest threat, and added movement of naval and ground-based ABM and other conventional assets, right to the borders of Russia itself, have prompted the highest-level warnings from the Russia government, diplomatic and military officials.

“This exact type of confluence of events is exactly why, after President Eisenhower's warning of a military-industrial complex, Kennedy had his staff reading *The Guns of August*.

“Clinton's considerations must now rise above all others, to effect a change, whose implication by exposing Obama, could sway events with national and global outcomes. Russia Duma Chairman Sergei Naryshkin gave a lengthy interview on July 30th in which he warned that a Third World War would be mankind's end.” [as read]

And I think that everyone in this listening audience, and whoever we can get to, should be making that point clear to the Congress.

LaRouche: That's exactly my point. I agree with you totally on the whole thing.

Follow Roosevelt's Policy

Q: Good afternoon, nice to see you. I'm R— from Brooklyn. I was on two rallies this week and I noticed that the educational system has so indoctrinated people, that when we say Obama is starting World War III or beginning World War III, people have no frame of reference, to comprehend what we are trying say. And would you suggest a tactic we could break down this indoctrination?

LaRouche: Well, that's what I'm occupied with chiefly right now. I'm concerned essentially of course with the immediacy of the threat of thermonuclear war, which is embodied in the intention of Obama. That's the first issue.

The second issue of leadership, is what are we going to do, in order to shut down Wall Street? Because Wall Street is totally bankrupt; it's hopelessly bankrupt. I can never be reconstructed. There's no value in it any more. And the problem is, what we have to do, is we have cancel the worthless assets of Wall Street: Just shut it down. Forget it, it's a lost cause.

What we have to do instead, is follow Franklin Roosevelt's policy, during the 1930s. What we have to do is create a provision for circulation of legitimate, Federal government sources of wealth, that is economy, and we must do this with the idea, that for all the major parts of

the U.S. population which are virtually ruined, and in a hopeless situation, we have to create a fund of the type Franklin Roosevelt used for the 1930s. We have to use that fund and allocate it, in order to create the kinds of welfare benefits, and health care, and productivity which Franklin Roosevelt did during his terms of office as President. That model, which has been tested already, is the sufficient law to do the job that has to be done in developing the strength of our economy, developing the benefits of our people, and that's all it takes.

Bring back Franklin Roosevelt's approach to crisis by that method, the same method he used, but we have to apply it in more modern terms, and we have to rehabilitate citizens who are almost without hope. Increasingly, under Obama, the rate of acceleration of loss of wealth, of loss of the chance of life itself, has destroyed things so badly, that only a desperate measure, will work, like throwing him out of office and putting through a Franklin Delano Roosevelt-type of recovery program, using the power to create the currency, in order to provide the means for health and for employment-improvement among our citizens, and giving us a modern economy as well. That is what we must do as a minimal standard for this occasion right now. It can be done. There's no difficulty, there's no excuse, which will justify not doing it.

Mankind Is Not an Animal

Q: Hi, my name is A—. You sort of answered my question, it's more so on the economy, but maybe you can say a little bit more on, being a physical economist yourself, you know, today, most of the world is moving towards—at least away from a monetarist, mathematical economy, and there's a real transformation going on in most of the planet, you know, with this BRICS global phenomenon going on. And it's through this transformation that people, even in the transformation in their minds, like what a real economy actually is and what it involves. And it seems like your idea of physical economy sort of touches upon every aspect of human life. You can say more on that.

But just on the BRICS and what happened in Egypt recently, I think that's a transformation going on, that

What we have to do instead, is follow Franklin Roosevelt's policy, during the 1930s. What we have to do is create a provision for circulation of legitimate, Federal government sources of wealth, that is economy, and we must do this with the idea, that for all the major parts of the U.S. population which are virtually ruined, and in a hopeless situation, we have to create a fund of the type Franklin Roosevelt used for the 1930s.



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

A street scene in the U.S. Capital, December 2010.

the BRICS has actually materialized; it's a real physical impact taking place, on the planet right now. And it's just changing—it sort of embodies your idea of physical economics. Maybe you can say more on that?

LaRouche: Yeah, well, that's the point. What we have to understand about the nature of mankind, is a way of addressing what you have said, just now. The point is that mankind is not an animal: First fact. Mankind is not an animal. Mankind cannot be identified by any name of animal. Why? Because the human being, in its normal state, mankind, is always going to higher levels of discovery, in space, in everything else. And mankind's creative powers are unique to mankind; it's expressed often as scientific advances, but there are other things as well. And the progress of mankind, the development of progress, the development of the spirit, of the mind, of the skills of mankind, that's the issue.

Because, what's the meaning of all this? Mankind dies, people die. Is that the end of the meaning of their life? It should not be; for me it is not. Because what happens is, the normal course of life of mankind, is dif-

So therefore, all of this is available to us. It's available to us, through the realization of what we call scientific discovery; scientific principles which carry man to a power over nature, which is beyond anything mankind had experienced previously. And the proper motive of mankind is that mankind must say to their children, "You," the children, "will be empowered to discover principles of nature and a power of nature which earlier generations were not capable of achieving."



NASA

Astronaut David A. Wolf on a space walk off the International Space Station, October 2002.

ferent generations, successive generations of people acquire superior qualities of productivity at a higher level of productivity, at a higher level of skill, mastery of new skills that mankind had not known before. So mankind's role is, yes, we're all going to die in due course, or maybe a little earlier than due course in many times. But the point is, mankind is a creature of the future. No animal is a creature of the future, only mankind, and the purpose is that mankind must become better, and stronger, and richer in terms of effect with successive generations.

An Immortal Species

The greatest period of renaissances in human history, have been periods of great originality in achieving new skills, new principles of knowledge. And that's what makes mankind. So the devotion has to be of the development of mankind, to rise to higher degrees of power, to discoveries of scientific powers which mankind has known before, and to bring those forces to bear; because now, mankind is not just on Earth, you know; with Kepler's arrival we already had the Solar System. Kepler exposed the Solar System's existence to us. And now we're in a higher system, which is called the Galactic System, and most of the water in the system that our life depends upon, is based on the Galaxy, not on the Earth's water system. Earth's water system is a minor part of the whole water system of the Galactic System.

So therefore, all of this is available to us. It's available to us, through the realization of what we call scientific discovery; scientific principles which carry man to a power over nature, which is beyond anything mankind had experienced previously. And the proper motive of mankind is that mankind must say to their children, "You," the children, "will be empowered to discover principles of nature and a power of nature which earlier generations were not capable of achieving."

And that's the attitude on which we have to operate. That's the conception of *man*, *mankind*. And thus mankind is an immortal species in this respect. Mankind may die, but when mankind is productive, mankind before dying, contributes something, with

which the next coming generations will achieve a higher rate of development of the human species than the previous ones. And the fact is that people used to think that way. They'd say, "What is life all about?" The immigrants used to talk about that. People who came as immigrants into the United States. And they would think about, "Things are tough for us right now. We're immigrants. We don't have the access, we don't have the right accents and so forth, therefore we have to accept a poorer position than most of the native Americans of that time."

Moral Principle of Mankind

But the point of the purpose was, well so what? You have a family, your family is integrated into the United States by immigration in many cases, and therefore you have a right to partake, through your children, a right to get the kind of education, the knowledge, the opportunities which earlier populations had achieved inside the United States. And in turn we have to give them to all the people of the United States together, both immigrants, and those who have been, shall we say, regular citizens.

We have to make each generation of humanity more meaningful than what the earlier generation had been capable of doing. And it's that concept of progress, which is not just physical progress; it's the progress of the human mind, and the human mind's ability to make discoveries which mankind of the earlier times, had not been able to do.

So what you get is a principle of triumph. Mankind is a constant principle of triumph. Mankind must always reach to higher levels of achievement, for the future of mankind, at each turn. And that is the moral principle on which we should base all our assumptions, all our doctrines. That mankind is the perfect case, the perfect growth which can do everything that no animal could ever have achieved.

Q: Good afternoon Mr. LaRouche. My name is A—. Obama is crazy and creating situations that could easily become a thermonuclear war, either by intent or by accident. Since his actions are insane, doesn't he qualify for removal as of the Twenty-Fifth Amendment, or indictment under the Nuremberg World Court? Could the United Nations bring Obama up on charges before the war becomes nuclear?

LaRouche: Yeah. Well the purpose of this thing is obvious, that's the nature, of which we in the United States should have adopted. I don't think we always did adopt it.

But the recognition that we are all going to die; everybody dies eventually. The question is, what is the outcome of the life of the person who dies? And the person who creates a generation, builds up a generation, to a higher level than they themselves had achieved, is the great heroic statement.

Twenty-Fifth Amendment

What is the definition of human immortality? It's the realization of creativity on behalf of mankind's mission, which always leads to a higher and better form of

expression, of human achievement than before. This was true in the characteristic of the Renaissance, for example the medieval Renaissance, so called, was the same thing. The idea of the permanent Renaissance, that mankind should always rise to a higher level of achievement, moral achievement, practical achievement, than the generation before, as an average of the situation.

Mankind thus progresses, as no animal can progress. No animal can choose a superiority over man, because mankind is the highest level. And therefore the population of a nation must *progress*, in the service of the Almighty, in the end.

Q: Can Obama be brought up on charges, before it becomes nuclear?

Speed: Lyn, he's asking whether Obama can be brought up on charges by the 25th Amendment [cross-talk]

LaRouche: Yes he can, in the period of the 1960s and '70s there was—a bill was put through which dumped a President out of office in midterm. And right now, and any time you want to, there is a statutory provision, under the Constitution of the United States presently, that any President, such as, for example, Obama, who's no damn good, shall we say, and therefore can be dumped out of office suddenly, by the proper means of our Constitution. And that should happen.

Q: Hi Lyn, this is A—. I wanted to, in the context of the Manhattan Project as it were, talk about music insofar as, early on in the process as I am, and being a part of the chorus, and even my participation has been somewhat limited, the idea is finally starting to register in my mind; because of the challenges that the work requires, the fears, one has to either decide to run away from it and not come back, or return and work through the tensions that are there. And I mean it's all very friendly, but those things exist. And I find it very challenging, but I'm beginning to get the understanding that if you can work through this with a group of people, and develop yourself, then the question of confronting your fellow citizen on the threat of thermonuclear war becomes less fearful. [LaRouche laughs.] You're facing your own fears.

A Miracle Event

So it's early on, but it never really made sense, I just went to sing; but the thing is starting to come together. And then the idea of doing what we need to do, which seemed impossible, begins to seem more possible to me now. So I just wanted to share that and get something

The point is that the importance of music is a moral one, in a very special kind of way. It's a moral force which leads to improvements in all the qualities of the human individual. And when they're deprived of that, it's like bad education, bad schooling, which destroys the morality and destroys the rights, of the citizen,—the child and the citizen in general,—and therefore there's a kind of a sacred implication of the sort of magic which is expressed by Classical artistic composition as such.



Facebook page of Lynn Yen

A chorus rehearsal in Brooklyn, New York, in September 2012, sponsored by Lynn Yen's Foundation for the Revival of Classical Culture.

back from you on that.

LaRouche: Okay, well the point is, is that the composition of progress, and composition of musical composition, Classical musical composition is a miracle event, in the sense of ordinary opinion. Because creativity, true creativity in music, for example, depends upon a development of the idea of music, which is always perfect. That as it goes ahead, the general history, the course of history from Bach, on to the present time, there has always been a current of progress up until the beginning of the Twentieth Century.

At that point we had a general degeneration in the quality, intellectual quality and moral quality of music. That is the form of music that in the later generation, as of the Twentieth Century, what was generally provoked prominently, was a degenerating process in terms of music.

Now the significance of that for music is, that the

effect is, that bad music, that is poor music, that is, music that is not fit for mankind, shall we say, has created a degeneration of everything in terms of the moral aspects of human life over the course of the Twentieth Century and beyond. It became more and more acute, particularly after Franklin Roosevelt died. But then, there were heroes who stood up again, like Eisenhower, for example, stood up as one of those heroes, and they represented a defense of the principles of United States where certain Presidents of the United States had failed, brutally.

The point is that the importance of music is a moral one, in a very special kind of way. It's a moral force which leads to improvements in all the qualities of the human individual. And when they're deprived of that, it's like bad education, bad schooling, which destroys the morality and destroys the rights, of the citizen,—the child and the citizen in general,—and therefore there's a kind of a sacred implication of the sort of magic which is expressed by Classical artistic composition as such. And this, as through Brahms, for example, and through Furtwängler, for example, who are leading examples of this thing, that approach to music is not a mechanical one, is not a practical one. It's a moral principle, that mankind's

ability to think in terms of what we call music, rises and lifts mankind upward; whereas bad music, or junk music destroys the creative powers and moral powers of the population. So there needs to be a moral drive which compels people to find a greater virtue in their life than before.

Jesu, Meine Freude

Q: Hi Lyn, this is D—. I was reflecting on the development of our force here in Manhattan, as the germ of the national Center of this organization, and at this moment in our community chorus in New York City, and also in our New Jersey chorus, we're working on *Jesu, meine Freude* by Bach. And my question to you is, I know that before I became a member of this organization, the youth movement that you created did a lot of work on this piece. And so in a sense, I think it's very fitting that as this chorus comes together right now, this

is what we're working on. And my question is, what is the significance of *Jesu, meine Freude*?

LaRouche: It's obviously topical. But what it represents is a principle, in which people can affirm a relationship with the process of life and death combined. In other words, what is the meaning of *Jesu, meine Freude*? It represents the fact that mankind is living in a struggle, a struggle of life, and mankind has to find a standard of behavior, self-imposed behavior, which is in accord with what they believe to be the right means of bringing about progress into the future of mankind.

I mean, everything that is serious about religious belief, Christian religious belief in particular, is all based on that principle: The presumption is, everybody dies sooner or later. *But!* Some people actually advance, despite death, to a higher level of achievement, than they had represented even in their own lives. And that's the meaning, of *Jesu, meine Freude*.

Hillary Is a Failure

Q: Hi, my name is C— and thank you for having me. This is my first time here, and I find it very interesting. I love politics. My question is, if Hillary doesn't move forward, and I feel that she may not, if she's really concerned about being President; but if she doesn't, what can we do at the local level? I'm in local politics, and I'd like to know, what can we do at this level?

LaRouche: Well, I think what's going to happen, is, as of now, and what I can give you is only a qualified guess as to what the outcome would be. Hillary is a failure. She blew it, shall we say, in various ways, by keeping her mouth shut in one case, which really sunk her; and then she killed herself more by the things she did say, after the mess she made of not saying.

So she's finished, implicitly finished. And that's regrettable, because she at one point was a fairly, more than reasonable person. But she had a certain weakness, which is a, shall we say, a political problem.

But anyway, that's the nature of the problem, and there is a solution immediately, and the solution is, she should withdraw from office because she's going to be sinking deeper and deeper at an accelerating rate, in the competition for campaigns now. She's finished. But she can have a decent way out by admitting that she had lied, under pressure from the President, in what happened in North Africa; and that's clear, she committed a crime. She lied, under pressure of the President; well, the criminal is actually the President, Obama. He's the

criminal. So he should be put out of office, and we should have Hillary going into a different career, because she's not going to become President.

But then, we have to take this case and not leave it there, and say what is the standard? What is the standard of behavior which is required, by the citizen, when we enter into the idea of election campaigns? And there are certain standards which are implicit; they don't have to be detailed, they're implicit. And when they make the wrong move, as she has done, then she's going to take a back seat. But I'd be happy to see her still living, and I'm not sure that Obama will not kill her, because I know him.

Q: I agree with you. Any thoughts on the 2016 Presidential race right now?

LaRouche: Well, I can't draw a conclusion. I can draw a very good estimate. We have a couple of people who are, right now, already credible appellants for the Presidency, as opposed to things that I know aren't fit to run for the Presidency.

2016 Elections

But see, when I talk about President, I don't think about President, I think about the Presidential *system*. Because contrary to myth, it is not the President that defines the character of the administration; it's the combination of people, who are the combined forces of the Presidency as such, and if that combination of the right Presidency comes into place, then you will get a corresponding benefit in the next round of elections.

And that I think is the rough guess of what the best possibilities are. I think we have—O'Malley has obvious potential; some others have some significant potential. And I just think we're going to have to live it out: If you want to choose a good Presidential candidate, you better get in there and work with them. You have to make it a good Presidential system.

Q: I agree. Thank you so much.

Q: Hi how are you. My name is J—; I'm from China. My question is, how can you forecast the relationship between China and the U.S.A. in terms of politics, economic culture, and education?

LaRouche: Well, you just touched upon a very important issue, which is beyond the actual question that you're posing. Because what's happening, is, China of course is undergoing a great step of progress, under the present administration of China. This is good, very good. There are problems in China which are nuisance values, where you have a big speculative thing of some

When I talk about President, I don't think about President, I think about the Presidential system. Because contrary to myth, it is not the President that defines the character of the administration; it's the combination of people, who are the combined forces of the Presidency as such, and if that combination of the right Presidency comes into place, then you will get a corresponding benefit in the next round of elections.



creative commons/Ralph Alswang

Both Bernie Sanders (left) and Martin O'Malley (right) are stressing the need to return to Glass-Steagall in their campaigns for the Democratic Party nomination.

groups of people, who are placing in financial speculation.

But the China system is a very good system as it stands now; it's been a great improvement over what the deep potential of China has been for a very long period of time. And China has a great history, one of the greatest histories of any living nation. And they've gone through various ups and downs, and fights and quarrels, in certain factions inside among the Chinese population, or different parts of it.

The Chinese System

But in general, the present administration of China is a miracle of the century. It now is bringing India back to life; it hasn't been fully brought back to life, but it's going back to life. Take the whole region, like the new thing that just happened Egypt, the canal in Egypt. The canal in Egypt, has opened up the world so that you no longer have an Atlantic nation as opposed to an Asian nation. Everything's going to change suddenly as a result of what happened by the Egyptian change right now; everything's going to change—beautifully. Parts of things in the southern parts of the planet, different

parts of the planet, are going to improve as a result of this thing, given a chance.

So this is a great moment, and most of the problems we face are not really net disasters; they are challenges. And it's up to the people who have the opportunity to seek that kind of success, it's up to them to demonstrate their ability to seize upon the options that are presented to them; and the current China administration,—it's very well qualified in this respect, the achievements are very great.

We would wish that, for example, other parts of Asia would go the same way, for example, look at Japan. Japan, you know, coming out after the defeat of Japan in World War II, the unfortunate thing was that the President of the United States committed great crimes against the people of Japan, by dumping bombs, U.S. bombs, on two major cities of Japan.

And the population of Japan, at that point was very peaceable; they decided they wanted there to be an end to the war that they'd gone through.

And during that period, my experience with Japan, was a very progressive process, and less so today. I think Japan has gone back a few steps in history. But at that time, Japan was, after coming out of a war, suffering the effect of a war, and of the President of the United States committing mass murder against people of Japan.

And that made everything worse in the area of Asia. I mean, the fact that the President of the United States dropped nuclear bombs on two cities of Japan, has left a mark which is still hitting Asia today, that example, that kind of situation.

So the point is, that we are in a period where I am optimistic about the future of China and therefore, there are problems, but these are problems which belong to China, not to outside busybodies. China is doing very well right now, and we should wish more nations had the same kind of success that China's had recently.

Q: How can you foresee the future of China? Like, the social system, will it change to a capitalist country, or do you see them as a communist country? Or...

The Future of China

LaRouche: The class division among Chinese populations and culture—and that has been an off-and-on problem for a long time in China. I think the problem has been essentially been conquered as of now. I think that China is essentially in a very stable way, with some problems—but every nation has some problems. I think those problems can be solved.

And the cooperation of China with India, which is not always agreeable—I mean some of the people in India don't like China; they're jealous. But that's all right, it'll work out well.

And what's happened with the new canal by Egypt, has now changed the whole planet. There are no longer several oceans: There's now one ocean. And the Atlantic ocean and the Pacific Ocean are all opened up to the same thing. So we're coming to a new period, we're coming to where the nation-state is not as important as it used to be. The culture of a people is very important, because without the familiarity of their culture, they cannot really function perfectly. So therefore, while you have still, a distinction in language use and things like that, and cultural uses, in various parts of the world, in general, the entire planet should be becoming one nation. Not immediately, but in a process: Because mankind, is mankind. There is no difference between mankind and mankind!

But the question is how to make the practical expression of that unity be realized, as with the “win-win” concept in China, is an example of *exactly* that issue. And so, China plays a very leading role, in presenting that kind of influence throughout the Asian and other areas of the planet.

So this is good stuff, shall we say.

Q: Thank you very much.

What Roosevelt Did

Q: Yes, Mr. LaRouche, good to see you and I hope you live a long life, here. My question here, is, within the Federal government, there are, within my knowl-

But the question is how to make the practical expression of that unity be realized, as with the “win-win” concept in China, is an example of exactly that issue. And so, China plays a very leading role, in presenting that kind of influence throughout the Asian and other areas of the planet.



Press Information Bureau of India
Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi, and visiting Chinese President Xi Jinping, review plans for development in Gujarat, India in September 2014.

edge from the website reading, meaning that there are a few of them who are for Glass-Steagall. Now, I want to know, that being that this is an economy of money, what are they doing to fortify the Glass-Steagall Act, knowing that this is necessary because of the situation of the economy? And then, the second question is, the national bankers: Where are all these so-called national bankers? Are they afraid to step up to the plate to promote Glass-Steagall? What can we do to protect their interests? And then, the third question here is, being that the monarchy is a vicious group of people, and they do play psychological warfares; and they have families—they show this on the TV in the media, the birth of their new kids and the new monarchy coming in; would they be anarchistic to kill themselves and actually go for [world war], or is this all one big bluff? One big bluff to set—to make it appear that there's going to be a big war, so that the land-bridge and the Glass-Steagall issue will break down under pressure?

LaRouche: First of all, there is no chance that Wall Street is going to survive; there is no chance. Wall Street is hopelessly bankrupt! It's super-bankrupt! That it has no possible recovery options. The problem therefore, is

So therefore, the question is, what are we doing to steer the new direction that we think is necessary for mankind on a global scale? And therefore, we just take: OK, Franklin Roosevelt was right: We have to do the same kind of thing that he was trying to do with it, while he was still living, in order to develop the economy of the United States, with great degrees of progress.



President Franklin Roosevelt during his January 1943 visit to Morocco, where he discussed greening the deserts with Moroccan Sultan Mohammed V, seated to FDR's right.

since Wall Street is absolutely worthless, worse than worthless, it's a trash bin, and the stink from the trash bin is getting worse all the time. So therefore, what you have to do, you *cancel* Wall Street! The United States government cancels Wall Street, because it's in disorderly bankruptcy! It cannot be revived.

Now, what do we do? We go back to Franklin Roosevelt, we take the kind of disaster which occurred in the 1920s, we look at that, the Hoover thing. So Hoover sucks, but we don't use it otherwise except for vacuum cleaning.

So therefore, what Roosevelt did, was made a reform which was the foundation under Glass-Steagall, which enabled the United States to become a victorious nation, actually, in the course of World War II. We did it that way, why? Because Roosevelt made it possible, and organized it. We had general officers in charge of our command during my time in the military service, and they were heroes. They created geniuses in effect. And we went through a terrible war; many of

our people were killed. But that is what is true, that's what's good. We don't like to have those wars, we would like to get rid of those kinds of wars. But we think one of the best ways to do that, is to remove the British Empire, for example, and some other nuisances on the public account.

The Idea of Nations

And that we could bring nations together, because we're ready. You know, the old idea of the nation-state, is different than it was before. We used to have nations, "this nation is sacred, this nation is sacred," and so forth; well, it's not true any more. Because nations are more and more tending to mix in close cooperation with each other. Yet nations can still continue to function as they exist, but the closeness of cooperation among nations will be increased. And eventually, what we call "national systems," will probably disappear.

So therefore, the question is, what are we doing to steer the new direction that we think is necessary for mankind on a global scale? And therefore, we just take: OK, Franklin Roosevelt was right:

We have to do the same kind of thing that he was trying to do with it, while he was still living, in order to develop, the economy of the United States, with great degrees of progress.

We went in the wrong direction, when the new President came into place.

And therefore right now, we have to say, no, we're not going to be chauvinistic nations; we're going to be nations which work together. We're going to be sovereign, but we're going to work together, we're going to cooperate, we're going to solve problems commonly. And over the course of a century, we should be able to get the effect of a unified humanity on the planet. And we will not be limited to the planet. We will be going into space, as well.

Q: Thank you very much.

LaRouche: [Closing statement] Well, it's obvious that we're at precisely that point. What we have is an abused population of the labor force in the United States in general. The economy stinks. It's totally immoral the

way it functions right now. The banking system is immoral and incompetent beyond belief. All we have to do, is make one single kind of law, based on the principle which is expressed by the Glass-Steagall law: Restore the Glass-Steagall law and understand what the power of the Glass-Steagall law can mean, not just what it *did* mean, but what it *can* mean if we know how to use it properly.

Our Objective

And the point is, what our objective is, is to get our citizens, first of all our children, our young children, our dependents; most of them are totally ignorant, of the *most essential facts of life*, that earlier generations like my own had already known as achievements. Most people in the United States today, have neither the experience or the opportunity of experience, nor an understanding of the principle, nor the skills involved, in order to make progress per capita throughout our society.

We are losing everything in terms of investment; all the skills that we had accumulated by a certain point are now *disappearing*, they're rotting away! And so therefore, what we have to do is recognize this fact, and by

supporting our people, *like a new Glass-Steagall law*, which wipes off *all* Wall Street investments in one stroke: *There's no value in that thing! Shut it down!*

We then turn around, in Franklin Roosevelt's neat trick, and he comes in with a system of creating money, to be used by the citizens and by producers, in order to make mankind in the United States, once again successful, and more successful than ever before. Now, he died unfortunately, and after he died, everything began to go rotten; the FBI took over and things like that. Corruption was tremendous.

But now the time has come for vengeance: The vengeance is simply achieving what we had been cheated of being able to do, earlier. Now we get a new chance, to do what should have been the case, in our nation, in our economy. This time, we have a chance to bring it back. [applause]

Speed: Well, that will not actually conclude our session of today, since everybody is going to be so agitated by what they've just heard, that I'm sure this is going to go on and on in their minds for many hours. But Lyn, I want to thank you for being with us, and we'll see you again next week.

LaRouche: OK! Have fun!

REVIVE GLASS-STEAGALL NOW!



"The point is, we need Glass-Steagall immediately. We need it because that's our only insurance to save the nation... Get Glass-Steagall in, and we can work our way to solve the other things that need to be cleaned up. If we don't get Glass-Steagall in first, we're in a mess!"

—Lyndon LaRouche, Feb. 11, 2013



LaRouchePAC is now leading a nationwide effort to push through legislation for Glass-Steagall (www.larouchepac.com).

WATCH the [LaRouchePAC](#) video:

'Glass-Steagall: Signing a Revolution'

SUBSCRIBE to EIR Online
www.larouchepub.com/eiw

toll-free: **1-800-278-3135** e-mail: fulfullment@larouchepub.com