

Creating the Harmony of Nations

Here are edited excerpts of Lyndon LaRouche's Dialogue with the Manhattan Project on Sept 19, 2015.

Dennis Speed: On behalf of the LaRouche Political Action Committee, I want to welcome everybody here today. My name is Dennis Speed. We're going to go into our dialogue with Lyndon LaRouche immediately.

As people know, we've now begun the extraordinary session of the United Nations, and Mr. LaRouche has said several things about that session, and about what its implications can be. I want one thing to be clear: Certainly what we want done with respect to that session, is that Barack Obama, the erstwhile President of the United States, be removed through the actions that we intend to take, including as they impact that session, and as that session impacts the United States.

So, Lyn, I want to first invite you, if you want, to give us some opening remarks, and if not, we'll go right to questions, if you would prefer that.

Lyndon LaRouche: *Well, we are now, as you know, on the verge of the participation in Manhattan, and elsewhere, of a very important event, an event which may determine the judgments made to bring about a safe reconstruction of the relations of the planets, and together with those on Earth. And I think that in the course of time, that statement from me will stand up.*

So, why don't we just take it that way, and let's see what the result is in the minds of our people here, gathered today.

Speed: Okay, I like that!

Q: Hi, Lyn. It's A—from New York. I'd like your help regarding,—in this upcoming week now that we're going to rally and intervene in the UN,—this has,

as you talked about or referenced, worldwide historical effects, and I'd like for you to help describe that a little bit. But more specifically, I'm working through your paper on global warming and population control, and in the process of looking to work through this with others, be it through phone calls, or discussions. So I'd like your help on that, because Obama is a focus, a center point, of this operation that we need to snap, and so with that in mind, give us a hand here.

LaRouche: Well, I would say that everything about Obama is dissonant, and therefore it has no real human resonance. This is true in terms of the way he speaks, if you listen to him. Listen to him when he makes speeches. You say, this man is a dissonant character.



One of the panels which decorated the singers' gallery in the great Florence cathedral, one of the jewels of the Italian Renaissance.

When he says things, or when he starts to make proposals, the same effect comes in. And the question is, why are Americans so stupid that they don't recognize this guy's a bum?

Resonance in Leaders

That's a fact. Because if you think about what the role of leaders in society have been, for example in the United States, or in some cases of some Europeans, you find that the leading figure,—as speaking to the population around,—that these figures have a certain resonance, which attracts the audience very much as like what just happened here. The idea of “tuning in” on coherence.

So the easiest thing to do, is if somebody is really twisting everything around, and you don't like it,—not because you have some prejudice, but because it doesn't fit your idea of what a human being should say, in order to propose a policy question to an audience,—and therefore I think the best experience is exactly that. That when people are able to convey concepts which resonate within the mind of an audience, you have to pay attention to that. And when it doesn't resonate, you have to say, “uh-oh, we've got a problem.”

Maybe it's something that can be corrected, but the likelihood is that there's something wrong with the works, if you can't get that kind of resonance.

Q: Hello. I'm from Turkey, and I'm a student. I am learning English. If you can't understand me, you can tell me. It's okay? My name is S—.

I have a question, one question. We have so many problems. One of them is ISIS. Second one, economic problems: What are the economic problems in Turkey? So many factors turn up, so many factors to try to correct now. And also young people cannot find jobs in Turkey. Other problems: our government killed 200 Kurdish people in the last four months, and also some fascist Turkish people are killing Kurdish people, too. And governments have suffered [allowed] them. Also, Kurdish people killed so many soldiers, and these soldiers' ages are like 21, 22 years old.

What is the question? I need peace in Turkey. Also in the Middle East. Some countries tried communism in Europe. It didn't work. And also, capitalism, it doesn't work for us. I need new systems, new economic systems for my country, meaning Arab countries also.

The question: What new economic system is available for me? Also, what is the way? Got it?

So, we are now at a point of a very evil condition of mankind. However, there are certain movements which are coming into shape, which can bring about a kind of harmony among different parts of human culture, and that I think is what the objective has to be. Because each part of society does have its own characteristics. But the characteristics we're looking for are those which are harmonious, harmonious for that population.

Harmony in Culture

LaRouche: Okay, you've got quite a list of things implicitly, as your concern in this matter. I understand what the variegation is in the expression, because it's valid.

The point is, we're living in a dissonant world. That's the first thing. The United States is dissonant. It's a terrible place, not because it's the United States, but because we have Obama in it. And we had some Bushes in it, and they weren't burning—maybe they should have been burning—but the Bush family is not very good. It never was.

And we've had many bad Presidents as well, back in our history.

The problem is this: We're trying to get some kind of harmony within society. Now, obviously, I know the Turkish situation. I'm not an expert in experience in Turkey, but I know what the problem is. We see the ISIS problem cuts into there. We see the whole thing. We see what happened in Africa, northern Africa—same thing.

So, we are now at a point of a very evil condition of mankind. However, there are certain movements which are coming into shape, which can bring about a kind of harmony among different parts of human culture, and that I think is what the objective has to be. Because each part of society does have its own characteristics. But the characteristics we're looking for are those which are harmonious, harmonious for that population.

And it's a moral question. It's a question of satisfaction. It's not just that you want to have your own language and speak it. You want the *ideas* that that language conveys to be harmonious with other parts of humanity.

Now we're not doing too well right now on that, on

this basis. But we can focus on the intention that we shall come to that kind of harmonious relationship among different qualities of human population. And that's our best shot. It's the idea of going for the harmonious expression, among different languages, different particular cultures, different experiences. But we can bring about the harmonious inter-relationship within and among those nations, and their cultures.

Q: [follow-up] It sounds very good, but the problem is our government, also our system. How can I do that? I am a student. I have some contacts. I have some friends. I am socialist, actually, and we have a party actually. And what can I do?

Everything has Changed

LaRouche: Now you've got this case already there, and Putin, President Putin, has moved from where people thought he was going to stay, and he moved in to try to clean up the ISIS problem and so forth, in order to bring about harmony. Because we know that there is a disharmony in that part of the world, but we also know that with some corrections, we can bring about a relatively harmonious relationship.

We're seeing aspects of that right now. We see it in Europe.

For example: Look. Here you have this terrible threat of general warfare throughout the nations of the North Atlantic area, both sides. And suddenly, something wonderful happened. Germany stepped forward under the pressure essentially of Putin, President Putin, stepped forward and began to move other parts of Europe, and other parts of the world, into an attempt at harmony. We've seen too much disharmony in Europe—there are some places in Europe that are not harmonious by any means, right now.

But the tendency, the attempt to form a harmo-

nious relationship among different cultures, which have different characteristics,—that is in process. And I think the question is: Are we going to be able to carry out what we know we have as a potential? Do we have the ability to bring about that kind of potential when the nations come together?

I think the ultimate result is the fact that mankind is going to have to change. Mankind *will* change. We see it in South America. We see it in India. We see it in other nations there. And I think we're on the verge of such a change. Putin has played a very key role in this, because he upset everything. And by upsetting it, he created an opportunity to bring about harmony—it doesn't exist yet—but we see it coming. We saw that Putin moved into a direction that people thought he was *not* going to move into. And by moving into that, in that sector there, what he did has now broken out and created an impetus for grave reforms in that whole region of nations.

Prospects for General Peace

Now I think the options are good. They're not guaranteed, but we have enough good options, to know that it is possible to pull something off like this now. It may take a little time, but we know we're on a different package. We see it in Germany. We saw it first in Germany breaking out. We've seen it now in France. We've seen it in other locations.



Seeking harmony among cultures: President Vladimir Putin, in the center on the left side of the table, conducts a dialogue with Russia's Muslim spiritual administrations in October 2013.

kremlin.ru

For example: Look. Here you have this terrible threat of general warfare throughout the nations of the North Atlantic area, both sides. And suddenly, something wonderful happened. Germany stepped forward under the pressure essentially of Putin, President Putin, and stepped forward and began to move other parts of Europe, and other parts of the world, into an attempt at harmony. We've seen too much disharmony in Europe—there are some places in Europe that are not harmonious by any means, right now.

So it means there's a *change in the winds* of progress. And so, I think all nations will have an opportunity.

For example, we have the Kra Canal progress,—just take that as an example of a reference, now, right now, I was involved in pushing what was called the Kra Canal. And this reform which we worked on, was not carried out. Japan was working to support this thing, and it could have worked. It would move the transport of goods in the southern region of the world, and bring that about in such a way that we could actually make a *great* improvement in terms of maritime traffic and in relations among nations. We have things like that underway now as possibilities, and in some degree, partly acceptable. But it's there: The options now for man, are options which go beyond anything that mankind has had for a very long time. It's still a tough time; it's still dangerous, but there is the sign of something which is good. We just have to work with it and hope we can win.

Q: [follow-up] All right, we'll see everything, everything will change in Europe and Asia and everywhere; it doesn't matter. But every day people are dying. It's government's problem. I have to focus first of all on my country. After that I can focus on global problems. Of course, I have to think about global problems because we are living on the world, and. . .

We Can Do It

LaRouche: Look, the best thing is—you've got to bring people into,—or some people at least,—you've got to bring them into harmony. And therefore, while they may retain different particular characteris-

tics in their behavior, the point is that there must be a harmonious relationship. And that's what we're seeing right now with Russia's intrusion, in trying to save part of this whole area, which includes Turkey. We have to do that. It's an obligation. It's a moral one. And my view is, we have the potential in the fairly short term, of *possibly* bringing about a general peace throughout the planet. That is now possible. It doesn't mean it's guaranteed, but it means the winds are blowing in that direction. The question is whether we can keep the windstorm going up.

Q: [follow-up] Yeah. We have to, actually, we must do that. I know that. But. . .

We have to; we must do it. OK, but I'm not government, I'm not God, I'm not anyone, I'm just a student; I have just some ideas, that's all. But if I don't do any-



Harmony in action: Astronauts currently on the International Space Station. This picture was released this September in connection with the visit of the first Dane in space, Andreas Mogensen, seen bottom right.

thing, who's going to do something? I have to do something as a student. What can I do?

LaRouche: We can do it! We are trying to do this on a global basis. We are trying to change the whole situation of the planet right now, the human occupation of the planet. In China, in India, in many other nations there is a very important development. What we all

We can do it! We are trying to do this on a global basis. We are trying to change the whole situation of the planet right now, the human occupation of the planet. In China, in India, in many other nations there is a very important development. What we all have to do is bring a certain harmony among those nations which are trying to converge on harmony as such, on a general harmony.

have to do is bring a certain *harmony* among those nations which are trying to converge on harmony as such, on a general harmony.

And you're a student? All right, you know exactly what you want. You know the kind of life you want to have *in your head*, and your neighbor's. And you can achieve that. It's been done before in society; it can be done right now.

Q: [follow-up] All right. I'll try. Thank you. [applause]

Q: I have been involved most of my life with music, although I'm not a musician. That's harmony I'm talking about. So when we have harmony, from the beginning, then we should have harmony going forward. I know the technology of today is wonderful. But why have we removed harmony from our lives by removing beautiful music, the Classics, all the instruments that were quite beautiful: the violins, the violas, the cellos, all of these things,—and we go to beating drums? Which I always thought was for making war. [LaRouche laughs] I don't know if I'm right or wrong. At my age, I'm beginning to think maybe I learned the wrong thing growing up. I'm 80 plus. I won't tell you what the plus is, but it's plus.

So, explain to me where we've gone wrong, because I remember the Classics—Shakespeare. I remember the music Classics, including the later ones of Brahms. So where are we now, where we beat drums for war? Explain it; I don't know.

Only One Real Scientist

LaRouche: Well, I think you should be more optimistic. Or at least I think there are grounds for you to be more optimistic on this subject.

First, you have two problems. We had a progressive movement on the part of the United States, in parts of the experience of the United States, during the 1800s. At the end of that period, what we had was the introduction of a fairly evil influence in terms of the government of the United States. And Bertrand Russell jumped in on that, and Bertrand Russell created evil, *pure evil*, throughout his entire life. And what happened is, we used to have science, but Bertrand Russell came along and virtually destroyed science.

And there was one man in the whole kit and caboodle who was really loyal to the principle of science—Einstein. He was the only person in the whole century, who manifested a really true appreciation of what the meaning of his objectives were. And he died, but in the meantime we have gone through a destruction of the moral and intellectual development of the citizens of the United States, both in the Twentieth Century and in the Twenty-First Century now. We are destroying our children, our young people; we are destroying our aging people. We are reducing them to bitterness and fear.

So that we've come to a time when a great change has to occur. And I believe that what we're trying to do now, with the new agreement which is coming in the next week, this coming week,—this turn can be the opening which forces the opening of a new view of the planet.

You see what happened in Germany. Recently Germany seemed to be almost hopeless—the Germans and what they were going to do. Suddenly, the leaders of Germany,—that is, the senior leaders of Germany,—suddenly organized something which became infectious. It spread to other parts of Europe. All these people were being thrown into the water to be drowned or to be killed otherwise, and the leaders of Germany *moved*, together with Putin, to try to remove this problem and correct this error.

We don't know how much we can count on a certain success, but we know that success is possible now. And everything that's beautiful for people who know that



The West-Eastern Divan orchestra, established in 1999 by Argentine-Israeli conductor Daniel Barenboim and the late Palestinian-American academic Edward Said, to promote harmony in the war-torn Middle East region. Here, Barenboim with the orchestra in Salzburg, Austria in May 2013.

the one thing on that which I think has to be put on the record for this purpose. It's the fact that we are in a situation right now, with this United Nations operation in place: I think we have entered into a period of opportunity, and a certain zeal involved in that. I think that in the coming week, and the week after that, and maybe the week after that, we're going to find there's a fundamental sweeping change in terms of many things about the United States, and also certain other parts of the world. [Applause.]

was beautiful, and always wanted that beautiful kind of thing to come knocking on the door, I think we are approaching a possibility with that question. I don't think—you know, I'm 93 years of age, [laughs] so maybe I'm senior to you, and therefore, I think maybe I can say something about that.

A Period of Opportunity

Q:[follow-up] When you mentioned Einstein, I did remember he played the violin quite well.

LaRouche: [laughs heartily] Yes, of course! He did more than that.

Q: [follow-up] ...we go forward, rather than backwards. Thank you.

Q: Hello, I'm C—from Brooklyn. I have a comment, and then maybe an idea. September 17th was the Constitution's birthday. The Constitution is 231 years old. I know that we have to fight hard to reinstate Glass-Steagall. But I think while we are holding the sign that says, "Reinstate Glass-Steagall" we need to hold another sign that says "Reinstate the Constitution." That's it. [Applause.]

LaRouche: [laughs] Okay. Well, I can answer on

Q: I'm R—from Staten Island. And I'm a student of history, I work in a National Park, and recently President Obama changed the name of Mt. McKinley, and also there's discussion and suggestion that Alexander Hamilton be taken off the ten-dollar bill. What's

We are in a situation right now, with this United Nations operation in place: I think we have entered into a period of opportunity, and a certain zeal involved in that. I think that in the coming week, and the week after that, and maybe the week after that, we're going to find there's a fundamental sweeping change in terms of many things about the United States, and also certain other parts of the world.

implied by these actions, and what do you think of them?

Alexander Hamilton

LaRouche: Well, very simply, Alexander Hamilton was the founder of the United States. His role, of course, was manifold, but his key role was in the Philadelphia convention, which preceded the formation of the actual Constitution of the United States. He'd played a key role in shaping the principles, or actually the four key



The conclusion of the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 marked the end of the orgy of blood called the Thirty Years War, and established the principle of nation states collaborating for the “benefit of the other.” This painting by Dutch artist Gerard ter Borch shows the ratification of the Treaty of Münster which finalized the agreement.

economic principles of the United States; he was the one who induced the President of the United States to become the President, the first President of United States, Washington.

Then he was shot! And then things weren't so good. And the people in the United States at that time who were evil, who were promoters of slavery, and a whole bunch of them were promoters of slavery,—about four of them in the Presidency at one swoop. And then we got a great President back in there. And then next we had a real bum, evil bum, who liked to kill Indians, things like that. And we have a very poor record, with few exceptions by our Presidents in that era, until Abraham Lincoln became President. Now that was good. But then they killed him. And by killing him, they disrupted the entire effort of Abraham Lincoln.

Then later on there were a lot of ups and downs and so forth. We had a great general who led the fight, the warfare to defeat the enemy, to defeat the British, in fact. And then we had a great President here and there. But they get scarcer and scarcer.

Abraham Lincoln would have been happy to see some of these things. And certainly our greatest President, Franklin Roosevelt, achieved great things. And

we had a few Presidents who were not too bad. But then, recently, we've had nothing but terrible Presidents. We could enjoy some relief from that sort of thing. But that's the sort of history of the United States in short. And Alexander Hamilton is essentially the monitor of that history of our nation, of our republic.

Bernie Sanders

Q: Good afternoon, Mr. LaRouche. This is R—from Brooklyn. On Friday we did a deployment at 43rd Street and Sixth Avenue, and at any given time we had five to seven people there, and at the same time, Sen. Bernie Sanders had a Town Hall Meeting at the same location, and I was giving out Glass-Steagall leaflets, and there was less resistance than in the past. It seems like a lot of people are hearing more about

Glass-Steagall. Several people made a comment to me, “I'm on your side, I think they should bring back Glass-Steagall.” And I heard from some of Bernie Sanders' supporters, that at his meeting he supported and recommended Glass-Steagall. How do you see Bernie Sanders at this time?

LaRouche: well, I see him in a positive light. How far he's going to get with his election campaign I don't know. This is the very tricky period. We have a couple of people who are Presidential candidates who would be useful. I realize we need a new Presidential system, and we need certain protections to ensure that those things will be handled properly, so we won't get the usual kind of swindle we've had recently. Because this system now, of recent Presidents and recent procedures, are not decent operations.

And what he's trying to do,—I sympathize with what he's trying to do in this thing. I don't know how successful he could be, but I see what he's doing. This question has to be really dealt with.

We must absolutely get rid of Obama, and anything like him, from the United States. We have people in the Congress who don't belong there; people in the Senate who don't belong there. Because, they, in a sense are

We must absolutely get rid of Obama, and anything like him, from the United States... We need a new Presidential system, which means with a President and a coherent team around that President. We need that now. We don't want these jokers we're getting from other locations. We don't.

crooks, or are feeble,—feeble in their moral qualifications.

We need a new Presidential system, which means a President and a coherent team around that President. We need that now. We don't want these jokers we're getting from other locations. We don't. And what he's doing is a contribution to expressing what must be considered. And I think he's generally on the right track. As I say, I don't know how much qualification he has to actually achieve the actual nomination and election. But I think his efforts have merit, and should be treated accordingly.

Wall Street Hopelessly Bankrupt

Q: Good afternoon, Mr. LaRouche. This is J—from Brooklyn, New York. I'm approaching things a little differently today. I was recently speaking with some friends of mine, and we were talking about the things that we need to do *when* Glass-Steagall is put in place—not *if* it is put in place, but *when* it is achieved.

And some words came up that seemed to evoke a lot of emotion in people. And one of those things that I thought was a good idea to do, when Glass-Steagall is put in place, is to have a Manhattan Project, like the Manhattan Project of old that produced a nuclear bomb, the A-bomb, but in this case we would produce nuclear energy. We're going to need nuclear energy to power all those buildings that are going to be vacant, that you talked about once before, that we'll need to put hospitals into, and schools, and other residential buildings and homes for people. And kick Trump out and put

people in homes that they can afford, and we could use those buildings for that.

Well, we were talking about this new Manhattan Project that would not be a destructive A-bomb, but would be to get nuclear energy on the table, to actually come together with scientists to produce this new amount of energy that we're going to need to power New York City. People are afraid of this "nuclear" word, nuclear energy. And I just thought about it for a minute, and I'd like you to kind of put in perspective why there is such a fear of the idea of nuclear energy. I know that with the Cold War and all that business, we were brainwashed into thinking that "nuclear" means something really terrible. But we know we have the technology to produce nuclear power plants, and to produce them safely. And so if you could kind of tell us a little bit about what you know on this nuclear thing?

LaRouche: Well, I can do also the other part of what you made in your remarks, and take the two of them together. First of all, Wall Street is presently hopelessly bankrupt. That is, there is no way that Wall Street can continue to live. It can't. Just look at the figures, and



Dissonance in the White House: Obama presides over a "Memphis Soul" performance in the East Room in April 2013.

go over this period where they have this “easing” story; I don’t know if you were following this “easing” story: Every week we were getting a new “easing” story. And what was this? It was nothing but a fraud, a complete fraud.

Now, Wall Street is actually hopelessly bankrupt.

Now, Wall Street is actually hopelessly bankrupt. There is no way in which Wall Street can actually exist. There would have to be a Nazi occupation for Wall Street to survive, and it might not even survive then.

There is no way in which Wall Street can actually exist. There would have to be a Nazi occupation for Wall Street to survive, and it might not even survive then.

So that’s the first thing. So therefore, it’s going to go! Now, we’re trying to get Wall Street shut down, permanently and in a peaceful way, because we don’t want a big fight. We want it to just be absolutely bankrupted, thrown out of office, thrown out of their positions, because all they’re committing is frauds. There is no justification for the defense of Wall Street. It’s a disease; it’s an enemy of mankind.

How to Rebuild

So now, at the same time, what are we faced with? What is our construction method? How’re we going reconstruct what has been destroyed by Wall Street, and by Wall Street’s accomplices? All right, well, that’s simple, and you’re right: it is nuclear power. Right now, we have some very bad news, not relevant to this directly, but indirectly. First of all, we have people who are trying to produce a reduction of the population, and it’s being done by a Pope; and the Pope is out to reduce the population by a method of mass murder, and that’s what it is, there’s no doubt of it. The governor of California is now a spokesman for this kind of mass murder.

Now therefore, what we have to do then, is we have to say: “Look, we have to increase the power per capita of human beings, the power of creativity, to enable mankind both to sustain larger populations, to correct evils, and so forth.” Our education system stinks, and has for a long period of time. You know, you have some people who are teaching properly, but the institutions don’t do that; they don’t practice that.

We are a degenerate nation, and I think at the time

that President Ronald Reagan was shot, but lived afterward, the effect of his being shot ruined what became his re-election. Therefore at that time of the shooting of Ronald Reagan, who I was actually working for,—he was a good guy, but he really was weakened by the shooting of him, and so the Bush family took over.

We’ve had the Bushes; the Bushes are kind of stupid, except for the grandfather. They were just stupid; he was evil. The effect was about the same, I guess.

But anyway, the point is the development of higher forms of energy.

We are now in a process where we’re

going into the new space operations; we’re going into a new layer of future science, and also nearby space within the Galaxy. So we are now working on developing a Galactic System which will be controlled, directly or indirectly, by mankind as a developing system. That is now a feasible proposition. It is not something we are able, yet, to work, but we do know the water system of the United States and Earth in general, depends upon this water system of the Galactic System. So in order to do that, you have to go into the nuclear areas; otherwise you can’t accomplish that project.

So these are things which you’re talking about, which are highly important, as well as feasible. It’s going to take a little work to get it moving, but that’s possible.

The Fraud of Wall Street

Q: Hi, Mr. LaRouche, this is R—from Bergen County, New Jersey. I preemptively apologize if this question is not well formulated because I just started thinking about it.

LaRouche: [laughs] OK!

Q: [follow-up] There was an article on the website where the first part of the article says that in a Glass-Steagall system of physical economy, prices will have to be completely reconsidered, and adjusted, if I read that correctly. In other words, pricing in a non-Glass-Steagall system seems to be based on what the market will bear, which means that prices are manipulated, unnecessary goods, entertainment, for example, is created and purchased through brainwashing operations; quantitative easing creates bubbles, and monopolies and cartels are formed, etc., in order to set prices at whatever



iter.org

Harmony among nations: The construction of the floor of the Tokamak pit at the International Experimental Thermonuclear Reaction (ITER) site in southern France. The work is being conducted by scientists and engineers from the European Union, China, Russia, Japan, India, South Korea, and the United States.

levels people can use to collect the most possible money, because money is a primary value in a non-Glass-Steagall system.

One can argue, I would argue, that a lot of pricing that's being done in a non-Glass-Steagall system is artificial and false because they're not based on productive value; they're based on speculation. So if money is the only value, and it doesn't matter if you're selling steel or if you're selling pornography, whatever is going to be the most profitable is what you're going to go after.

Do you have anything to say on the readjustment of pricing in what hopefully will become the Glass-Steagall physical economy system?

LaRouche: Sure! I do. The facts of the matter are sufficient; it's not a matter of speculation, it's a matter of facts, and the need to recognize those facts. All right, so Wall Street is hopelessly bankrupt right now. There is no basis for the sustaining of the existence of the Wall Street system at this time. If you look at the so-called easing program that was going along for some years,

every week, a new "easing," a new "easing" program, well, what was this? This was pure inflation. The easing program was pure inflation and fraudulent.

Then we got into a later period, where that whole thing has no capability of surviving; no intrinsic ability to survive. So the thing is, if we act, and we act on the basis of a government finding that Wall Street is a fraud, complete fraud, today, and if the United States acts on that basis, *there is no more Wall Street*. Wall Street disappears.

New International Negotiations

Now, that would be my joy, to watch this process, but I think it should occur anyway, whether I'm there to see it or not. But we have to get the United States free

of this kind of great fraud. It's a complete British-style fraud that's being played on us! We are being destroyed as a nation, by the effects of what is done by Wall Street. And Wall Street has no merit, it has no reason to *exist*; there's no justification for it to exist. And people who sponsor this in the Congress, should be shut down in the Congress! Because we can't have that any more.

And as our speaker earlier said, the introduction of the proper higher order of energies, nuclear energies, and super-nuclear energies,—these things are absolutely essential; and we have to fight against the fact that there's a scheme to try to reduce the members of the population of the United States right now, in particular, to kill us by these methods. The governor of California is an advocate of mass murder against the citizens of not only the United States, but also of California as such. He's very active on this thing.

So these problems have to be treated accordingly. There are evils, such as these and others, like the drug problems, like the lack of a competent school system

But I think we're at a point,—what is the point? The point is, now we have a new international agreement in the making. This agreement, this negotiation can be the mechanism by which we change things very quickly during this period of international negotiations. By doing that we can change almost everything that has to be changed. All we have to do is get the people to see,—and I think many people do see,—many governments see, many parts of the world governments, they see this has been a terrible problem, and they're approaching a point where they're about ready to do something about that.

any more. The education system is poisonous; the culture, the cultural factors in most parts of the United States, are terrible. We're going to have to rebuild!

But I think we're at a point,—what is the point? The point is, now we have a new international agreement in the making. This agreement, this negotiation can be the mechanism by which we change things very quickly during this period of international negotiations. By doing that we can change almost everything that has to be changed. All we have to do is get the people to see,—and I think many people do see,—many governments see, many parts of the world governments, they see this has been a terrible problem, and they're approaching a point where they're about ready to do something about that.

So I think our function here, in our more modest work, in Massachusetts, or other similar places,—that the time has come that we can actually do something about this. The option is there and the means is understood. I'm familiar with the means that can be used. I think we can do it. And I think this period, or this period of this international event for the next coming weeks,—this does present the option of getting a sweeping change in these conditions.

A Fundamental Change

Q: Hello, Mr. LaRouche, H—from the Bronx. I appreciate this discussion on the economy; we in the Bronx, we have a lot of problems with housing and it seems under the existing conditions, almost impossible to build new housing. We have other problems with the Greenies, but I'm trying to get to the point of your presentation, which is the international agreement. Do you think that Mr. Putin of Russia and forces

that he has at his control can defeat ISIS, the Islamic State, in Syria and other places?

We have to be concerned about the strange super-powers of the so-called ISIS thing, and why it continues to expand. We are told that there there's a coalition out there that's fighting ISIS; we had the Kurds that won their little battle in Kobane; but then there were certain setbacks, which may be to do with some of the things going on in Turkey at this time.

But anyway, what's up? Because it seems to be good, but then not so good.

LaRouche: No, it's good right now. What happened is, President Putin changed his program in a couple of phases, including being a sponsor of a march [Victory Day parade September 3] in China; and this was a real military power show by China. But Putin was one of the people who set it up! But immediately



tjgtheatre.org

Charles Dutoit and the Philadelphia Orchestra at a concert in Tianjin, China in June 2012.

after that, Putin also moved to deal with the other part of the show.

So now, inside the present system, Putin has moved things south! And is going to take over. And what's happened in Germany, is that the leaders of Germany have also supported this in their own way. Officials in France, have adopted that; others have adopted that policy.

Right now, there has been a fundamental change in the alignment of major forces, in terms of the trans-Atlantic region in particular, but also beyond. So now that which you want to happen, it probably can happen. Now we're having this great celebration among the nations, where they're coming now to their seasonal bit on that subject, and it's probable that they will succeed. And therefore, these things are achievements which are being done in part by Putin, who's been a leader in this operation.

Great Projects Beckon

And you see this whole change. You just watch what I've seen in the past three or four weeks, the *change* in terms of the trans-Atlantic community. It's big. I think that this new event coming in the following weeks to

come right now,—I think that's the occasion for bringing that issue more to the fore, and bringing it around to certain actuality; I think we can do it.

Q: Hi Lyn: Bill Roberts [of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee] from Detroit,—from the Galaxy, but Detroit, specifically.

So, on Tuesday, there will be an *EIR* seminar and press conference to announce the release of the special report that's been published by *Executive Intelligence Review*, “‘Global Warming’ Scare Is Population Reduction, not Science”; and this will be part of a series of interventions going into the UN General Assembly meeting.

You raised, I think importantly, the connection within the Twentieth Century of really the twin evils of Wall Street and the Green population reduction/climate change fraud. It's often the case in popular political terms that oftentimes people will be soft on one of those, and see the other one as evil. Europeans are more infested by the Greenie ideology; I wonder if you could just address the importance of what can actually be done along the lines of the defeat of the British Monar-

“You know, the Earth can only carry 1 billion people.”



‘Global Warming’ Scare Is Population Reduction, Not Science

SPECIAL REPORT FROM **Executive Intelligence Review** \$25

Order from **EIR**, 1-800-278-3135 Or [online](http://www.larouchepub.com) at:www.larouchepub.com.



The Schiller Institute Manhattan chorus, in rehearsal on Sept. 17, with conductor Diane Sare.

Members of the Manhattan Project study Kepler's harmonies prior to the discussion with Lyndon LaRouche, on Sept. 19, 2015.

EIRNS/Margaret Greenspan



EIRNS/Diane Sare

chy which occurred at Copenhagen [UN COP15] in 2009, and the importance of this particular question in terms of what has to be done to actually bring together a harmonic association of principle in the upcoming United Nations General Assembly.

LaRouche: I think you just put your finger on the issue: The General Assembly. That assembly, I think, is pregnant with intention to make some radical changes, or what would seem radical changes. Look at the crisis of France, for example, and you have the crisis of Germany; other crises in Europe. The crises which you see in other areas, in the intermediate areas; the operations and opportunities we see in areas such as the Kra Canal project. The Kra Canal project, which is a very feasible thing and has been; I would push for this thing, and actually some Japanese institutions wanted to get the channel through the Kra Canal; and the Kra Canal channel would change the character of much of the international trade in the Pacific and related regions, and the Oceania area.

The Mind Is the Future

So all these things are *there*; they're now ready to go! And we simply have to find the catalyst, and the catalyst I think involves the General Assembly. I think the General Assembly defines the option of launching

exactly what most people would think is impossible, but what I see is very possible. I can't say it's guaranteed, but I can say it's very, very possible. And if you could give us a few weeks before we close down the General Assembly, I think within that period you're going to find some very important action, gratifying action, on this matter.

Q: [follow-up] Great, thank you.

Q: [Megan Beets of the LaRouche PAC Science Team] Hi, Lyn. You saw the opening of our [music] session today, when we were doing some work on Kepler and the issue of harmony and the origination of harmony in the human mind. So I was just wondering

if you could maybe say a few more things about that, but I wanted to put it in the context of what you had brought up in a discussion that we had had earlier this week on Tuesday, where you were insistent that man's not a creature of the senses; he doesn't live from the present into the future, but the creative impulses of the human mind are in the future. They make and create the future. So I was wondering if you could say a few things about that in the context of what we were discussing today?

LaRouche: Yes, I understand exactly. No, the issue here is: what is the nature of mankind, and how does mankind's nature differ from that of animals? That's the issue. And it's a very important one. Because only mankind is capable of being mankind; others are just animals. Now that doesn't mean the animals are bad creatures, but it means they're not human. They don't have the essential qualities of humanity. And so, this defines the concern on that account.

Human Immortality

I'll keep it short: The point is, do you believe that there's a meaning to the death of a human being? Do you think that there's a positive meaning in the death of what had been a living human being? Because there's no animal that can meet that standard; no animal, no species of animal. Only the human species has a reason for existing in the future.

In other words, you live a life which comes to a point of death, and is there a future of that person? Or is there some continuity of the presence of that person? In a good human society, a real human society, there is an immortal principle: that the dead, when they've lived an appropriate life, will bring about the discovery of creativity, the discovery of creativities, which give mankind a higher standard of achievement than mankind has ever achieved before, in that circle.

And therefore, you have a quality of immortality of the dead human beings, which can be achieved, because they live a life, and when they died, they are able to have supplied a contribution to the future of mankind,—and only human beings can do that. And the shame is, when human beings don't do that, when the human beings think they can't do that. And the point is, they should all be developed to be able to make that kind of contribution to the future.

Mankind is essentially, virtually, the immortal species. And even death of the individual does not end the meaning of their life, if they give a meaning to their life.

If they're creative, if they make discoveries that mankind has not known before, they make steps in progress in that direction. All of these things are that virtue which is specific to the human being's opportunities. Mankind is the only immortal species of which we know.

Speed: Lyn, I believe we're at the end of the questions, and I—not so much by way of conclusion, but I want to bring up something: A friend of yours, whom you invoked at your birthday. Some of us from New Jersey gave you a recording of the work of Bill Warfield. And some people wouldn't have a reason to know, but William Warfield was one of the members of the board of the Schiller Institute, and got to know Lyn, actually. One of the very first things we did, which I think was in May of 1994, that's when Lyn met Bill Warfield.

Now, many people don't know who he is, but he was one of the great singers of the Twentieth Century, and he wrote an autobiography called *My Music and My Life*, and on this question of dissonance and harmony, I wanted to bring something up and have Lyn respond to it; because Warfield compares how he dealt with the racism of not being allowed to sing on the stage of the Metropolitan Opera, and how others of his contemporaries didn't deal with racism. And he makes an important point, which I think is something, Lyn, you may want to comment on.

So Bill says this—Bill was born in 1920; he was a World War II veteran. He says: “When we remember the Civil Rights revolution of the 1950s, we forget that it got its momentum in the 1940s.” He then talks about a friend of his named William Marshall who was also an actor. He says, “Marshall was up to date on all these movements, and his involvement was an important part of my education. In particular, he was following the ups and downs of Paul Robeson's career. I was particularly interested to know more about that. Where Marshall and I were of different mentalities, was in our perceptions of personal slights due to racism: I was generally oblivious; he was easily insulted. In Boston, in Cleveland, in Chicago, it could be as simple as buying a newspaper from the corner stand. He would look at me with a kind of wonder. ‘You're very naïve,’ he'd say, ‘Look around you. Did you see the way that person looked at you?’ and he would laugh a bitter laugh.”

Bill says, “Marshall was often right. I had simply not noticed before he mentioned it, and would probably never have paid any attention. I would ignore it; he

would fume. That was the climate that was always around us then. Neither William Marshall nor I were on the barricades of the movement. Each of us in our own way worked out our commitment on a different kind of stage. But temperamentally, you could say that Bill Marshall and Bill Warfield represented opposite extremes within our own band of the spectrum. He didn't miss a single nuance of even unconscious racism; I

Mankind is essentially, virtually, the immortal species. And even death of the individual does not end the meaning of their life, if they give a meaning to their life; if they're creative, if they make discoveries that mankind has not known before; they make steps in progress in that direction. All of these things are that virtue which is specific to the human being's opportunities. Mankind is the only immortal species of which we know.

shrugged it off. Racism was going to be the racist's handicap, not mine."

Now, I put this here, Lyn, because you've referenced harmony, dissonance; Obama as a dissonant personality, and so on. And Bill—I was listening to a recording he did of the *Four Serious Songs*, Brahms, that whole first one particularly. And as we go out, as we conclude, I just wanted to see if you might want to say something about, not so much him, but this issue of what it takes to be creative in the face of great adversity, and how, when we go into this UN session, we might be able to overcome any of those problems any of us have?

LaRouche: You have to really study Bill Warfield's behavior. Look, he was very, very clear in his sense of what his mission was. He did not feel that he was somehow shortcoming in any of the things he did. He was not a bitter man as such. He was a man who could become angry, but if you know what his personal life was like, and what he went through in the process of this life he lived, you see a man who was not reacting personally. He was reacting impersonally, on the question of music, on the question of art, on the question of everything,—yes, race, too.

But it wasn't like an angry thing; not a rage thing. It was something that was *plain fact*. Everything he did was *plain fact*. Even the abuse he was subjected to under certain condition: plain fact! Because he devoted himself to his mission, and that's what made the difference.

He was a person who lived and died for his mission, which was largely music. He performed in Europe, he performed in the United States. He was a major figure in the trans-Atlantic community, in his musical abilities. But he did not have the fault which many ambitious singers and others would have under the same circumstances.

He was a friend to me, in my relationship to him; we were partners in spirit. We worked together, we talked together, and he was a friend. [applause]

Speed: Thank you, Lyn. So if you'd like to give us any summary; I think we got a very clear idea that you think we have a mission for this week, but if there's anything you'd like to say in closing, we'd be happy to hear it.

LaRouche: Well, fine. Look, this is the great assembly that's going to be brought out over the weekend, and this is probably one of the most important, precious opportunities, to get mankind out of the mess that mankind has been in up to this point.

Much of the world does not want to continue the kind of things that mankind has been subjected to recently and for a long time. And I think, that if we succeed,—and I think we *can* succeed,—with the General Assembly, because with what we've seen in Europe in terms of changes in temperament in Europe, in parts of Europe, what we've seen in other parts of the planet, it is now possible to make radical changes in devotion to service, which had not been experienced by me, very much for a very long time. And now it's just happened, recently. It came to the surface at the time that President Putin made a shift in his policy, and upset everything that Obama was working for.

And I think that the dumping of Obama under this process, is the thing that is required, if you want to save humanity from a horrible fate. I think a lot of the world would agree with that. They may not think of Obama himself as the focal point of their concern; but whenever they would see something smells like Obama politically, they would have the same reaction: Get this guy out of here. [applause]

Speed: Thank you, Lyn. And that is the conclusion, for today.