

EIR

Executive Intelligence Review

March 15, 2019 Vol. 46 No. 10

www.larouchepub.com \$10.00

Italy Joins Silk Road as Trump Challenges Climate Fraud



Editor-in-Chief and Founder:

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Editorial Board: *Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.*, *Helga Zepp-LaRouche*, *Robert Ingraham*, *Tony Papert*, *Gerald Rose*, *Dennis Small*, *William Wertz*

Co-Editors: *Robert Ingraham*, *Tony Papert*

Technology: *Marsha Freeman*

Transcriptions: *Katherine Notley*

Ebooks: *Richard Burden*

Graphics: *Alan Yue*

Photos: *Stuart Lewis*

Circulation Manager: *Stanley Ezrol*

INTELLIGENCE DIRECTORS

Economics: *Marcia Merry Baker*, *Paul Gallagher*

History: *Anton Chaitkin*

Ibero-America: *Dennis Small*

United States: *Debra Freeman*

INTERNATIONAL BUREAUS

Berlin: *Rainer Apel*

Copenhagen: *Tom Gillesberg*

Lima: *Sara Madueño*

Melbourne: *Robert Barwick*

Mexico City: *Gerardo Castilleja Chávez*

New Delhi: *Ramtanu Maitra*

Paris: *Christine Bierre*

Stockholm: *Ulf Sandmark*

United Nations, N.Y.C.: *Leni Rubinstein*

Washington, D.C.: *William Jones*

Wiesbaden: *Göran Haglund*

ON THE WEB

e-mail: eirms@larouchepub.com

www.larouchepub.com

www.executiveintelligencecereview.com

www.larouchepub.com/eiw

Webmaster: *John Sigerson*

Assistant Webmaster: *George Hollis*

Editor, Arabic-language edition: *Hussein Askary*

EIR (ISSN 0273-6314) is published weekly

(50 issues), by *EIR News Service, Inc.*,

P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390.

(571) 293-0935

European Headquarters: E.I.R. GmbH, Postfach

Bahnstrasse 9a, D-65205, Wiesbaden, Germany

Tel: 49-611-73650

Homepage: <http://www.eir.de>

e-mail: info@eir.de

Director: Georg Neudecker

Montreal, Canada: 514-461-1557

eir@eircanada.ca

Denmark: EIR - Danmark, Sankt Knuds Vej 11,

basement left, DK-1903 Frederiksberg, Denmark.

Tel.: +45 35 43 60 40, Fax: +45 35 43 87 57. e-mail:

eirdk@hotmail.com.

Mexico City: EIR, Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz 242-2

Col. Agricultura C.P. 11360

Delegación M. Hidalgo, México D.F.

Tel. (5525) 5318-2301

eirmexico@gmail.com

Copyright: ©2018 EIR News Service. All rights reserved. Reproduction in whole or in part without permission strictly prohibited.

Canada Post Publication Sales Agreement
#40683579

Postmaster: Send all address changes to *EIR*, P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390.

Signed articles in *EIR* represent the views of the authors, and not necessarily those of the Editorial Board.

Italy Joins Silk Road as Trump Challenges Climate Fraud

Cover This Week

President Donald Trump and Italian Prime Minister Giuseppe Conte at the G7 Summit in Charlevoix, Canada on June 9, 2018.



White House/Shealah Craighead

ITALY JOINS SILK ROAD AS TRUMP CHALLENGES CLIMATE FRAUD

I. The World Acts Against Empire

3 ZEPP-LAROCHE WEBCAST

Italy Joins with China in Battle for a New Paradigm—Geopoliticians Flip!

10 Italy's Move to Join Belt and Road Unleashes Panic in the Geopolitical Centers

by Claudio Celani

14 INTERVIEW

Discussion with Philippines Secretary of National Defense

by Michael Billington

II. America Acts Against Empire

23 President Trump's Committee on Climate Security: A Much-Needed, Overdue Return to Science

by Jason Ross

27 Pro-War Democrats Seek to Overthrow U.S. Constitution

by Harley Schlanger

31 The LaRouche Alternative to the Existential Danger of a Third World War

by Elliot Greenspan

III. The Real Lyndon LaRouche

42 N.Y. TIMES CAUGHT IN A TWICE-TOLD LIE Lyndon LaRouche and the True History of 20th Century America

by Dennis Speed

47 LaRouche South Africa Honors the Memory of Lyndon LaRouche

by Ramasimong Tsokolibane

48 Messages of Condolence on the Passing of Lyndon LaRouche

IV. What is 'Human Nature'?

51 THE FUTURE IN SCIENCE: The Coming End of the Cult of Sense-Deception

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.
October 14, 2012

59 FORGET POPULAR OPINION! Brahms, Liszt and the Test of Immortality

by Mindy Pechenuk

I. The World Acts Against Empire

ZEPP-LAROUCHE WEBCAST

Italy Joins with China in Battle for New Paradigm—Geopoliticians Flip!

This is the edited transcript of the Schiller Institute's March 8, 2019 New Paradigm interview with Helga Zepp-LaRouche by Harley Schlanger. A [video](#) of the webcast is available.

Harley Schlanger: Hello, I'm Harley Schlanger of the Schiller Institute. Welcome to our strategic webcast for today, March 7, 2019, with our President and founder, Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

Italy and China

As is almost always the case these days, Helga, things are happening at a rapid pace. The contrast between the two paradigms is being fought out on virtually every continent, but perhaps the most interesting and immediate, is the fight going on now around Italy. And there are some very significant developments with Italy and China, Italy and the European Union, internal developments in Italy—so why don't we start there?

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Yes, this is very significant, because Italy is the one European country, or—I shouldn't say "one," but one of the major industrial countries of Europe which has, with the new government, developed a very, very productive relationship with China. They have a very good relationship with President Donald Trump. When Prime Minister Giuseppe Conte was at the G7, he totally agreed with Trump that the G7 should be expanded to be the G8, with the addition of Russia. They also demand that the sanctions against Russia be removed. And they have a very interesting and positive attitude toward overcoming the refugee crisis by joining

hands with China in the industrialization of Africa.

The Italian government is very different from what the Western media portray it to be—a surprise, actually—and now, President Xi Jinping is scheduled to come to Italy on a state visit March 22-23. It has been leaked that a memorandum of understanding is in preparation between the Italian and Chinese governments, to be signed between Xi Jinping and Conte during Xi's visit, for full cooperation with the Belt and Road Initiative.

Now, you would think that this is a positive thing. But as the furor of the mainstream media demonstrates, this is regarded as a threat. The *Financial Times* yesterday was apoplectic. They highlighted the comments of Garrett Marquis, a spokesman for the U.S. National Security Council, from the Bolton wing of the administra-



White House/Shealah Craighead
President Donald Trump and Italian Prime Minister Giuseppe Conte at the G7 Summit in Charlevoix, Canada on June 9, 2018.



LPAC-TV

Michele Geraci, Undersecretary of the Italian Ministry of Economic Development in Washington, D.C. in December 2018.

tion, who said, “We are skeptical that the Italian government’s endorsement will bring any sustained economic benefits to the Italian people, and it may end up harming Italy’s global reputation in the long run.” The person in the Economic Development Ministry responsible for the formulation of this memorandum, Michele Geraci, countered that, and said, what is wrong that Italy will try to increase the export of Italian goods into fastest growing market, which is the Chinese market?

This was one response. And the EU Commission also came out and said that this is totally against the EU policy, that it’s the EU which sets the standards, and Italy must comply. Actually, Germany and France right now are the key blocking countries. You have a situation in great flux: Already 13 EU countries have signed memoranda of understanding or some such protocol, including Poland, Czechia, Slovenia, Slovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece, Portugal, Malta, the three Baltic states, and with Italy, now, it would be, as I said, one of the major industrial countries of Europe.

There is a great benefit to all sides participating. All the ports of Italy—Trieste, Genoa, Palermo—are all absolutely to be part of the Maritime Silk Road, and Mr. Geraci pointed to the fact that all Italian ports are close to Africa, without being in Africa, implying that this will make the development of Africa easier by integrating them into the New Silk Road perspective.

So you would think this would cause great positive excitement, but as you can see, there is a fierce storm of opposition coming from the City of London and from

neo-con circles in the United States. I do not think opposition is the position of President Trump, who, as I said, got along very well with Prime Minister Conte.

We have to see how this plays out. My suspicion is that the tension will increase in the days leading up to the visit of Xi Jinping who, after he is in Italy for two days, will go to France, and then, according to several sources—not totally confirmed in the United States yet—but certain European sources say he will go to the United States on the same trip and meet with President Trump at Mar-a-Lago.

I think this is really incredible. Because, according to certain Italian news blogs, citing unnamed insider officials, the one sentence in the memorandum of understanding that apparently the U.S. Embassy in Rome was most freaked out about, is a formulation used by Xi Jinping all the time, namely that the aim of the Belt and Road Initiative, is to form a “community for the shared future of mankind, a community for the common destiny of humankind.”

Away with Geopolitics!

I have always emphasized that it is exactly this conception which is the closest approximation to what we in the Schiller Institute are pushing for, namely a New Paradigm in the history of mankind, that you have to put the one humanity first, before all national interests, and that we have reached a point in the history of humanity where we have to think in terms of the united future of the one human civilization, being united in space travel and research, being united in other scientific breakthroughs, and overcoming geopolitics.

Now, if it’s confirmed that this is really a bone of contention, well, then this is the smoking gun of the geopolitical faction that they oppose this idea of the one humanity—which we know they do, but we have to see.

I think this is a big fighting issue, because as we discussed in the last days and weeks, the strategic outcome of this historical period will depend on our ability to move the United States away from geopolitics, and to move it into accordance with this idea of being part of this one humanity and not necessarily insisting on a unipolar world, which in any case, does not exist any longer, because, with the rise of Asia, with the rise of China, with the absolute, dramatic success of the Belt and Road Initiative—which now involves 156 nations and international institutions which have signed such agreements—I think it is very clearly the sign and the future of civilization.

So I think this is a very interesting fight, and in the United States, people would be well advised to talk to Italian Americans, who are proudly American, but also proud of having come from Italy. We have seen that, when a couple of months ago, one of the European Parliamentarians, Marco Zanni, came to the United States, and had many meetings in the Congress, there was a huge interest in the Italian community. And I think this is very worthwhile to be pursued.

Go with the Belt and Road!

And I think in the United States there should be a discussion about all of this, similar to the way we discussed it two years ago, before the first Belt and Road Forum in Beijing in May 2017, where we pushed for the United States to participate in that, and then President Trump sent an important delegate to this Belt and Road Forum.

The second such forum will take place this April. Prime Minister Conte will attend. We should use this period between the coming visit of President Xi Jinping to the United States, and the Belt and Road Forum in April, to really escalate our campaign for the United States to join the New Paradigm and not oppose it. I think President Trump in any case does not oppose, but the opposition comes from those people who are his opponents, meaning the war party of the Democrats and the neo-cons. And it is very, very urgent that we use this international constellation to move the United States and the world forward.

A Unipolar World Is a Bad Idea

Schlanger: I think it's ironic that the charge against China from the European Union and from U.S. Secretary of State Mike Pompeo and others, is that China is trying to become the unipolar power, when in fact, as you just pointed out, more than 150 nations are signing on, to one degree or another, with the Belt and Road Initiative.

Now, also on this unipolar world issue, we have the testimony given by Gen. Curtis Scaparrotti, who went into a typical neo-con attack on Russia. This just continues to reverberate from the people who are opposed to President Trump's calls for cooperation with Russia. Where is this going? Sections of the U.S. military are cooperating with Russia's military in Syria, but then Scaparrotti comes out with his wild statement.



DoD News

Gen. Curtis M. Scaparrotti. Commander of the U.S. European Command and Supreme Allied Commander of NATO in Europe.

Zepp-LaRouche: Scaparrotti is the Supreme Allied Commander of NATO in Europe and the head of the United States European Command, so he is quite important in the role of NATO. He addressed the U.S. Congress a couple of days ago, where he went into this absolute incredible line that Russian aggression is increasing everywhere, and they are supposedly challenging “the U.S. ability to deploy uncontested in all domains.”

Now, that formulation is a synonym for the right of the United States to defend a unipolar world, to do whatever it wants to, in the Middle East and the South China Sea, in the Pacific, in the Arctic. This is the attitude behind the global missile system, which is right now being challenged by the new weapons systems announced March 1 of last year by Russian President Vladimir Putin. The Russians are absolutely worried with the suspension of the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF Treaty).

This is very, very dangerous, because if the United States keeps insisting on a unipolar world and keeps insisting that Russia and China are the big enemies and competitors and opponents and so forth, I think we are really in a much greater war danger than most people have an inkling of. Many people have said in the recent period that it's much more dangerous than during the 1962 Cuba Missiles Crisis, it's much more dangerous than it was with the medium-range missile crisis at the beginning of the 1980s; the only difference is, then, you had a large peace movement in the streets, hundreds of thousands of peace people in the streets being concerned about World War III. And now, it is more like



U.S. Mission Geneva/Eric Bridiers

Anatoly Antonov, Ambassador of Russia to the United States.

before World War I, that the world is in danger of sleepwalking into a new world war.

So, I think Scaparrotti's remarks, demanding an increase in the U.S. military budget, already the largest in the world by far—I think it's ten times as big as the Russian one—point to no solution other than pushing the world into the potential of a catastrophe.

Schlanger: As you've been emphasizing, other than people sleepwalking into war, there was an effort made by the Russian Ambassador to the United States to bring a sobering assessment, in a presentation he gave this week in Washington, D.C. What did he say?

Mutually Assured Survival

Zepp-LaRouche: This was Anatoly Antonov, who spoke at the Stimson Center. In reviewing the mutual suspension of the INF Treaty, he took it back a little to when President George W. Bush withdrew the United States from the Antiballistic Missile Treaty (ABM Treaty). He said, up to that point the world was aware of the fact that we are living under a Mutually Assured Destruction doctrine, meaning that if it ever came to nuclear war, nobody would survive. And it was that deterrent which contributed stability and peace.

This is not what mankind should live under. This is what my husband at the time tried to replace with the doctrine of Mutually Assure Survival with the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), so I'm not speaking in favor of having nuclear Armageddon as a threat over human-

ity as the only condition for mankind to maintain peace, but it worked insofar as it was clear that a nuclear war was not winnable.

With the cancellation of the ABM Treaty, however, that stability in the international system has been eliminated, and that was obviously the origin of President Putin's telling Russian scientists and engineers and military men, to come up with new weapons systems, which he announced more than a year ago. Many of those systems,—hypersonic missiles are highly maneuverable in flight, so they're not following a ballistic trajectory; then nuclear-powered missiles—all weapons systems which the West presently do not have, and whose weapons systems, Putin emphasized at various points, are now made technologically obsolete, including the ABM system of the United States.

That is the context in which, then, the INF Treaty, that is, the agreement which was reached between President Ronald Reagan and General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachov in 1987, to eliminate an entire category of weapons, namely the intermediate-range missiles deployed in Europe, is now out the window.

Ambassador Antonov used maps in his presentation, making graphic that if the United States deployed intermediate range missiles in Europe, Russian cities would be within range, leaving Russia no other choice but to counter by targeting all of Europe.

This is very important, because I think there must be a completely different approach. We have said many times, you need a completely New Paradigm and you need a new security architecture, based on such a New Paradigm.

But I just wanted to mention this, because people should be alert: The war danger *is not very far away*.

The Green New Deal: Depopulation

Schlanger: Part of the fight for the New Paradigm, is the rejection of the anti-science, anti-technology approach being taken, for example in the United States in what is called the "Green New Deal." There's been a lot of activity around this. Very interestingly, President Trump has set up a new commission to do what they say is not acceptable, which is to question the scientific basis of the claims of man-made climate change. This has an impact in Germany, as well, where the Greens have shut down nuclear, they're threatening coal, and the auto industry is under attack. This Green New Deal, as you've said, Helga, has to be stopped in



CC/Malte Hübner



CC/Gastian Greshake

Green hysteria today: Hans Joachim Schellnhuber (above), Greta Thunberg (right) and “Fridays for the Future” demonstration in Hamburg, Germany on March 1, 2019.



CC/Jan Ainali

So you can see, this is highly orchestrated.

Then you look at the operation of Greta Thunberg, a 16-year-old Swedish teenager, with Asperger’s syndrome, and she’s being trotted around the world, sponsored by all kinds of things. In the United States and in Europe, she’s promoting March 15 as

its tracks, or there’s not going to be a survival of mankind.

Zepp-LaRouche: Well, we have pointed out, for a long time, that the Green New Deal really has nothing to do with protecting the environment, but is for depopulation. Sir John Schellnhuber, the former head of the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, said that decarbonization of the world economy means there is only room for one billion people on the planet, and that’s what they want! I mean, they want to use the green discussion to eliminate people.

And if you needed one more proof, look at page 2 of today’s German tabloid *Bild*, the so-called “political page.” It has a headline, “Children are the Worst for the Environment,” and then it quotes a book author, a woman named Vernea Brunschweiger, saying that the best thing is not to have children anymore, because they’re the biggest threat to the environment; for every child you don’t have, you save 54.4 tons of CO₂ per year; if you don’t drive car, it’s only 1.4 tons—so it’s insane!

In Great Britain, BBC hosted a discussion with two women who are part of a group called “birth strike,” under the headline, “The Women Too Scared of Climate Change to Have Children.”

a day on which all the schoolchildren don’t go to school, but strike against the politicians for not doing enough about climate change. This is all financed very well by the Sierra Club, and by various foundations.

This is a complete onslaught by the oligarchy at a moment when the financial system is about to blow, again, much larger than in 2008, to divert attention, using this green hysteria—and it is hysteria; there are now schoolchildren in Germany who say, “I don’t need to learn anything anymore, because the world will end in 12 years anyway,” which is what Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez has been saying. Others are saying, “I’ll commit suicide in 13 years, because the world is ending.” This is really too much!


Many parents are really upset that their children are being turned into fearful, hysterical little monsters, turning against their families. This is what dictatorships do: They turn children against their parents.

This must be absolutely countered, because there is no science to it. The universe is anti-entropic, science and technology are the drivers of a continuous progress of civilization, a better understanding of the laws of the universe, and this green stuff is just completely brown. It's not green, it's brown, and people should recognize that it comes out of the eugenics movement and similar things which we have documented very well, which you can find on our website.

I think this is really very dangerous, and people should understand: People who are willing to use children in such a way, will not stop at anything.



FBI



CC/Gage Skidmore

The same legal assassins Robert Mueller (l.) and William Weld (r.), who attempted to destroy Lyndon LaRouche in the 1980s are today out to destroy President Trump.

Investigations Shift Away from Russiagate

Schlanger: There's lots of speculation now concerning the release of Special Counsel Robert Mueller's report. I think it's becoming increasingly clear what we've been saying since the beginning of the attacks on Trump, that there's nothing there: No evidence of collusion, no evidence of Russian meddling.

Despite the lies of former Trump lawyer, Michael Cohen, and former FBI Director Andrew McCabe's admission in his interview with CBS that there's a coup underway, in the midst of this, the Democrats are beginning a new onslaught in the Congress, with at least three committees having hearings right away. House Judiciary Committee Chairman Jerrold Nadler gave it all away the other day in an interview, saying "It's very clear that the President obstructed justice." When the reporter asked him, "Well, if it's so clear, why aren't you beginning impeachment right away?" he said, "Well—we don't have the facts, yet."

So, again: Suspicions, lies, slander, gossip, but there's an intent to this, isn't there Helga? To prevent the President from being able to carry on with the mandate for which he was elected—not to mention the larger intent, to destroy the United States.

Zepp-LaRouche: Yes. I think the constitutional lawyer, Alan Dershowitz, put a point on it. He said the Congress is completely overstepping its competence. It has the oversight, according to the Constitution, but it

doesn't have the power to investigate out of proportion, and what it's doing is only aimed at preventing the President from acting.

Same Apparatus Going After Trump Went After LaRouche

I think we need a full-fledged mobilization, because as we've pointed out so many times, the apparatus which is going after Trump right now—Mueller and his people, and William Weld, who wants to run against Trump as a Republican in the upcoming primary election—this is the same apparatus that went after my husband and his organization in the 1980s, and which covered up 9/11 and which is now attempting a coup against President Trump, with the same aim.

So maybe I'll turn it around this time and ask you to comment on this.

Schlanger: Yes. I think this is very significant. Because what we've been discussing for the last twenty minutes, the crisis in the world, the dangers in the world, each of these developments being run by geopoliticians trying to divide the nations—divide the world between East and West, North and South, using wars, assassinations, false flags and so on—for each of these developments over the last five decades, your husband Lyndon LaRouche identified who was behind them and what

their intention was.

Not only that, but LaRouche offered the solutions to outflank these operations. And it was for this reason that the British Empire made him Enemy No. 1, enlisting networks in the Justice Department and the Democratic Party in the 1980s, when Lyndon LaRouche was brought in by Reagan to bring about a joint agreement on the Strategic Defense Initiative. They launched a vicious slander campaign and then a “Get LaRouche Task Force.” As you pointed out, William Weld headed it, the man who is now announcing that he’ll run against Trump in the Republican primaries. It was William Weld who brought in Robert Mueller to run the Get LaRouche Task Force in Boston.

And they’re using the same lies, slanders, and prosecutorial fraud that were deployed against your husband, against Trump. For that reason, this has to be overturned: Not just for the sake of justice alone, but what’s the intent of running this kind of attack on someone like Lyndon LaRouche? It’s to terrify people so they won’t take up these issues!

The same way they’re trying to stop Trump from addressing the potential of a U.S.-Russian cooperation, and a U.S.-China cooperation, ending wars, getting fair trade agreements and so on, they’re trying to stop this and shut it down.

Therefore, Exonerate LaRouche!

And for that reason, we have to wage a fight for the exoneration of Lyndon LaRouche: This is not simply about Lyndon LaRouche the man, although I think people should read the [obituary](#) and [condolences](#) to you Helga and to our organization, to see that people around the world had enormous respect, and love, for Lyndon LaRouche. But the fact that this injustice was done against him, and the same networks continue to carry out injustices, whether it’s the Iraq War with the mass slaughter, the deprivation of medicine and food there as a result of sanction policies, and so on. There’s too much at stake to allow this to pass.

So, go to the Schiller Institute website. Go to this [link](#) to reach the Petition to Exonerate LaRouche. This



LPAC-TV

Organizations associated with Lyndon LaRouche are conducting an international campaign petitioning President Trump to exonerate Lyndon LaRouche.

is something that people should use. Our listeners should study what’s in the statement in the petition, look at the condolence letters, look at the [history of Mr. LaRouche](#), and use all of this to educate your friends and your family. Because what’s at stake now is the future of mankind, and this is what Lyndon LaRouche devoted his life to.

So I urge people to take this opportunity, to wage a battle for the exoneration of LaRouche, which is a fight, precisely, for bringing into existence the New Paradigm based on the ideas of LaRouche, such as a Four-Power Agreement, a New Bretton Woods, the [Four LaRouche Laws](#) for the economy, and other ideas.

This is an opportunity for people who always ask, “What can I do to stop this attack on Trump?” Fight for the exoneration of LaRouche and the destruction of the anti-science networks, and that will clear the way for the proper kind of discussion to take place in the United States.

Helga, do you have anything you’d like to add?

Zepp-LaRouche: For a very long time, I have thought that for the United States to become really great again, to go back to the great tradition of the American Revolution, it has to honor my husband. And I’m asking all of you to look at what he has been writing and his vision for the future. And then, I really appeal to you: Fight with us for his exoneration. That’s the best thing you can do for the United States and the world.

Harley Schlanger: And for yourself and your families.

So, Helga, thank you very much, and we’ll see you again next week.

Zepp-LaRouche: Till next week.

Italy's Move to Join Belt and Road Unleashes Panic in Geopolitical Centers

by Claudio Celani

March 10—A coalition of forces—including the City of London, failing European governments, the European Commission, U.S. neocons, and a fifth column within Italy itself—has mobilized in an effort to sabotage Chinese President Xi Jinping's upcoming visit to Italy, March 22-23, and to prevent the two governments from signing a friendship and cooperation protocol.

Especially targeted is Undersecretary of State in the Ministry of Economic Development, Michele Geraci, the mastermind of a policy aimed at establishing cooperation between Italy and China in the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) and in the development of Africa.

The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that Italy and China will probably sign during Xi's visit, or at the latest, during Prime Minister Giuseppe Conte's visit to the Second Silk Road Forum in Beijing in May, has become almost a *casus belli* for the geopolitical trans-Atlantic establishment.

According to Italian [media sources](#), there is one passage in the draft Memorandum, which includes the phrase, "Community of shared future for mankind/community of common destiny," that provoked a sharp, hostile response from certain elements in the U.S. embassy.

That phrase, indeed, defies the British-directed effort to establish China, as well as Russia, as "enemies" of the West. One can understand why geopolitical centers in the trans-Atlantic world are alarmed.

On March 6, the British *Financial Times* (*FT*) kicked off the campaign against Italy, quoting U.S. National Security Council spokesman, Garrett Marquis, who makes a not-so-veiled threat: "We view BRI as a 'made by China, for China' initiative. We are skeptical that the Italian government's endorsement will bring

The image is a screenshot of the Financial Times website. At the top, the 'FINANCIAL TIMES' logo is visible. Below it, a navigation bar includes links for HOME, WORLD, US, COMPANIES, TECH, MARKETS, GRAPHICS, OPINION, WORK & CAREERS, LIFE & ARTS, and HOW TO SPEND IT. There are also links for 'Sign In' and 'Subscribe'. A section titled 'Latest on Belt and Road Initiative' features three article teasers: 'US, China and the return of a two-bloc world', 'China tells Italy to stick to Belt and Road decision', and 'How Italy's ruling class has warmed China investments'. The main article headline is 'Italy set to formally endorse China's Belt and Road Initiative', with a sub-headline 'White House hits out at plan to sign agreement that is likely to alarm Brussels'. Below the text is a photograph of construction workers on a site with cranes and a building under construction. A caption below the photo reads: 'Builders at work last year in Sri Lanka on a project that is part of China's Belt and Road Initiative © Bloomberg'. On the right side of the image, there is a vertical sidebar with the text 'Project impr' and 'Form perfo build home confi outco'.

any sustained economic benefits to the Italian people, and it may end up harming Italy's global reputation in the long run."

Marquis further said that U.S. officials had raised concerns about what he called the negative effects of "China's infrastructure diplomacy," and urged "all allies and partners, including Italy, to press China to bring its global investment efforts into line with accepted international standards and best practices."

The *FT* report was picked up by Reuters and subsequently covered by media internationally. Marquis was then joined by a spokesperson of the EU Commission, who warned Italy to "ensure compliance with EU rules and EU Law and to respect the unity of the European Union in implementing EU policies."



CC/Michel Temer

President Xi Jinping.



LPAC-TV

Michele Geraci, Undersecretary of the Ministry of Economic Development.

might decouple from the Western alliance or from the EU will disappear. The MOU is not a treaty but a framework for Italian companies to receive support from the Italian government in their trade and investments with China and the BRI. He then turned the heat on the U.S. government, stating, “if there is someone who is in the debt trap” with China, “it is the United States, with a \$1 trillion debt, owned by Beijing.”

Two days earlier, Prime Minister Conte had made clear that despite international pressures from its “partners” and “allies,” Italy won’t change its mind on the Belt and Road Initiative.

The Old Order vs. the New

What is behind that is revealed by the German business daily *Handelsblatt* the same day: “In Paris and Berlin they have a bad suspicion: China is using its economic effort to gain more and more influence on EU political decisions.”

Whereas other EU countries, such as Portugal and Greece, have already signed MOUs with China on the Belt and Road, Italy would be the first founding member of the European Community and the first G7 member to do so.

In order to increase the pressure, a few neo-liberal Italian figures were recruited to the campaign, such as former Prime Ministers Romano Prodi and Enrico Letta, who advised Prime Minister Conte not to sign an MOU at this stage.

On March 7, the *New York Times* immediately reposted a twitter by Undersecretary of State in the Foreign Ministry, Guglielmo Picchi, an investment banker with Barclays in London, saying he believes “there is still work to do and further reflections inside the government,” and that “at this point no memorandum should be signed” on the Belt and Road.

Both Undersecretary Geraci and Prime Minister Conte, as well as the Chinese government, have reacted firmly to these pressures. In a speech at a public event in Genoa on March 10, Geraci said he is sure that when the content of the MOU becomes known, all fears that Italy

initiative. Conte said:

Xi Jinping will soon visit us this month. We are working to sign an MOU. The Silk Road is a major project of infrastructural connectivity which offers a large availability by China to promote a trade exchange and not only that. I believe that, with all necessary cautiousness, this can be an opportunity, a chance for our country.



CC/OSCE Parliamentary Assembly

Guglielmo Picchi, Undersecretary of State in the Foreign Ministry.

It is an opportunity for our country system and for Europe in general.

As for the U.S. ally, Conte stated,

We have explained that this is for us a choice of economic and trade relationships. The fact that we are comfortably in the Atlantic alliance and in the European system does not prevent us from making economic and trade choices that allow us to have more opportunities.

The Chinese view was given by Foreign Minister Wang Yi on March 8:

Historically, Italy has been a terminal of the Silk Road. We welcome Italy and other European countries that take active part in the Belt and Road Initiative. Italy is an independent country and we are confident that you can stick to the decision you have taken in an independent way.

At the same time, *Global Times* ran an unsigned editorial in its Chinese language edition, stating that characterizing the Silk Road as “a trap” is “an insult to the IQ of Italians.”

What’s Italy Up To?

Although the MOU between Italy and China is not yet ready, the European Commission-connected media website, *EurActiv*, leaked its content March 9, with the intent of sabotaging it. If the leaked content is genuine, the leak probably comes from the office of the Italian Foreign Minister, Enzo Moavero Milanesi, one of the “very few” persons privy to the MOU’s content, along with the Prime Minister, Undersecretary of State Geraci, Economic Development Minister Luigi Di Maio, and Finance minister Giovanni Tria. Moavero Milanesi was rumored to be against the Memorandum, a credible proposition given his profile. Moavero Milanesi is an aristocrat who made a career as a bureaucrat in the EU before being called into the austerity government by then Prime Minister Mario Monti in 2011. He has been put in the Conte government as a watchdog for the EU by State President Sergio Mattarella.

According to *EurActiv*, China plans to cooperate with Italy in the development of “roads, railways, bridges, civil aviation, ports, energy, and telecommuni-



CC/European University Institute

Enzo Moavero Milanesi, Foreign Minister

cations,” as part of Beijing’s Belt and Road Initiative. According to *EurActiv*, the memo also says that China and Italy “will promote synergies and strengthen communication and coordination,” as well as “enhance policy dialogue” on “technical and regulatory standards.”

EurActiv then accuses the Italian government of having passively accepted a text dictated by Beijing, writing on its website, “A source revealed late on Thursday evening that the text currently in the hands of *EurActiv* concerns proposals put forward by the Chinese state. However, as yet no changes to the text have been made by the Italian government.”

Although the validity of the leaked report is unconfirmed, it is nonetheless in Italy’s interest to upgrade its infrastructure, especially its ports, as Italy is at the conjunction of the Maritime and the Terrestrial Silk Road, as another article in the *Global Times* correctly emphasized.

An insight into the direction that current developments could take, might be gleaned from the scheduled visit by President Xi to Palermo, Sicily on the third day of his Italian visit. It was Geraci, himself a Palermitan, who emphasized the importance of such a visit for a number of reasons, including the perspectives for development of Sicily and Southern Italy.

In an interview with *Giornale di Sicilia* March 3, Geraci spoke about the unique opportunity presented by the visit in providing good publicity for Sicily, but also the development possibilities, including infrastructure development. He said, “The Chinese are good at infrastructure and we greatly need their involvement. For example, if the President wants to go to Agrigento, we would have a very serious logistical problem.” Geraci thereby points to the fact that a place like Agrigento—known for its “Temple Valley” with some among the best preserved ancient Greek temples in the world—is difficult to reach because of poor road, railway, and air transport connections.

“All proposals to attract investments advanced before March 23, can be blessed by President Xi,” Geraci said. “We must clarify what we want China to do in Sicily. To advance proposals after Xi’s visit would be useless.” Geraci mentions energy, education, and research as possible cooperation areas. He added, “We must exploit the cultural similarities that bind us to these people, which similarities are the grounds for any business. I regret that in the last twenty years, not enough has been done to strengthen this bond.”

Win-Win Proposition Especially for Italy

According to Luo Hongbo, a senior researcher at the Institute of European Studies at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, quoted by CGTN (China Global Television Network), if Italy joins the BRI in the near future, it will be a win-win choice for both countries. Currently, Italy’s economy is fragile and stagnating. Though Italy has the fourth-largest share of the EU’s gross domestic product (GDP), its GDP per capita is below the EU average. Italy has an immense debt amounting to 130% of GDP, 2.3 trillion euro (\$2.6 trillion), the highest in the EU after Greece.

In the CGTN interview Luo states, “Trading with China under the BRI could be a solution. The two countries have a lot to offer each other economically and their development strategies complement in many ways.” Luo also points out that the export of processed products is the lifeline of the Italian economy, and China is a huge market.

According to China’s Foreign Ministry, bilateral trade between China and Italy was over \$49.5 billion in 2018, a year-on-year increase of 10.6%. China’s new direct investment in Italy has now reached over \$900 million.

Luo adds that China can also learn from Italy, as Italy has many advanced technologies including machinery production and the clothing industry. He put forward the idea that China and Italy could jointly explore third-party markets, such as North Africa, under the framework of the BRI. He concluded by stating,

As Geraci said earlier, this would be “win-win” for all parties involved: African countries need to develop infrastructure, transportation, technology and trade, while Italy and China have world-leading companies in these fields and can work together to help Africa develop. At the same time, Chinese and Italian companies also have investment opportunities in Africa. In a nutshell, strengthening cooperation with China is a choice made by Italy regarding its national interest . . . We always say, “When in Rome, do as the Romans do.” Now, it is Rome again, why not let the Romans decide themselves?

Who’s in Command?

Geraci has emphasized that Italy is seeking to improve its exports to China, which lags far behind Germany, France, and even Switzerland with only 15 billion euro. This is not much different from President Trump’s effort to re-balance U.S. trade with Beijing. And indeed, the warnings against Italy coming from the National Security Council and the State Department via the U.S. embassy in Rome might not at all reflect Trump’s views.

Trump and Conte established a good relationship when they first met at the G7 meeting. Conte was the only one to share Trump’s wish that the G7 become again the G8, with Russia brought back in. Eventually, during Conte’s state visit to Washington, the two governments established a joint “[directorship](#)” for the stabilization of Libya. Whereas the other European “Bigs,” such as France and Germany, have snubbed Trump, Italy has always stood by its U.S. ally.

There is no “problem” between Trump and Italy. Rather, the British and trans-Atlantic forces that have unleashed the “Russiagate” attacks on Trump, are the same interests attempting to sabotage Italy’s initiatives toward China. The goal of both efforts is to prevent a New Paradigm among nations and to continue down the path of endless wars and economic decadence and decay.

INTERVIEW

Discussion with Philippines Secretary of National Defense

EIR Asia Editor, Michael Billington interviews the Secretary of National Defense of the Philippines, Maj. General Delfin Lorenzana. Their conversation took place on March 1, 2019.

Michael Billington: Hello, General. How are you?

Delfin Lorenzana: Hi, Mike, I'm fine, thank you.

Billington: Good to see you again.

Lorenzana: First, I'm sorry to hear that Lyn passed away.

Billington: Yes, it's a great loss. I think our enemies will be even more fearful of him in death than when he was alive, because his ideas are still there. We have had powerful, wonderful messages from all over the world about how he inspired people, and nations, through ideas which will never die. It's an interesting time.

Lorenzana: I remember with fondness my meeting with him in Leesburg.

Billington: Round Hill, at his home. I'll ask you to comment on your thoughts about Mr. LaRouche at the end.

Lorenzana: OK.

Billington: It's great to see you again after such a long time since your time in the United States—13 years I believe ...



Philippine News Agency/Joey O. Razon

Delfin Lorenzana, Secretary of the National Defense of the Philippines.

Lorenzana: 14 years actually.

Experiences with Duterte

Billington: You served as military attaché at the Philippine Embassy in Washington, and then as head of Veterans Affairs. Now you are the Secretary of National Defense for the Philippines. I know you were appointed soon after Mr. [Rodrigo] Duterte was elected President in 2016, but that you had previous experience with Duterte when he was Mayor of Davao. Could you say a few words about that?

Lorenzana: Yes, we first met when I was appointed as a battalion commander of the 2nd Scout Ranger Battalion in Davao, in 1987. Mr. Duterte was the vice mayor then. It was next year, 1988, that he ran for mayor and won. We worked together, closely, for the next two years, in clearing the city of the NPA [New People's Army—the armed wing of the Communist Party], which was in the city.

Billington: You were dealing then both with communist and Islamic terrorists, right?

Lorenzana: Not at that time. Islamic radicalism was not present in 1987, mostly bandits and communist insurgency.

Billington: I know that President Duterte has, both politically and militarily, maintained the historic relations of the Philippines with the United States. However, he had earlier quite openly rejected the policies of President

Obama, who wanted a confrontation with Russia and China. You've been engaged in some of the military diplomacy with Russia and China, since President Duterte came in.

Lorenzana: Yes. For the longest time we were dealing only with the United States and its allies—Australia, Japan, and South Korea—all the countries here that had close relations with the United States, only to find out that China and Russia were also very eager to develop relations with us. So, when President Duterte became President, he visited Beijing, and then Moscow, and directed me to visit those countries again, and meet with the defense ministers of China and Russia. We found out that we have a lot of things in common—fighting terrorism, keeping our countries safe, and they were in fact willing to help us develop our own defense capability.

Billington: As I recall, under the Obama Administration, the United States was offering military equipment that was more appropriate for fighting China, rather than for fighting terrorism. Is that correct?

Lorenzana: (laughs) We did not think of it that way. I wasn't the Secretary then, but I think that we are trying to develop our defense capability.

Billington: How have your relations with the United States developed, both politically and militarily, under Presidents Duterte and Donald Trump. How have they evolved?

Lorenzana: The relationship is still very strong, Mike. The EDCA [Enhanced Defense Coop-



Philippines President Rodrigo Duterte has established friendly relations with Russia's President Vladimir Putin ...



... and China's President Xi Jinping, while maintaining close ties with the U.S.

eration Agreement, signed in 2014] is moving along. We just inaugurated the first EDCA facilities at Basa Air Base in central Luzon. I think the next one will be on Palawan Island, facing the South China Sea. EDCA is a follow on to the Visiting Forces Agreement that we signed with the United States in 1998.

The Mutual Defense Treaty, and China

Billington: I understand that you have recently called for a re-evaluation, or a review of the U.S.-Philippines Mutual Defense Treaty signed in 1951.

Lorenzana: Yes, I think that Treaty should have been reviewed when the U.S. left its bases in the Philippines, in 1991, because the parameters of our defense have dramatically changed without the security umbrella of the United States. There are ambiguities we would like to clear up, like which part of the Philippines do they mean when they say “metropolitan Philippines”—does it include some of the shoals and islands that we also claim in the South China Sea?

Now, we still believe that the United States left the Chinese free to do whatever they wanted in 1995, when they, the Chinese,



President Duterte rejected President Obama's demand for confrontation with China.

started to occupy Mischief Reef in our 200-nautical-mile Exclusive Economic Zone [EEZ]. And now that reef is a developed island, an artificial island, with a 3.5-km runway and a lot of facilities. Not only that, China also has facilities on Subi Reef, which is outside our 200-mile EEZ, but it is in viewing distance (14 nautical miles) from another one of our islands, Pag-asa, and it also has a 3-km runway, and is also developed.

So we believe that the ambiguity of the Treaty, I think, left the United States to interpret it the way it wanted to—had they stopped the Chinese at the start in 1995, then we wouldn't have this problem now in the South China Sea, Mike. That's what we believe here in the Philippines.

Billington: I would suppose that that question in your mind is that if there were a conflict with China over these islands, whether the treaty would necessitate the United States defending the Philippines. Is that correct?

Lorenzana: Yes. The statement of American officials, when they said they do not meddle in territorial disputes, that pretty much gave the Chinese blanket authority to do what they wanted to do in the South China Sea.

Billington: There is a second issue you have identified about the Treaty. In the case of a military conflict between the United States and China, would the Philippines be required by the Treaty to join the United States against China?

Lorenzana: Yes.

Billington: And you don't think that is appropriate for the current relations. Is that right?

Lorenzana: Yes. The Treaty will kick in, immediately, because the Treaty calls for one to help the other if the other is attacked, in the Pacific, or any of their ships are attacked, we are involved. Now the problem here, Mike, is that we are within striking distance of Chinese medium range missiles. If U.S. forces would be stationed here, if there is a conflict between the United States and China, then we are a fair target by the Chinese.



CC

Mischief Reef, within the Philippine 200-nautical-mile Exclusive Economic Zone, but occupied by China since 1995.

Billington: Do you think this can be reformed, or revised, in the Mutual Defense Treaty?

Lorenzana: We'll see, because we'll also have to listen to the other side, what they propose on the table when we have this formal review.

Sovereignty, Terrorism, and Economic Development

Billington: I understand the concern about the sovereignty over these islands. On the other hand I understand that you and President Duterte are trying to work with China on joint development programs for the regions that are contested between the two countries.

Lorenzana: Yes, but not me, Mike. It's the Departments of Energy and Foreign Affairs who are trying to ink some kind of agreement on joint development of gas and oil extraction. I think it would work. At present we have a gas field at Malampaya (about 80km NE from El Nido in Palawan Island), operated by the Shell Corporation, and the sharing is 60-40—60% for the Philippines and 40% for Shell. I think the Chinese are also amenable to that kind of sharing, so it will work fine, it will be acceptable to us.

Billington: What kind of military aid have you been receiving from China and from Russia? Has it been significant?

Lorenzana: Not too significant, but at the height of

the Marawi siege [the five-month battle with ISIS and Abu Sayyaf Islamic terrorists who seized the town of Marawi in Mindanao], China delivered 10,000 rifles, mostly M16s and a couple of million rounds, and about 60 sniper rifles, and they also delivered four fast boats to be used in the South. Russia also delivered 5,000 rifles to us, also M16 compatible, and gave us, I think, 20 big military trucks—also to help us in our fight against the terrorists. That’s about it, Mike. That’s not very significant—very small compared to what we are now receiving from the United States.

Billington: The United States also supported that effort in Marawi, right?

Lorenzana: Yes, there are still U.S. Special Forces in Zamboanga City—that’s a city in Mindanao, not too far from Marawi. Immediately after the start of the fighting, the United States sent an intelligence team and some drones to help us in Marawi.

Billington: Was there any cooperation or contact between the United States, Russia, and China in all of this, or was it completely separate?

Lorenzana: Separate, Mike, because no Chinese or Russian troops came in to help us, only troops from the United States. The Australians came to help, they sent two of their P-3 Orion surveillance planes.

Progress in the War on Drugs

Billington: The other big fight you have in the Philippines is the war on drugs. As you know, President Duterte’s war on drugs has brought a lot of very, very strong criticism from some in the United States—but not from President Trump, who has supported the fight. And even though the United States is suffering the worst drug crisis in the history of our nation, still people complain about what they consider to be authoritarian policies in dealing with the drug crisis in the Philippines.

So I wonder how you think this war on drugs is going, where it’s heading, and how you deal with some of the British and U.S. criticism, and complaints from international human rights types.

Lorenzana: Well, I think it is normal for them to criticize anybody that doesn’t fit their idea of civilized society.

Billington: Indeed!

Lorenzana: I think we are succeeding in our fight against illegal drugs. There are still a lot of drugs going around the country, because we have a very porous border. Lately our military and fishermen have been fishing bricks of cocaine and meth in the shores of Mindanao, meaning that these drugs are no longer coming in through customs, through containers, but dropped in the sea to be retrieved by their local contacts in the Philippines. That is one of our main efforts now, is to prevent the entry of drugs into the Philippines.

Billington: Has the Philippines been a trans-shipment point for drugs into the United States?

Lorenzana: They say it is. Some of the cocaine and heroin that come from Asia, especially from the Golden Triangle of Burma, Laos, and Cambodia are coming in here and being trans-shipped anywhere else in the world. But that news came to us a couple of years back, and we aren’t seeing anything like that anymore. But we believe we are still a transshipment point for drugs going into the United States, and also Europe.

Build-Build-Build, and the Belt & Road

Billington: As you know, we have been very much involved, Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche, in the development of the idea of the New Silk Road, which especially under Xi Jinping, has become a major international development project, of a scale that is unprecedented in history. I know President Duterte has his Build-Build-Build policy for developing infrastructure and wants to cooperate with China on the Belt and Road. How is that going so far?

Lorenzana: Our president’s Build-Build-Build program could be complementary to the program of the Belt and Road Initiative. We are on board, we’ve signed on to the BRI. We’ll see how this will play out in the future.

Billington: The Philippines could very well become a hub of the 21st Century Maritime Silk Road.

Lorenzana: Yes, very much, we are smack in the center of the trade routes. We will be there.

The Citizen National Guard

Billington: I know that you spoke at the founding convention of the Citizen National Guard [CNG].

Lorenzana: Yes.

Billington: The CNG was organized by our friend Butch Valdes, who is also the head of the Philippine LaRouche Society.

Lorenzana: Yes.

Billington: What is your sense of the purpose and the goals of that organization?

Lorenzana: I think it is a very good organization. They have lofty ideals and objectives. All they have to do is propagate these ideas all over the country to generate more membership. From there, we can actually pursue some of the plans for the country. It's actually an organization to support the development of the nation. I support that. I am a member of that organization.


The Philippines as an East/West Bridge

Billington: We look at the Belt and Road as a means for breaking down the division between East and West through development corridors, not only in Asia but in the whole world. Besides great development projects, the idea is to create a new paradigm for mankind, which is based not on East vs. West, British imperial divisions of the world, but one where people look at the common aims of mankind.

I think you know that Mr. LaRouche always saw the Philippines as playing a very crucial role in this, because, in a sense, it has one leg in the East and one leg in the West. You have very negative aspects of the impact of the Spanish and American colonial eras, but you have also the positive aspects in terms of assimilating cultures of both East and West. In that sense, as a nation, the Philippines serves as a bridge, despite the adage of the British writer, Rudyard Kipling who asserted, "East is East, and West is West and never the twain shall meet."

How do you actually unite these two parts of the world? What are your thoughts on this?

Lorenzana: I think there was actually some push-back on the Belt and Road of the Chinese, but there are so many countries that have signed in to it. There are



criticisms in the papers that the Belt and Road Initiative of the Chinese is hitting some snags, because of suspicions that China is trying to subvert nations by providing soft loans, like in Djibouti and in Sri Lanka. I think that has a negative effect on the minds of people on what this BRI is all about. There is also [talk about] a "debt trap" that is coming out now. I don't know who is disseminating this in the media, but this is having a negative effect, somewhat, on the BRI.

But the way I look at the BRI, it is good, because if you connect the Indochinese Peninsula to Asia, to China then going on to Europe, you open up a lot of roads, other than the Malacca Straits and the Strait of Hormuz. I think that is good, Mike. We support that.

Win-Win

Billington: This brings up another question. I know what you mean by the mass publicity in the West about "debt trap," the Belt and Road is a new imperial plan to take over the world militarily by the Chinese, and so on. We know this to be false. Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche have been involved with the Chinese in planning this from the beginning, and they have this "win-win" idea, to benefit China and benefit everyone else as well.

The BRI is quite the opposite of what was being done by the West for many, many years, which was that they simply refused to invest in infrastructure in the Third World. They would take their raw materials, but they weren't interested in building railroads, or power facilities. So the BRI is looked at by the developing nations in Africa and South America and Southeast Asia as an opportunity to eliminate poverty in their countries the same way the Chinese have done in theirs.

Lorenzana: Yes.

Relations with the U.S., China, India, Russia

Billington: But it brings up the question, in the United States—and I don't want to ask you to comment on the internal policies in the United States, but I think you know that President Trump is on the verge of signing a very positive trade deal with China. He praises China as a great country, he wants to be friends with China and Xi Jinping, and yet at the same time his Vice President and some of his Cabinet ministers are preaching that China is the new devil that wants to take over the world and take away everything from the United States. Various heads of state have commented on the difference between President Trump and many of the people around him.

How does that affect your relations with the United States and with Russia and China, whom Trump insists we should be friends with, while others say that those two countries are our enemy?

Lorenzana: I know what you mean. I was there when Vice President Pence spoke at the ASEAN Summit. He represented President Trump last November in Singapore. Those were biting words by the Vice President towards China. But it doesn't affect our avowed independent foreign policy by our President. He keeps saying that we are friends to all, enemies to no one. That is why it's about time to closely engage the two superpowers in this region, China and Russia. And also India. I have been to India and they are very much willing to engage us here in Southeast Asia.

Billington: Is India also engaging in military affairs with the Philippines?

Lorenzana: They want to. We are looking at some of their hardware, to be bought by us. Our navy has been there already. We might buy some from them. And also Turkey. I went to Turkey as well, and they are so willing to come here, and put up some of their defense



PPD/King Rodriguez

President Duterte and Secretary Lorenzana consulting at a military event in Malacanán.

industries here in the Philippines. We want to engage everyone.

Billington: Yesterday, in the United States, there was a meeting of leading people, including former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright; former NATO Secretary General, Rasmussen, and Rep. Adam Schiff, the congressman who is most vociferous in denouncing Russia and denouncing President Trump as a tool of Russia.

Lorenzana: Yes, I know him.

Billington: These people said at this conference that there is now the greatest threat to democracy since the rise of fascism in the 1930s coming from the new authoritarian governments, naming Turkey, the Philippines ...

Lorenzana: Ha ha!

Billington: ... Russia, China, of course. It is their idea that nationalist governments which look to building their nations in collaboration with all other countries, as you say, that this is somehow a danger to western democracy, that is, what they consider to be democracy. I'll allow you to respond to Madeline Albright and Adam Schiff.

We Don't Listen to Fake News

Lorenzana: We don't mind, we don't listen to those words, Mike, we have our own understanding of the interests of our country and we will follow it. We have listened to those words before, and they didn't get us anywhere. We are on the right track now with President Duterte.

Billington: I would support that, and I know that Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche do as well. On Philippine history, with the presidency of Ferdinand Marcos, he and his wife Imelda at the time had a similar view of wanting to develop the industrial infrastructure. They had big industrial projects and self-sufficiency plans in agriculture, and also wanted to establish friendly relations with China, even when at that time, China was considered even more of a communist outpost. But they tried to establish relations with China, Iran and others. I think this is one of the reasons that they were targeted by the neoconservative movement at that time.

Lorenzana: Exactly!

U.S. Overthrew Marcos, and Now Maduro?

Billington: George Schultz and others ran the overthrow of the Philippine government. Would you concur with that?

Lorenzana: Yes, I believe that in the overthrow of Marcos the United States had a big role. I have seen a video of Marcos when he went to the U.S., I think in 1981 or 1982. During the Q&A, the Mutual Defense Treaty [MDT] came up—at that early time Marcos was already saying that we should take a look at this MDT, because he said the MDT was ratified by the Philippine Senate when it had only an executive signature from the U.S. President. He said, if something happened in the South China Sea—that early, Mike, in 1981, 82—if something happened in the South China Sea, the U.S. [President] would still need to go to your Senate, while we are dying here. That's exactly what he said. I'd like to review it again, because I'd like to show to the people here that the idea of reviewing the MDT is not new, it has been broached since the time of Marcos.



Public Domain/Dino Bartomucci

Former President Ferdinand Marcos in 1982, with then U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, who orchestrated the “color revolution” that deposed him.

Billington: There was the creation of a color revolution sponsored by foreign interests, which openly supported this, then argued that this was a reason for the United States to become involved.

I'm sure you are aware that what is taking place in Venezuela right now is very similar to the way that Marcos was overthrown.

My view is that one of the most important things Trump has said as President is that the invasion of Iraq was an absolute disaster.

Lorenzana: Yes.

... And Made Middle East a War Zone

Billington: ... turning the entire Middle East into a war zone with terrorist organizations, using arms from the United States, intended to overthrow people the U.S. considered dictators.

Lorenzana: I was the Defense attaché in the U.S. when Iraq was attacked in 2003. I had arrived in Aug. 2002. Before the attack was launched, I think a week before, all the defense attachés were called to the Pentagon, and were given a briefing on the impending operation. Someone asked after the briefing, “What will they do after they've won, after they defeated the Iraqi Republican Guards, what will they do?” And that's the problem. There was no exit strategy nor any strategy to hold on to the country. And American troops are still there. How many years?

Billington: There is still chaos in Libya, Iraq. They tried in Syria.

Lorenzana: And I think the United States wanted to remove the Syrian President Assad.

Billington: I don't think so. I don't think President Trump will allow that. When he announced the pullout of the troops ...

Lorenzana: I was talking about Obama. [President Barack] Obama wanted to remove Assad.

Billington: Yes, I'm sorry, that's true. We mobilized opposition to that, and many in the military had by that time learned the lesson of the disaster in Iraq and Libya and basically said no to Obama. Through fake news, Assad was accused of using chemical weapons, which was simply a lie orchestrated by the British White Helmets, to make it look like the Syrian Arab Armed Forces were doing that.

Unfortunately this is happening now in Venezuela, creating incidents in which the hope is that somebody gets killed, and use that to justify a military intervention. I bring this up because I think that Duterte also represents a nationalist leader—actually I think much better than [Nicolás] Maduro ever has been—but in the case of the Philippines you have a much more forceful and creative leader.

Is Duterte Next?

Is there a concern that you might see this neoconservative crowd in the West try to intervene against President Duterte?

Lorenzana: Yes, we are afraid of that, Mike. We have been cautioned by our friends that the neocons might try to take out the President. Even President Duterte talked about that several times in his public speeches. They are watching what our President does, that if he does things that align with their interests, as the neocons see it, or if President Duterte gets closer with the Chinese, Russia and India. But China said



PPD/King Rodriguez

President Duterte in 2016, with Delfin Lorenzana on his left, giving his signature "fist" salute, in 2016.

they don't want a military alliance with anybody. They want to have trade relations with everybody. They want to help people to improve themselves so that we can trade. I think that is what the Chinese are saying.

Can the 'Big Four' Come Together?

Billington: You mentioned China, Russia and India, that you have been involved with. I think you know that Mr. LaRouche refers to what he calls the "Four Powers," that is, Russia, China, India, along with the United States representing European culture, the four great cultures of Eurasia, with Europe in total chaos now.

If these four nations came together, this would give them the necessary strength to replace the bankrupt financial system with something along the lines of the Alexander Hamilton policies, the Franklin Roosevelt policies, the best of the American System historically. Again I see the role of the Philippines as crucial, being friends of Russia, China, India and the U.S., a link, a bridge, bringing these cultures together to achieve a new paradigm. Not war and depression as we see around the globe today, but one that is based on taking the New Silk Road idea and a new financial system based on development, to bring the world together around the common aims of mankind.

Lorenzana: Our problem now, Mike, is that we are looking at post Duterte, when a new President comes in. We don't know if that President will be pursuing the same ideas that our President is doing now. But let's see. Hopefully we can get another Duterte, so that we can continue the programs that he started.

Billington: Let me close by asking—you said that you were aware that Mr. LaRouche passed away on Feb. 12. You had the opportunity many times during your 14 years in Washington to meet Mr. LaRouche. I wonder how you see his impact on yourself, your nation and the world.

Lyndon LaRouche

Lorenzana: Yes, Mike, I had a one-on-one with you and Mr. LaRouche in 2003 at his home in Virginia, and so many times I would listen to his speeches in Washington, D.C. I think his ideas will live on. He worked for cooperation among nations, to uplift the lives of all people of the world. That's why he went around, speaking in Europe, in Asia, all over the world.

Unfortunately, some of his ideas did not match the

ideas of some people in the States, that's why he was in hot water for a while. They could put him in prison, but they could not stop his ideas from spreading. So I am very sad that he passed away, but I believe his ideas will live on, through you, through the *EIR*, propagating them.

Billington: Anything else you'd like to say to those around the world who follow us?

Lorenzana: Yes, my message to the world is let's continue to cooperate. This divide, East and West, "Evil Empire," and all those words that divide should be stopped, and let us cooperate.

I was talking to some of my friends a couple of days back. We were looking at the amount of money we spend on defense. Look at this money, which could be used to develop our land and our people, that should be more beneficial to future generations. But here we are, in an arms race. I think we should stop this once and for all and start developing our countries. That's my message.

Billington: Thank you very much.

NEW RELEASE, **Volume II**

The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge:

A Shared Future For Humanity


The spirit of the New Silk Road is changing the world for the better. The exciting overview in this new 440-page Volume II report updates the roadmap given in Volume I, on the coming into being of the World Land-Bridge for development and peace. BRICS countries have a strategy to prevent war and economic catastrophe. It's time for the rest of the world to join!

Includes:

Introduction by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, "A Shared Future for Humanity."

Progress Reports on development corridors worldwide, spurred by China's Belt and Road Initiative. Features 140 maps.

Principles of Physical Economy by Lyndon LaRouche, especially his "Four Laws" for emergency action in the Trans-Atlantic.



Soft cover (440 pages)

Domestic Price: **\$60**. Shipping cost included in price.

Foreign Price: \$60. Add \$15 per copy for shipping.

Order from newparadigm.schillerinstitute.com

Tel 1 703 297 8368

II. America Acts Against Empire

President Trump's Committee on Climate Security: A Much-Needed, Overdue Return to Science

by Jason Ross

President Donald Trump plans to appoint a panel to find out if man-made climate change is actually causing an imminent, irreversible, insurmountable, inescapable crisis that threatens not only the entire human species, but planet Earth as a whole. Shouldn't we find out whether there truly is an impending catastrophe before allocating literally trillions of dollars for prevention and remediation, putting at risk the well-being of billions of people who will be adversely affected by expensive and unavailable energy? The president's committee requires urgent support!

March 11—The *Washington Post* ran a story on February 20, centered on leaked National Security Council planning documents regarding an executive order to establish a committee “to advise the President on scientific understanding of today’s climate, how the climate might change in the future under natural and human influences, and how a changing climate could

affect the security of the United States.”


In an effort to prevent the formation of this committee, a vicious defamation campaign has been launched against Dr. William Happer, a distinguished scientist and Princeton Professor of Physics, who has been asked to head the committee. Happer is also a deputy assistant to the president and the National Security Council’s senior director for emerging technologies.

The *Post* snidely noted that several studies have already been performed by various U.S. agencies, but that the NSC document had the audacity to assert that, “These scientific and national security judgments have not undergone a rigorous independent and adversarial scientific peer review to examine the certainties and uncertainties of climate science, as well as implications for national security.”

Happer, the former director of the Department of Energy’s Office of Science (the Nation’s largest supporter of basic research in the physical sciences, with an annual



President Trump has asked Dr. William Happer, a distinguished and well-known Professor of Physics at Princeton, to head the presidential committee on climate science.



Gage Skidmore

budget of \$6 billion), has been accused of lacking expertise in the subject matter and of being in the pocket of the fossil fuel industry. This last charge is both untrue in Happer’s case, and is selectively applied: how often are proponents of impending climate doom attacked for being part of the multi-trillion-dollar Climate, Inc.?

Two questions are being prominently raised: is the science settled, and what are the actual costs of the Green New Deal?

Is the Science ‘Settled’?

A March 5 [letter](#) signed by 58 self-described “senior military and national security leaders” opposes the climate committee on the grounds that the science is already settled, stating:

Climate change is real, it is happening now, it is driven by humans, and it is accelerating. The overwhelming majority of scientists agree: less than 0.2% of peer-reviewed climate science papers dispute these facts. In this context, we are deeply concerned by reports that National Security Council officials are considering forming a committee to dispute and undermine military and intelligence judgments on the threat posed by climate change. This includes second-guessing the scientific sources used to assess the threat, such as the rigorously peer-reviewed [National Climate Assessment](#), and applying that to national security policy.

Statistics such as the “0.2%” cited in this letter, and the commonly heard “97% of scientists” agree with climate change, are both misleading and inaccurate. First, there has been no meaningful survey of all scientists with relevant knowledge in this field. Secondly, it is essential to unpack what it might mean to “agree with” or “acknowledge” climate change. Clearly, climate change exists, and has existed for the history of the Earth, even without human involvement.

The question is not *whether* but *to what extent* human-caused changes in the atmosphere drive climate variations, *and whether such changes are good or bad*.

Meaningful statistics (but ones that do not exist) would include responses to the following questions:

- What would be the impact of doubling atmospheric CO₂?
- To what extent does water vapor cause a feedback effect?
- To what extent must we take into account the solar magnetic field’s effect on the creation of clouds via cosmic radiation?
- What is the certainty range on these predictions?
- How well have climate models of the last two decades fared at predicting the global climate during the past 5 to 10 years?
- Will the specific, foreseen changes in climate be beneficial or harmful, or a mixture of the two?

The climate of the Earth, as it exists in the solar system, is much more complex than a foolishly simple, yes-no question about “believing in” or “denying” climate change.

How can any such changes be determined? An individual cannot possibly notice that the climate is changing through their personal experience, which is necessarily limited in location and time. And it is absolutely ludicrous to claim that anyone could know, through their personal experience of weather, the *cause* of any such changes.

Science is not fashion. It is not decided by taking a poll or by seeing what is most popular. The idea that



CC/Friends of Europe

Patrick Moore, an early and influential member of Greenpeace, quit the organization in 1986, and has since then opposed the Green population-reduction agenda and advocated nuclear power.

the Earth moves around the Sun was not popular, but it is true. Einstein's theory of relativity was not supported by a popular vote, but it is true. A scientific argument that relies on appeals to authority is suspect. But, sadly, it coheres with modern education, in which the joy of discovery through experiment is replaced by learning formulas but not their origin, and by performing virtual, simulated "experiments" on iPads, rather than learning by interacting directly with the physical world.

A true, adversarial review of supposedly "obvious" climate truths is needed to sort out the wheat from the chaff.

What are the Costs?

The United States currently relies on hydrocarbons (fossil fuels) for 78% of its energy needs. The recently proposed Green New Deal calls for a reduction of net CO₂ emissions down to zero within a decade. So-called "renewables," which currently provide 17% of our electricity, would have to be scaled up to provide 100%. And that doesn't even address the majority of U.S. energy use, which is not electricity. Transportation by air, land, and sea is overwhelmingly powered by hydrocarbons. What would it take to transition to 100% electric surface transportation? And would this even be technically possible for air and water transportation?

The worldwide costs for the less ambitious goals

put forward by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) are absolutely mind-blowing. Their "[Special Report Global Warming of 1.5°C](#)" claims that in order to prevent a temperature rise beyond 1.5°C, CO₂ emissions must be brought down to net zero by 2050. Point D.5.3 of the Summary for Policymakers gives an estimate of the cost: "Global model pathways limiting global warming to 1.5°C are projected to involve the annual average investment needs in the energy system of around 2.4 trillion USD2010 between 2016 and 2035."

This absurd goal is belied by the world's rapidly increasing use of fossil fuel energy to eliminate poverty and provide high living standards. China's CO₂ emissions tripled from 2000 to 2012. During that period, poverty in China decreased from 40.5% in 1999 to 6.5% in 2012, according to the World Bank. Even under the Paris Agreement, Chinese CO₂ emissions are expected to double by 2030, while those from India are expected to triple. Reliable and affordable energy means electricity in schools, fuel for agricultural equipment, transportation of crops to market, high-value-added manufacturing, top-tier research facilities, and efficient movement of people and goods; this brings higher life expectancies, lower disease rates, improved nutrition, and education.

Simply put, the green agenda means a reduction of human life and of human living standards. In a recent interview, a former top leader of Greenpeace, Patrick Moore, was very direct:

I suppose my main objection is the effective elimination of 80 percent of the world's energy would likely eliminate 80 percent of the world's people in the end. I mean, just growing food, for example—how would we grow food for the world's people without tractors and trucks, and all of the other machinery that is required to deliver food, especially to the inner cities of large centres like Moscow, Shanghai and New York City? How would we get the food to the stores? It's symptomatic of the fact that people who live in cities just take it for granted that this food appears there for them in supermarkets in

great variety, healthy food to keep them alive when they couldn't possibly grow it for themselves with such dense populations. And if, in fact, fossil fuels were banned, agricultural productivity would fall dramatically, and people would starve by the millions. So, that is just a little bit of why I think it's a ridiculous proposal.

The costs for implementing a Green New Deal or comparable policy are enormous, and every dollar spent on such projects is a dollar unavailable for other uses, such as education, research, or eliminating poverty through bringing on line much-needed efficient power.

Given the enormous, real costs of any plan to reduce CO₂ emissions or to mitigate against purported climate catastrophe, wouldn't it be remarkably irresponsible to future generations, if we were not absolutely certain about the science and models behind climate predictions, and of the costs (and benefits) of changing CO₂ levels?

Where Did This Come From?

In a recent article, Megan Beets reports that

The modern environmentalist movement, to which so many deluded people in the West today pay obeisance, was never a grassroots movement of concerned youth, and never had anything to do with saving the Earth. It was created and promoted from the beginning by the British Empire to stop development: as a depopulation policy.

Emerging out of the eugenics movement, which became somewhat unpopular in the wake of Hitler's genocide, the re-branded "ecology" or "conservation" movement continued the goal of maintaining the pre-war colonial system in the post-WWII world.

In 1968, money from some of the biggest oligarchical families in the West was deployed to found the Club of Rome, which declared,

In searching for a new enemy to unite us, we came up with the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famine, and the like would fit the bill.... But in designating them as the

enemy, we fall into the trap of mistaking symptoms for causes.... **The real enemy, then, is humanity itself.**

In parallel the United Nations sponsored a series of conferences on population in the mid-1970s to promote the idea that human population growth is a cancer on the planet, and launched the hoax of "sustainable development."

A cultural paradigm shift occurred in the 1960s and 1970s, transforming the understanding of the relation of human beings to nature, and transforming the meaning of "progressive" from supporting progress to preventing it!

Beets argues:

Out of this process—not honest scientific work—came the formation of the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in 1988, with a goal of inducing nations into signing binding agreements to limit their own development and industrialization based on lies of the dangers of CO₂ and a coming climate apocalypse.

From this paradigm shift arise the unstated assumptions that underlie the emotional responses that many people have to these issues. One such assumption is a definition of "natural," which excludes human activity, implicitly creating a goal—humans should simply not exist. This goes along with the shift from global warming (a specific change that could cause problems) to climate *change*, taking the assumption that *any change to the climate would be bad*, simply by virtue of its being *change*. Is this really true? Using desalinated ocean water to transform a desert, with a remarkably low level of biological activity, into a lush garden would be a *good change*!

The results of the Presidential Committee on Climate Science could challenge these assumptions, and could have cultural effects extending beyond the debate over this single issue.

The climate narrative has largely been controlled by climate alarmists. Now it's time to give other experts a chance to weigh in, to have an open, sound, honest scientific discussion.

President Trump, for economic, scientific, and even cultural reasons, we call on you to move forward and appoint your Presidential Committee on Climate Science.

Pro-War Democrats Seek To Overthrow U.S. Constitution

by Harley Schlanger

March 8—A narrative for the deluded now dominates the nation’s media. The story goes that Democrats in the House of Representatives, flush from their victory last November, are now acting to re-impose the “rule of law” and to put an end to the corruption within the Trump Presidency.

This entirely fictional account bears so little resemblance to the truth, that if the physical laws which governed Pinocchio were to be imposed, most news commentators, reporters, and Democratic Party Congressmen would now be walking around with noses growing down to the ground.

In reality, an entirely different agenda—and a set of entirely different motives—is at work. What is at stake, what is central to the current political assault on Trump, is the determination by Donald Trump to pursue a policy of global peace. This commitment, which Trump had already clearly enunciated in his 2016 campaign, is what has provoked the hatred of the British monarchy and its Anglophile allies in the United States against President Trump. The British goal is to sabotage all of Trump’s current efforts toward peace, remove him from office, and to reverse all of the actions he has taken to extinguish the axioms of the 2001-2017 war regimes of the Bush/Obama presidencies.


Now Democratic Party leaders in the U.S. Congress have unleashed a new firestorm of assaults against Trump. The actions taken so far by Congressional Democrats signal not only their

collective determination to go for impeachment; their actions also are intended to sabotage the current initiatives Trump is taking defuse crisis situations throughout the world.

Many of these Congressional Democrats are now flirting with crossing the line into an open insurrection against the U.S. Constitution. They are dipping their toes into the pool of outright treason. Make no mistake. The current anti-Trump offensive is replete with lies, dishonesty and unlawful actions, all grounded in an intention to return U.S. policy to an aggressive anti-China, anti-Russia war stance. That is the intention. Any contrary narrative, such as can daily be seen on



Representatives Schiff (left) and Nadler (below) are leading figures in the effort to paralyze the foreign policy of the United States.



display in the establishment media, is simply fodder for the uninformed and credulous.

Storm Over Asia

Let us look at the current situation within the context of global events during the recent decades.

As Elliot Greenspan emphasized in his presentation to the March 2 Manhattan meeting of LaRouche PAC, to understand what has transpired in the world since September 11, 2001, it is necessary to “go back to 1991-92, and examine the policy proposals of British intelligence, of Chatham House (the Royal Institute of International Affairs), to develop what they called a *uni-polar world*.”

The 1989-1991 dissolution and dismemberment of the Soviet Union created an historic opportunity for initiating a new era of peace and global economic development. This is precisely what was addressed in the proposals by Lyndon and Helga LaRouche for a European Productive Triangle, and what ultimately became known as the World Land-Bridge and New Silk Road perspective. At the same time, however, the British monarchy and its American lap-dogs viewed the Soviet collapse as an opportunity to secure absolute Anglo-American hegemony. This is precisely what the 1989-1992 actions of Thatcher, Mitterrand and George H.W. Bush were intended to accomplish.

In 1999 Lyndon LaRouche warned, in a nationally televised [broadcast](#), *Storm Over Asia*, that, if not stopped, London-originated provocations against Russia and China would lead to World War III. Rather than heeding LaRouche’s warnings, after 9/11 the war drive went into high gear, with the Iraq and Afghanistan wars, the policy of regime change, NATO expansion, the coup d’état in the Ukraine, the U.S. withdrawal from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, and similar actions. Presidents George W. Bush and Barack Obama were equally guilty in committing these crimes.

The election of Donald Trump interrupted this war drive, and his subsequent—courageous—actions have put him at the center of a frenzied uprising to stop him.

Democratic Jacobins

With the long awaited conclusion of Special Counsel Robert Mueller’s investigation in sight, Democrats



NATO
U.S. Marines in NATO’s “Trident Juncture” exercise in Iceland on October 17, 2018.

in the Congress have begun a series of hearings in at least three House Committees. They have unleashed a “subpoena storm,” a demand for documents in preparation for what they intend will be the filing of one or more bills of impeachment. Though they piously intone that they are proceeding based on their commitment to “restoring the rule of law,” to counter what Representative Jerrold Nadler (D-N.Y.) called Trump’s “near daily attacks” on the rules and norms of “our system,” their actions confess a different agenda, and are themselves a deadly assault on the Constitution.

The goal of these investigations is to destroy the Constitutional power of a duly elected President to make policy, particularly foreign policy. The implications of this may be lost on the casual observer, but it is precisely the “Presidential” system, established at the Constitutional Convention in 1788 that is under assault. As Harvard law professor and constitutional scholar Alan Dershowitz has concluded, Congressional investigators are going beyond the “legitimate function of Congress,” and they are “going too far” in their use of the “oversight function.”

In particular, the intention of Nadler and his allies is to take away from Trump his right to pursue agreements for cooperation with Russia and China, in a decisive break with the geopolitical dogma which has kept the United States engaged in wars for the last eighteen years. Among the subpoenas issued by House Judiciary Committee Chairman Nadler, is a demand for all public and private communications between Trump and Russian President Putin. Nadler argues that these may show

that Trump “is not acting in the national interest” in his effort to establish a mutually beneficial relationship between the U.S. and Russia.

What is driving the Democrats in Congress into a frenzy is their fear that Mueller has not produced any evidence that Donald Trump was “colluding” with Putin. The anti-Trump media is filled daily with accounts of those who have been indicted by Mueller and have pleaded guilty, but to what? None of those alleged crimes relate to the mandate Mueller was given, to find evidence of “Russian meddling” and “collusion with Russia.” Some were prosecuted for actions that occurred long before the election of Trump, and are unrelated to Russiagate, as in the case of his former campaign chairman, Paul Manafort. At his sentencing on March 8, presiding Judge T.S. Ellis specified explicitly that Manafort was not convicted “for anything to do with Russian colluding in the presidential election.”

Other Mueller-obtained convictions are for so called process crimes, such as lying to the FBI, which occurred during the investigation, often having to do with misstatements based on a prosecutorial tactic known as the “perjury trap.” Again, none of these convictions nor indictments proves collusion, or obstruction of justice, the other charge Mueller has been pursuing.

The testimony of Trump’s former attorney Michael Cohen, initially hailed as filled with “bombshells” implicating Trump in multiple crimes, has also flopped. When asked by Congressional interrogators if he had any evidence of collusion with Russia by Trump or his campaign, Cohen admitted, “I do not. . . . But I have my suspicions.” In the U.S. legal system, “suspicion” is not a basis for either indictment or conviction of a crime, particularly when the accuser is clearly biased. The corrupt U.S. news media, however, has treated Cohen’s malignant fantasies as a smoking gun of Trump’s guilt.

Congress Unleashes Mayhem

Following the Democratic Party’s takeover of the House of Representatives in November 2018, Trump challenged the Democrats: “You can either choose to tie the country up in endless investigations, or we can cooperate on matters of bipartisan concern, such as infrastructure investments, lowering the cost of prescription drugs, trade deals, border security, etc.” As it has become clear, with their launching of the “subpoena storm,” that leading Democrats have no desire to coop-




Michael Cohen, former Trump lawyer; testifying before the House Oversight Committee on February 27, 2019.

erate, Trump tweeted on March 5, “So the campaign begins,” referring to his intent to make their efforts to sabotage his legislative and strategic agenda a campaign issue.

The destructive agenda of the Democrats was on full display in comments made on the March 3 Sunday talk shows. Nadler told the interviewer on ABC News that his inquiry will cover “alleged obstruction of justice, public corruption and other abuses of power.” Accusing Trump of evading accountability for his actions, Nadler implied that the hearings will be conducted as show trials to open the door to impeachment.

“Before you impeach someone,” he said, “You have to persuade the American public that it ought to happen.” Showing he has already reached the conclusion that he will go for impeachment, he added, “It’s very clear that the president obstructed justice,” citing as examples the firing of FBI Director James Comey—an action the President is legally and constitutionally empowered to do—as well as Trump’s allegedly trying to protect his former National Security Advisor, Michael Flynn, from prosecution; attacking the Mueller investigation; and intimidating witnesses.

When asked, “Why not go for impeachment now?” Nadler responded that despite the accusations he had just made, “We don’t have the facts yet. Impeachment is a long way down the road.” He then said that, before going for impeachment, it is necessary to persuade Trump voters “that you’re not just trying to steal—to reverse the results of the last election.” His pause after



CC/UN

Michael Bloomberg



CC/Phil Roeder

Tom Steyer

the word “steal” was an indication that he revealed more than he intended, exposing his true thoughts, that impeachment would amount to stealing the election from Trump and his voters! The day after this interview, Nadler released his demand for documents from 81 agencies, entities and individuals, including from Trump’s family members, his businesses, the White House and the Justice Department.

A second set of hearings is planned by Rep. Adam Schiff (D-Calif.), the vehemently anti Trump chair of the House Select Intelligence Committee. In preparation for the hearings, Schiff has hired Daniel S. Goldman, a former Assistant U.S. Attorney in the Southern District of New York (SDNY), to serve as a “senior adviser and director of investigation” for the committee. Goldman’s specialty at the SDNY was cases involving racketeering, gambling and money laundering, including targeting Russian organized crime. Schiff, who told CBS News on March 3 that “There is abundant evidence of collusion,” said he intends to pursue that charge, looking into whether Putin was paying off Trump through Russian organized crime figures investing in Trump properties in New York City! It was the charges brought against Michael Cohen by prosecutors of the SDNY that led to his guilty pleas.

A third committee investigating the Trump administration is the House Oversight Committee, under the chairmanship of Rep. Elijah Cummings (D-Md.).

Both Nadler and Schiff warned that they would subpoena Mueller’s final report, if Attorney General William Barr does not make it public. The laws governing the Special Counsel leave the decision whether to re-

lease the report to the Attorney General, to avoid damaging those who were investigated but not charged with any crime.

Billionaires for Impeachment

In addition to these hearings, there are now sixteen Democrats running for their party’s presidential nomination in 2020, almost all of whom insist that Trump must be removed from office, the sooner the better. Further, several billionaires recently have ruled out campaigns, but will make large contributions to either impeach Trump or defeat him

at the polls. One, Michael Bloomberg, spent \$100 million to support Democrats in the 2018 midterm election. In announcing his decision not to run, he said he would “spend freely to build the resistance movement to Trump.”

Tom Steyer, a Silicon Valley mogul, will also unleash torrents of money, to fund a “grass roots campaign to impeach Trump.” Both Bloomberg and Steyer are fanatic proponents of the fake science theory of “man made climate change,” and attack Trump for his rejection of the fraudulent “climate change” policies which are a cover for a drastic depopulation of the planet.

In response to the subpoena storm and impeachment frenzy, Trump tweeted that the Democrats “have gone stone cold crazy.” He attacked them for the timing of the Cohen hearings, which occurred as he was engaged in crucial but delicate negotiations with North Korean leader Kim Jong un. Trump has emphasized that his negotiations have been facilitated by cooperation from Russia, China, Japan and South Korea. His opponents do not want him to succeed in the effort to achieve a long term peace agreement with North Korea.

When asked what he thinks of the investigations by Congressional committees, he responded that they represent “a big fat fishing expedition desperately in search of a crime.” Further, he added that despite the chaos unleashed by his opponents, he intends to continue to work for the voters who elected him.

Trump has called the current Congressional insurrection “presidential harassment,” and it is precisely in that phrase that the illegal assault on the Constitution’s delegation of authority to the President to conduct foreign policy must be seen.

The LaRouche Alternative to the Existential Danger of a Third World War

by Elliot Greenspan

This is a shortened and edited version of a presentation by Elliot Greenspan to the March 2, 2019 Manhattan Meeting of the LaRouche PAC.

At our February 16 Schiller Institute conference, a dramatic intervention was made by the Russian government. The Russian Ambassador to the United Nations, Vassily Nebenzia, put forward an approximation of the Four Powers concept proposed over decades by Lyndon LaRouche, as the decisive initiative to stop the escalation toward nuclear war.

Read the beginning of the Ambassador's message, as delivered by the Councilor from the Russian mission, Theodore Strzhizhovskiy:

Theodore Strzhizhovskiy: We prepared a statement, which I will read now:

“First of all I welcome the organizers, participants, and guests of this conference. The Schiller Institute is known for its valuable contributions to the understanding of international political processes and development of new approaches to global challenges. The conferences held under your auspices are respectful platforms where the most urgent present-day issues can be discussed without politicizing and ideological clichés. We were very saddened by the bitter news of the passing of Lyndon LaRouche, the founder and inspirer of the Schiller Institute. We would like to express our deepest condolences to Helga Zepp-LaRouche, as well as to the relatives and colleagues. We are convinced that the paradigm of international political and economic interaction that he had proposed would be further developed by his apprentices and associates.”

Nebenzia proceeded to warn, in this message, about the shattering of the world security architecture, and counterposed the integration of the Eurasian Economic Union, led by Russia, and the Chinese One Belt One

Road. He emphasized the importance of the triangular process, Russia-China-India cooperation, and the urgency of the United States, of Russian-American relations coming into, shall we say, normalcy, or progress. And as you see, this is decisive for global stability.

Our power is rooted in LaRouche's singular power, the *Power of Reason*, as LaRouche calls his 1988 [autobiography](#)—the realm of ideas that actually shape history. In



UN/Manuel Elias

Vassily Nebenzia, Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation to the United Nations.

such an historic moment as this, this is uniquely decisive.

The Russians recognize this. They are playing the LaRouche card.

The Strategic Dimension

I want to concentrate this presentation on the strategic dimension of the unfolding crisis, in particular the existential danger of a third world war, a nuclear war of extinction. I want to focus your attention on this, on this war danger, insofar it is astonishing that such a danger appears not to exist if you listen to the mass media—the mainstream media, if you listen to the Congress, if you



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Jacques Cheminade, leader of the French LaRouche movement, speaks to the Schiller Institute Conference in Morristown, New Jersey on February 16, 2019.

listen to most citizens. Perhaps it's too frightening to face. Perhaps Americans fog out, thinking, "I can't do anything about this, about war and peace. I am preoccupied by my day to day concerns; family, job, survival, pleasure, matters closer to home, matters within my ken."

Happily, we have a growing movement, and we have a movement here, intersecting China and Russia and forces internationally, represented by those who are sending messages of condolence identifying the unique power of Lyndon LaRouche. But Americans, by and large, including the huge Trump support base, are not leading, not taking the urgently necessary actions. My intention here is to catalyze, not an antiwar movement, but a mass movement for peace through national and international economic development.

Listen to Jacques Cheminade, the leader of the French LaRouche movement, from the Schiller Conference two weeks ago:

Jacques Cheminade: Looking at all of us here, I see us with the eyes of the present, with all our imperfections, in this terrible moment of humanity, but I see us with the eyes of the future, and I am filled with hope, because our lives are shaped by the history of an organization which has always fought and fought to be at the forefront. Hope beyond pain and sorrow, hope across the boundaries of nations and time. . . . It is with con-

fidence that I see the common world as the world of Lyndon LaRouche.

We have before us the possibility of a paradigm change to free the world from the destructive grip of the British Empire and its ideology, but it will happen only if all of us become guiding lights ahead of what we are, and not followers of easy paths. So let's do it! Let's do it because it is our mandate and mission. This conference, to make sense, has to be followed by unprecedented political organizing to inspire minds, extending our hands to others beyond all parochialisms, personal biases, and borders. Our commitments, a New Bretton Woods, a National Bank, Public Credit, the Glass-Steagall Act, and fusion energy are not mere words or recipes to be repeated, but powerful ideas defining a

dynamic unity. If they do not become real, the world, as has been told us before, is doomed. The world is doomed.

LaRouche's Four Laws will define the future of humanity if there is going to be one. It is as simple as that. And it is what should make us decide what we will do with our lives. What de Gaulle called, at the liberation of Paris, our otherwise miserable and short lives. Not by adopting a set of cultish life savers, but as an intervention in history which confronts our quality of being human. At the moment the human house is threatened both by financial tsunami, and by the flames of war.

So I want to indicate, with some help from Vladimir Putin and Helga LaRouche and several others, the reality, the imminence of the flames of war that Jacques has referenced here. Why don't we look at President Putin's address, two weeks ago, to the Russian Federal Assembly on February 20, in Moscow?

Vladimir Putin: I have already said this, and I want to repeat: Russia does not intend—this is very important, I am repeating this on purpose—Russia does not intend to deploy such missiles in Europe first. If they really are built and delivered to the European continent, and the United States has plans for this, at least we have not heard otherwise, it will dramatically exacerbate the inter-



Vladimir Putin addressing the Federal Assembly on March 1, 2019 in Moscow.

national security situation, and create a serious threat to Russia, because some of these missiles can reach Moscow in just 10-12 minutes. This is a very serious threat to us. In this case, we will be forced, I would like to emphasize this; we will be forced to respond with mirror or asymmetric actions. What else does it mean?

I am saying this directly and openly now, so that no one can blame us later, so that it will be clear to everyone in advance what is being said here. Russia will be forced to create and deploy weapons that can be used not only in the areas we are directly threatened from, but also in areas that contain decision-making centers for the missile systems threatening us. . . .

We know how to do this and will implement these plans immediately, as soon as the threats to us become real. I do not think we need any further irresponsible exacerbation of the current international situation. We do not want this.

What would I like to add? Our American colleagues have already tried to gain absolute military superiority with their global missile defense project. They need to stop deluding themselves. Our response will always be efficient and effective.

Crisis on the Horizon?

President Putin went on to reference, in a press conference the following day, the possibility of a Cuban Missile Crisis on the immediate horizon. Remember, this is the president of the nation which defeated fascism,

defeated Nazism, in a long war, in World War II, at the cost of twenty-seven million people in the Soviet Union, the Great Patriotic War. So, Russia, as a sovereign nation, is committed to their security and their future, in concert with China, with India, and with the United States, and therefore, take Putin's most recent warning, this warning, in the appropriate context, and identify the challenge to us in the United States, in that regard.

Take a series of similar warnings, such as the recent book, *War With Russia?*, by Professor Stephen F. Cohen. His theme, as he puts it, is this:

The new U.S.-Russian Cold War is more dangerous than was its 40-year predecessor, which the world survived. The chances are even greater, as I hope readers already understand, that this one could result, inadvertently or intentionally, in actual war between the two nuclear superpowers. Herein lies another ominous indication. During the preceding Cold War, the possibility of nuclear catastrophe was in the forefront of American mainstream political and media discussion and of policy-making. During the new one, it rarely seems to be even a concern.

Let us take another expression of the same danger. This is a Feb. 26 *Washington Times* [column](#), "Are we Sleepwalking into Nuclear Disaster?" by Edward Loshansky, President of the American University in Moscow. He reviews the warnings from Cohen, and the warnings from former Senator Sam Nunn, and others, but he makes an additional striking point. He writes:

The question is whether U.S. policy-makers are willing to risk extinction of the U.S. and the rest of mankind in a futile bid to hold onto a unipolar moment that has passed and brought Americans nothing but debt and danger while it lasted. A good start would be a trilateral summit of the leaders of U.S., Russia, and China, or better yet, a quartet that includes India, to start work on parameters of a new constructive international consensus. Everything depends on Mr. Trump, because the other troika members have already met, and they would definitely accept his invitation. Such a move by Mr. Trump could not only turn around the sleepwalk toward nuclear war, but would help solidify his 2020 win by reminding us why he was elected in the first place.

Zepp-LaRouche Weighs In

So, you recognize the Four Powers concept which LaRouche began working on decades ago and which is at the core of our international organizing today, as we discussed at the Feb. 16, Schiller Institute conference.

In an [EIR report](#) from November 9, 2018, Helga Zepp-LaRouche stated, “During my recent trip to Moscow, in several meetings with representatives of leading institutions, I had the opportunity to get a first-hand impression of how the strategic situation looks from the Russian perspective.” When she returned from that trip, she emphasized three things that struck her when she was there: 1) the difficulties facing Russia economically, 2) the huge respect that she saw from Russian leaders for Lyndon LaRouche, and 3) the fact that the Russians, in general, are preoccupied with this war danger, as opposed to Americans. She says in the article that only days after her October 23rd address in Moscow, the Deputy Director of Non-Proliferation and Disarmament for the Russian Foreign Ministry, Andrei Belosov, told the UN in New York:

Recently at a meeting, the U.S. stated that Russia is preparing for war. Yes, Russia is preparing for war, I can confirm it. We are preparing to defend our homeland, our territorial integrity, our principles, our values, our people. We are preparing for such a war. Russia is preparing *for* war, and the U.S. is preparing *a* war. Otherwise, why would the U.S. withdraw from the treaty, the INF treaty, and build a nuclear potential and adopt a new nuclear doctrine?

Helga further reports that, according to a recent *Military Times* survey of active U.S. military personnel and officers, 46 percent—almost half—are convinced that their country will be drawn into a major military conflict with Russia in 2019. I could ask the question if those of you in this audience have thought about this situation in this way.

Look also at Helga’s recent [interview](#) with the Russian news service, Sputnik International, “Europe to Sign Own Suicide Pact If It Hosts New U.S. Missiles.” In the interview, Zepp-LaRouche proposes to “re-establish good relations with Moscow by creating an eco-



FAN-TV Federal News Agency

Helga Zepp-LaRouche (second from left), addressing the Civic Chamber of the Russian Federation on October 24, 2018.

nomie zone from the Atlantic to the Pacific on the basis of integrating the Belt and Road Initiative, the Eurasian Economic Union, and the European Union.” She went on to note that such cooperation would create a “new security architecture” that should become the basis on which Europe builds its cooperation with the United States,” a concept she has developed and proffered on multiple occasions.

A Crisis Long in the Making

How did we get here? This is an existential crisis—without much attention being paid to it by the man in the street, by the mass media, or apparently, by the Congress. I think it would be extremely useful to go back to a famous [broadcast](#) Lyndon LaRouche produced in 1999, called, “Storm Over Asia.” Here is what Mr. LaRouche foresaw and forecast twenty years ago:

LaRouche: What you’re seeing is a war in the North Caucasus region of southern Russia. What you’re also seeing, is a war which has broken out simultaneously on the border between Pakistan and India.

The forces behind these attacks on Russia and on India are the same. They are a mercenary force which was first set into motion by policies adopted at a Trilateral Commission meeting in Kyoto [Japan] in 1975: policies originally of [Zbigniew] Brzezinski and his number-two man there, Samuel P. Huntington; the policies which were continued by then-Trilateral Commission



EIRNS

Two graphics from Lyndon LaRouche's 1999 Storm Over Asia. "The forces behind the attacks on Russia and on India are the same mercenary forces first set into motion by the policies adopted at the Trilateral Commission meeting in 1975."

member, that is, back in 1975, George [H.W.] Bush, before he became Vice President.

These were policies which were continued by George Bush as Vice President. Under Bush, this became known as the "Iran-Contra" drug-financed link operations of mercenaries deployed with private funding all over the world—recruited from Islamic and other countries, and targeting Russia's flank.

This mercenary force, created then, still exists. The primary responsibility for creating the force, was the government of the United Kingdom—most notably, most emphatically, the government of Margaret Thatcher; a policy which has been accelerated and continued in full madness by the present Prime Minister, Tony Blair. . . .

Nuclear War?

This war, if continued, using mercenaries, can lead to nuclear general war. The major powers principally threatened today by this mercenary operation, are two of the world's largest nations: China and India; China on its western borders, India on its northern borders. Iran is also threatened; but, more notably, Russia. If these nations are pushed to the wall by a continuing escalation of a war which is modelled on the wars which the British ran against Russia, China, and so forth, during the 19th century and early 20th century, this will lead to the point that Russia has to make the decision to accept the disintegration of Russia as a nation, or to resort to the means it has, to exact terrible penalties on those who are attacking it, going closer and closer to the source, the forces behind the mercenaries—which in-

cludes, of course, Turkey, which is a prime NATO asset being used as a cover for much of this mercenary operation in the North Caucasus and in Central Asia.

This is our danger. The weapons the Russians have, are no longer the large armies. . . . Those vast armies are dissipated, weakened. Russia is ruined almost, by a vast economic destruction, caused by IMF policies, and related policies. But Russia still has an arsenal, an arsenal of advanced weapons, and laboratories which can match the weaponry being developed in the United States, Israel, Britain, and elsewhere.

If Russia is pushed to the wall . . . the likely thing is, it will fight back. It will use the weapons it has. It does not have the weapons to win a war, but it has the weapons sufficient to impose a powerful, deadly deterrent on the nations behind the mercenary forces which are presently attacking it. There lies the danger.

Unfortunately, most people in the United States are living under the delusion, that with the collapse of the Soviet Union, the combined military power of the United States and its British Commonwealth allies—including Australia, New Zealand and so forth, countries that are really under the British Queen personally, as the United Kingdom is—these forces, Anglo-American forces, are so powerful, that they can ignore the United Nations Security Council, and conduct wars on their own, with impunity.

War Can Come to the U.S.

Most Americans tend to believe that, and believe they don't have to worry about foreign wars. They don't have to worry about terrible things happening in Africa or South America, or Eurasia generally. "It won't come

here,” just as many Americans said before Pearl Harbor about the war then ongoing in Europe.

In reality, it *can* come here. I’m not predicting that it *will*; I’m saying the likelihood—the danger—exists. And as long as the present policies of our government continue, especially the policies of the right-wing Stone Age faction inside the Congress, the right-wing policies of Vice President Al Gore and of [Secretary of State] Madeleine Albright, a Brzezinski associate—as long as these policies on the United States’ part continue, the danger of war is growing.

It’s not immediate, not tomorrow, and not the day after tomorrow. But wars come on like that: you get to a point of no return, there’s still no war. Then, somewhere down the line, maybe a couple of years later, the war actually breaks out.

And war is breaking out all over the world war now; not only in the Balkans, as we saw recently, not only in an insane bombing attack on [President] Saddam [Hussein], for no reason whatsoever—the continued war against Iraq. . . .

That was 20 years ago. Consider what’s unfolding today: the Korean situation, the Southwest Asian situation, the India-Pakistan conflict, the Ukraine situation, the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF) issue. LaRouche said we’re not talking about a war today or tomorrow; well, that was 20 years ago. Perhaps we are. That again, defines our mandate and our mission.

Look at the Russia-gate business. Russia-gate is emphatically a British-directed operation to destroy this President; because this President is not under British control—to destroy the potential for improved relations with Russia. Trump’s intention is to improve relations with Russia, to develop his friendship with Xi Jinping and so on, to end regime-change wars and to insure that there’s no escalation beyond that to nuclear war. What you have is an attempt to consolidate the cooperation of major powers in particular on the common aims of mankind. Then the British war party, time and again, comes in to bust it up; manipulating both sides to maintain and perpetuate this division of the world, this East-West division, to maintain their empire, their neo-colonial looting, and their free trade system.

Think back to the Kennedy era. Look at Allen Dulles and company—the war party in the Kennedy period. Allen Dulles was the Director of the CIA. A couple of months after Kennedy’s inauguration, that war party attempted to trap Kennedy with the Bay of Pigs operation, an invasion of Cuba. It was a disaster. Kennedy learned the lesson and moved to clean some of these



DoS

President John F. Kennedy meeting with Chairman Nikita Khrushchev at the U.S. Embassy residence in Vienna, Austria on June 3, 1961.

characters out, but in the following year it was the Cuban Missile Crisis, and in those famous 13 days in October, most Americans quickly got religion, because for those 13 days, people were very aware of the existential danger of that moment.

The JFK Approach

Providentially, JFK had developed a correspondence with Khrushchev. Therefore, Kennedy was able to deploy his brother, Robert, and others in back channel negotiations with Khrushchev to work out a deal for removing Russian missiles from Cuba, and the U.S. removing its missiles from Turkey on the Soviet border. You had a diffusing of what could well have led to an imminent U.S. military attack of one form or other on Cuba, which could have led to nuclear war. Soon thereafter, on June 10, 1963, in a [speech](#) at the American University, JFK proffered to Moscow the establishment of a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty, a serious move toward disarmament. And a few months after that, on September 30, 1963, Kennedy [addressed](#) the United Nations General Assembly, calling for a genuine détente between the great powers through mutual interest cooperation. I’ll quote Kennedy:

Kennedy: I include among these possibilities for great power cooperation, a joint expedition to the Moon.

Why should man’s first flight to the Moon be a matter of national competition? Why should the U.S. and the Soviet Union become involved

in immense duplications of research, production, and expenditure? Surely we should explore whether the scientists and astronauts of our two countries, indeed of all the world, cannot work together in the conquest of space. Sending someday in this decade to the Moon, not the representatives of a single nation, but the representatives of all of our countries.

Two months later, he was shot, murdered. Think about that initiative of JFK, and you have one very clear reason why the British Party, in the UK and in the U.S., acted to kill that President.

The Last War-Avoidance Intervention

Let's jump ahead. Twenty years later, Soviet and American medium-range missiles,—the Soviet SS-20s and the American Pershing missiles—with a range of a few hundred to a few thousand miles, were in place in Central and Eastern Europe. A strategic crisis was exploding.

Happily, we had a President, much like Trump in important respects, with the courage to act and to act with Lyndon LaRouche. When Jimmy Carter was elected in November 1976, LaRouche, based on intelligence from inside the U.S. military, from inside the Pentagon, learned about the Soviet intention to develop a ballistic-missile defense, a beam-weapon defense; to “Sputnik” the United States in terms of such a strategic defense operation.

LaRouche authored a [pamphlet](#), *Sputnik of the Seventies: The Science Behind the Soviets' Beam Weapon* in 1977. This led, in the ensuing period, to President Ronald Reagan bringing LaRouche into his administration, unofficially, with security clearance as a back channel to the Soviets based on LaRouche's proposal, which proposal began with that publication.


Reagan and many of his associates in California were readers of *EIR* magazine from at least 1974. Reagan was elected in 1980. Key Reagan figures approached LaRouche's associates after the election and requested recommendations from LaRouche. Mr. LaRouche presented a series of proposals regarding international economic cooperation and development. Pres-

ident Reagan selected one thing, which is the policy that Reagan called the Strategic Defense Initiative.

Let me quote from Reagan's famous television [broadcast](#) of March 23, 1983:

... I call upon the scientific community in our country, those who gave us nuclear weapons, to turn their great talents now to the cause of mankind and world peace, to give us the means of rendering these nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete.

... We seek neither military superiority nor political advantage. Our only purpose—one all people share—is to search for ways to reduce the danger of nuclear war.



LaRouche authored this pamphlet in 1977.

Reagan was shot two months into his administration, early on in the administration; shot and almost assassinated. But it was already well known to British intelligence that this relationship that LaRouche had developed with Reagan portended the kind of breakthrough we would see later in the SDI. Reagan was shot, and the British faction inside his administration, led by Vice President, the “President of Vice,” George H.W. Bush, took greater control over that administration. Soon after the SDI breakthrough, a “Get LaRouche” taskforce was established in Manhattan, coming out of the Department of

Injustice, and related government and private operations. Eventually, with the assistance of the amoral legal assassin, Robert Mueller, the same guy we see today, LaRouche was framed up and sent to prison in 1989, after years of slander.

A year later LaRouche, from prison, proposed what was first called the European Productive Triangle and then the Eurasian Land-Bridge. We [published](#) “The Productive Triangle: Paris-Berlin-Vienna. Locomotive for World Economic Development” as a document in *EIR* in 1990. Then, in July 1992, *EIR* published an [article](#) on the “Eurasian Rail Project: Building the World's Greatest Rail Network.”

This is what has become, through our work, through Helga's work, the New Silk Road, the Eurasian World Land-Bridge. This is what the LaRouches put on the

table at the point that the Soviet Empire came down. Instead, there was a dirty agreement between Gorbachev, Bush, and Thatcher to acquiesce in a reunified Germany joining NATO in exchange for a pledge that NATO would not move one inch east of Berlin.

Well, NATO soon thereafter start gobbling up nations. NATO went from 12 countries at its founding in 1949, to 29 now. Over these past 70 years NATO has deployed massively to the borders of Russia. Beginning in 1991, Russia was subjected to horrible looting, de-industrialization, and depopulation.

So instead of the Eurasian Land-Bridge unfolding to unify the giant Eurasian landmass through economic, scientific, and infrastructural cooperation, the British/London/Wall Street financial empire looted the hell out of this country. This takes us to 1999; we have just reviewed what LaRouche emphasized about that danger in his *Storm Over Asia*.

The Current War Drive Begins

On September 11, 2001, the United States is attacked. The first head of state to respond—within moments of that attack—was Vladimir Putin. Unable to get through to President Bush, Putin spoke with Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice. Rice: “You realize we’re on strategic alert?” Putin: “Yes, we know, and we are standing down.” Putin then offered cooperation with the Bush administration to actually engage in a war against terrorism.

Instead of accepting such cooperation, a series of wars were launched, beginning with Afghanistan, through Iraq, Syria, and Libya—the various regime-change wars. And soon after 9/11, the United States withdrew from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, indicating the intention by the United States to attempt to develop, over time, a war-winning first strike capability.

To understand what happened after 9/11, you have to go back to 1991-92, and examine the policy proposals of British intelligence, of Chatham House (the Royal Institute of International Affairs), to develop what they called a “unipolar world.” In the U.S. it was called the “Wolfowitz Doctrine”—one pole; one hegemon; the

United States domination of the world. Of course, it wasn’t United States domination; it was Anglo-American—a dumb giant on a British leash.

The intention of these wars was that there would be no cooperation of the major powers to generate the sort of international economic development that LaRouche had been proposing—a New Bretton Woods system.

Fast forward now to the coup of 2013-2014 in Ukraine. Neo-Nazis were deployed on the Maidan with U.S. funds (about \$5 billion having been pumped into the Ukraine since the collapse of the Soviet Union), to bring down the democratically elected Yanukovich government. There was no Russian military invasion of

Crimea, as has been said; there was no Russian annexation of Crimea. There was a referendum in that section of what was formerly Ukraine, but for centuries prior, a section of Russia. The referendum was an overwhelming demand by that population to return Crimea to Russia.

Nazis were put in power in Ukraine, by the Obama administration with their British and other friends, on the border of Russia, and that dramatically ratcheted up the danger level in the strategic situation. Think back to the history of Russia! Then, these same forces attack a new American President—Donald Trump—for trying to address this, by engaging with, and developing improved relations with the other leading nuclear power. That, in a nutshell, is Rus-

sia-gate.

This is the British House of Lords’ strategy. LaRouche PAC, *EIR*, and the Schiller Institute have now pinned down—authoritatively—the authorship of the ongoing destabilization—through Russia-gate and through the various strategic moves, including the withdrawal from the INF Treaty.

As Barbara Boyd put it in a [series](#) of articles published on the LaRouche PAC website and in *EIR* magazine:

In the U.S., they (the British) have one immediate goal: Ending the disruption caused by Trump, by removing him one way or the other. They found that the “special relationship” was intact



The Schiller Institute's 1990 pamphlet, The 'Productive Triangle' Paris-Berlin-Vienna: Locomotive of the Global Economy, published in Germany.



CC/Mstyslav Chernov

Protesters clash with Internal Troops in Kiev, Ukraine on February 18, 2014.

and revered in U.S. intelligence and defense establishments, and especially on both sides of the aisle in Congress. But that relationship is threatened by the continuation of the Trump Presidency; therefore, their insistence on removing Trump or crippling him, ensuring that he is not more than one term. . . . With respect to Russia, they plan to continue their policy of containment, economic isolation, and political destabilization; and to ensure their destabilization and degrees of control over India and China.

No Economic Development, No Peace

So, we can and must defeat this. But to defeat the new emerging danger, it is necessary that people change their axioms, just as Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin proposed on September 13, 1993 in a toast to all who had participated in the Oslo peace negotiations, that they tip their glasses to “those with the courage to change their axioms.”

Again, look at the case of Professor Cohen, who I referenced earlier, a courageous figure in sounding the alarm. But Cohen, in his book, cites a perilous paradox:

Why, unlike the 40-year Cold War, is there no significant mainstream opposition to the new and more dangerous Cold War? I cannot explain this exceedingly dangerous paradox. . . . The fault lies with America’s governing elites.

Cohen misses entirely the nature of the beast that he’s dealing with. It’s not just America’s governing



DoD/Brian Kimball

Patriot air defense missile systems during Exercise Patriot Shock in Capu Midia, Romania on November 4, 2016.

elites, but it’s the control by this British ideology of those elites. “Dumb giant on a British leash.” If you are fighting a war, you had better recognize your enemy—the mindset of the enemy, and the strategy, weaknesses, and vulnerabilities of that enemy. If you mis-identify your enemy, you’re not going to win the war—or, in this case, we’re not going to stop the war.

What’s the nature of this British disease? Globalization, geopolitics, the neo-liberal system of free trade. Trump has made clear his intention to improve relations, and to potentially move into LaRouche’s proposed Four Power geometry. What Trump’s doing in Southwest Asia; what Trump did in Singapore and is working toward in East Asia with Korea—this is all conclusive evidence of Trump’s courage and laudable intentions. In just the last 48 hours, Trump, with Putin and Xi, have intervened in the India-Pakistan situation.

But, if we are to succeed, if the world is to avoid war, we have to be more precise as to the nature of the enemy; we have to take up the economic and financial dimension. As the German mathematician Bernhard Riemann put it, concluding his [habilitation paper](#), “On the Hypotheses Which Lie at the Foundations of Geometry,” we have to move from the department of mathematics to the department of physics, in this case, physical economy.

What is the physical-economic as well as financial reality in the world? The system is bankrupt. The British system, the London-Wall Street system is bankrupt; it’s coming down. It is, therefore, a wounded beast and extremely dangerous. But it is also very vulnerable. What is required is to put forward a program, a positive

conception—not merely a détente idea, which is what many of the better people desired years ago. Détente will not work. You need an entente in terms of a Four Powers combination. And you need to unify the Four Powers around their common interests, in economic development, scientific progress and all forms of infrastructure development, as the unique basis for peace.

Physical Economy Is LaRouche


The name for that is LaRouche; who is *the* physical economist in the world. Therefore, the general blindness on British influence and power goes directly to the decades-long, induced hysteria about LaRouche. Because LaRouche identified in the 1970s the actual enemy of America and of humanity—and it wasn't the "American elites," although many of those elites are in the British camp. But it was, and is, British ideology, British intelligence warfare—as you see with the targeting of Trump.

Let me try to make this as uncomfortable as I can for some of you, perhaps. To win this strategic war against empire on behalf of humanity, you have to go after various axioms, and you have to think them through in order to change them.

For example, Axiom #1: There's no British Empire after 1945, but an American Empire; Axiom #2: The left-right, east-west, communist-capitalist division of the world is fixed and eternal. This involves the lie that the British system of monetarism, international financial speculation, globalization, looting, and drugs, is somehow equivalent to the American System of capitalism—that there's no actual profound and systemic distinction between the historic British imperial system and the American republican system. Another axiom is that the world must necessarily be governed by zero-sum games—we win, you lose; as opposed to the win-win conception that the Chinese have put forward through the One Belt, One Road, the Westphalian idea of nations acting for the benefit of the other, to the benefit of all.

Let me go directly to the situation today, with the

Projected One Belt, One Road Economic Development Corridors



help of Helga Zepp-LaRouche who, in her weekly Schiller Institute New Paradigm [webcast](#) of March 1, identifies the method of thinking that is required for us to develop a quality of leadership in our ranks, and rapidly far beyond our ranks, to resolve the existential crisis and bring about the becoming of a LaRouche world:

Zepp-LaRouche: I think it [the U.S. threat to withdraw from the INF Treaty] is definitely a very dangerous development. It may be that President Trump wants to accomplish some other treaty replacing the INF Treaty, but this is a very tricky question. I think there is not so much the immediate danger that we will see immediately medium-range U.S. nuclear weapons deployed in Europe, because as far as I know there are no such weapons systems in the pipeline that could be established immediately. If they were to be positioned there, it would basically bring us right back to the situation of the beginning of the 1980s when you had only a few minutes' warning, and therefore all the forces of the Warsaw Pact and NATO were on launch-on-warning.

But I think the more immediate situation is that it opens a Pandora's box, because once you break down all disarmament or arms-control treaties, like the ABM [Anti-Ballistic Missile] Treaty, which has been cancelled many years ago now, such action basically brings down any

kind of treaty arrangements, leading to all kinds of developments.

This brings me to the point I have made many times. Some people say that behind that is the effort to get the Chinese into an INF agreement, but experts were writing, in the recent period, that it's not very likely that the Chinese could agree or would agree; because if you just have an INF approach, it means that the Chinese would have to give up about more than two-thirds of their entire missile arsenal, which they obviously will not do under these circumstances.

It brings me to another point I have made many times. Look at the totality of all of these problems—Venezuela, North Korea, India-Pakistan, the whole situation of Southwest Asia remains extremely fragile, the situation with Ukraine. All of these things have the potential of leading to a large, if not the final, catastrophe of a Third World War. Given the fact that the old paradigm is disintegrating, there are people and forces representing this old paradigm that are pushing confrontation. I think it is extremely urgent to recognize that humanity must move to a completely new type of thinking, a New Paradigm in which you establish new international relations that take into account the security interests, the economic interests, and the political interests of all nations.

The only way you can do that is to establish a higher order of a system, a New Paradigm that overcomes geopolitics and puts humanity first, and then all national and regional interests second. That is what Xi Jinping has been proposing with his New Silk Road, the Belt and Road Initiative, and the idea that we have to build a community of shared interests for the future of mankind. . . .

Fulfilling LaRouche's Mission

As many of you know, we are heavily mobilized to break through on the exoneration of Lyndon LaRouche and to get the truth of LaRouche's life work, LaRouche's ideas out in the open. The exoneration of LaRouche is directly relevant to the injustices that we see today with the British and Mueller operations against President Trump. Trump taking action in such a way—for LaRouche's exoneration—and for our movement to create the conditions for that to occur, is decisive in defeating the British imperial forces that

hate Trump and have hated LaRouche for many, many years, will thereby free the President to bring America at long last into the Four Powers arrangement, to consolidate the great potential to create a future through the New Bretton Woods.

Messages of condolence on the passing of Lyndon LaRouche continue to stream in from leaders internationally. Sergei Glazyev, an advisor to the Putin government sent such a message. I will quote one passage from that here:

Glazyev: A great thinker of our time, Lyndon LaRouche has left us. He was a titan of thought; a man of incredibly encyclopedic knowledge, great soul, and love for humanity. His conception of the Eurasian development bridge from Western Europe to Russia's Far East and onward to Alaska and the U.S.A. could become a real alternative to today's hybrid world war. . . . I remember one of the leaders of the Brookings Institution urging me in a whisper not to have any contact with LaRouche, so as not to spoil my reputation. For me, who had come to the U.S.A. to take part in a scientific forum on issues of developing democratic institutions in the post-Soviet region, this was shocking.

From then on, I started closely reading LaRouche's publications and attending conferences he organized. I must acknowledge that his presentations were often a ray of light in the kingdom of darkness and hypocrisy which had seized the public mind of progressive mankind.

Today, those ideas are coming to life in a New World Economic Paradigm. As you have leaders of Russia and China and India—and we already have a good number of them—and of the United States in particular, who are coming together around LaRouche's power of reason that defines a movement that can win.

The Russian government is playing the LaRouche card; the Chinese, to the extent that the New Paradigm of the One Belt, One Road and its Confucian methodological roots is transforming the world, are playing it as well. The method of thinking that Helga is identifying is the basis to create a Westphalian universe, to create this coming future for which we organized the February 16 Schiller Institute conference.

That's the challenge put to us by Helga. It is now up to us to realize Lyndon LaRouche's life's work. Thank you.

III. The Real Lyndon LaRouche

N.Y. TIMES CAUGHT IN TWICE-TOLD LIE

Lyndon LaRouche and the True History of 20th Century America

by Dennis Speed

March 12—The failing *New York Times* goofed.

Someone, perhaps inadvertently, ran an accompanying picture with the paper's Feb. 13 "fake news" article on the February 12 death of Lyndon LaRouche. The photo purported to show an angry LaRouche at a Trenton press conference during the Presidential campaign of 1984. The picture, however, also revealed a distinguished-looking African-American, who was clearly there in support of LaRouche. Who was he?

EXONERATE LAROUCHE

Then, on March 4, the *Times* ran a full-page article, titled "The Complex Story of Hulan Jack, The First Black 'Boss of Manhattan'." The general theme of that article

was that Mr. Jack, the first African-American elected to the Borough Presidency of Manhattan, and the most powerful elected official of African descent elected to a Northern municipality up to that time (1953), had for some mysterious reason, sunk into obscurity. The *Times* reports, "Hulan Jack rarely gets mentioned today, even during Black History Month"—including by the *Times*, which ran their print copy of the article in March, after having posted the article in their digital edition of February 20. Why, then, did Hulan Jack suddenly become significant to the *New York Times*?

Since the *Times* has not run an article about Hulan Jack since his death in 1986, thirty-two years ago, is it possible—just possible—that the *Times* wrote and ran the article, not because of a sudden impassioned interest in African-American contributions to history, but rather because of their earlier failure to identify Hulan Jack as seated next to Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche? Is it possible that the *Times* failed to note,

despite the fact that it is recorded in Jack's readily available [autobiography](#), *Fifty Years a Democrat*, that he endorsed Lyndon LaRouche as a candidate for President of the United States in 1980, co-founded the National Democratic Policy Committee (NDPC) with Lyndon LaRouche, and attended that 1984 press conference because he supported Lyndon LaRouche for President in 1984?

The reader may have guessed by now, that the March 4 article on Hulan Jack did not in any way mention his involvement with Lyndon LaRouche, nor why Jack was present in the picture that had been published two weeks earlier in the same newspaper. If it had, the *Times*' own "narrative" about Lyndon LaRouche, contrived 40 years ago, would have fallen apart, and many Americans, whatever their views on LaRouche as such, would become interested to know why, even in death, the *New York Times* fears him. To exonerate Lyndon LaRouche, is to first eradicate the "narrative" of America's last 55 years.

LaRouche and the Lying *N.Y. Times*

Lyndon LaRouche, though deceased, has a bit to say on the matter of this recent *Times faux pas*. In a [piece](#) written February 15, 2000 titled, "He's a Bad Guy, But We Can't Say Why," LaRouche recounts:

Following the Congress' mid-1970s exposure of some shocking examples of the Justice Department's other operations operating under "internal security" covers, there was a greater emphasis on running these same kinds of operations under nominally private covers. So, during the period of Zbigniew Brzezinski's official reign

inside the Carter Administration, 1978-1980, two private international organizations were key in launching the continuation of former Justice Department operations. These were a private branch of British intelligence, known as Friedrich von Hayek's and Professor Milton Friedman's Mont Pelerin Society, and such operations of the London-created New York Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), as the Zbigniew Brzezinski-led Tri-lateral Commission.

On the basis of information received from multiple sources, several of my associates, under my direction, went up the back-trail of evidence leading to discovery of hard proof, that the *Times* was organizing a public defamation, a defamation intended, according to the voluntary statement of the *Times'* agents themselves, to set me, personally, up for imprisonment, through widespread and persisting waves of defamation with charges which the *Times* then knew to be false.

In the course of this investigation, we were able to document the existence of precisely such an operation and intent. This included our investigators' secretly tape-recorded restaurant interview with the relevant two *Times* reporters, Paul Montgomery and Howard Blum. That tape-recording was then promptly presented, at press conferences called for this purpose, in New York City and in Washington, D.C.

In an explanatory footnote, LaRouche comments: "In the July 23, 1979 meeting, reporter Blum stated that the proposed *New York Times* article was intended to start a government investigation of LaRouche and his associates and he needed an 'eye catcher.' Blum stated that, 'the article does not have to be especially true.' Blum went on to say, 'A government investigation is what you and I want, isn't it,' and, ... 'while it might sound cynical, it is more important for the government that something appears in the *New York Times* than whether or not it is true'."



EIRNS/Philip Ulanowsky

Hulian Jack speaking at a LaRouche rally in Philadelphia on April 8, 1984. Seated are Lyndon LaRouche and Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

Hulian Jack and the Lying *N.Y. Times*

Sensing the perfidy of the *New York Times*, however, does not always require such thoroughgoing investigation, and success, as is recounted above. For example, one reader of the Hulian Jack article, though not necessarily aware of the earlier LaRouche *faux pas* of the *Times*, still refused to be bamboozled by the benign Uriah Heep-styled "time-capsule" excuse for the appearance of the article, even taken at face-value. He smartly contested the intent of the *Times* piece, which attempted to blame the fall and subsequent obscurity of Hulian Jack on his legal troubles. The *Times* fraud purported to "report the facts" thus:

Harlem stood by Mr. Jack, at least initially, when prosecutors went after him on corruption charges in 1960 with particular tenacity, appealing a judge's dismissal of the charges and taking the case to trial before a jury deadlocked. The state re-tried Mr. Jack successfully—for receiving roughly \$5,000 in apartment renovations from a developer he'd been friends with for years, who was also seeking city contracts—leading to a misdemeanor conviction and a suspended sentence.


The suspicious New York reader responded thus:

To those who, "thank the *New York Times*," I beg

to differ. Hulan Jack was simply one of the Sugar Hill Gang who got shot down by white establishment politics and press in the City of New York. It is a question of undercapitalization and sheer pious hypocrisy being used to attack and strip any black politician who attained any power or authority in NYC by any means necessary. . . . But, it doesn't stop there. The *Times* played a pivotal role in taking down Charles Rangel—attempting to indict him by bad press for renting a perfectly legal office apartment in the same rent-controlled building where he had two other apartments. Many of us believe this was a campaign whose authors were white hedge fund owners threatened by Mr. Rangel's introduction of a resolution to tax hedge funds on individual transactions. . . .

This reader, whatever the limitations of his analysis may be, senses the “Uriah Heep” sliminess of the “oh so liberal” *Times*, which, paternalistically, did not even bother to include any of Hulan Jack's own words in its crusade to save him from obscurity. Hulan Jack spoke quite clearly, in his autobiography, as to why he was gone after, and who did it—including a future *New York Times* editorial board member named Roger Starr. On pages 112-115 of his autobiography, Mr. Jack tells us:

During my first term in office, I placed a great deal of pressure on the New York City Housing Authority to increase the maximum income ceiling for eligibility for public housing, to allow clerks, busboys, porters, and other low-income categories of employed workers to live in low cost public housing. As a result of the Housing Authority's eventual change in policy, more people became eligible for the project under its jurisdiction. However there were many other individuals who had been removed from their homes to make way for the construction of public housing, but who were nevertheless ineligible for apartments in the new housing that was built. These included unmarried persons, and the widow or widower without children. Through the assistance of my office, and the cooperation



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Hulan Jack at a Schiller Institute “Inalienable Rights of Man Day” in New York City on December 22, 1984.

of the Housing Authority, a commitment was made to create a limited number of single occupancy size apartments for those single and elderly persons in new projects under construction.

I felt the city would be a poor place indeed if the entire middle class migrated to the suburbs, as some today think is desirable, and I worked to keep middle-class families and their children in Manhattan. . . .

. . . In the middle of my first term as borough president, my office began to receive an increasing number of complaints that site clearance for projects being carried out by the city's Slum Clearance Committee were dispossessing large numbers of families. There were reports that hundreds of families were being turned out into the streets, having been given no assurance to find reasonably priced, clean replacement housing in the borough. My planners and engineers also reported the closing down of streets in entire neighborhood to make way for the construction of public housing projects. . . . These “superblock” building plans not only snarled neighborhood through-traffic during construction, but threatened to permanently foul up traffic patterns by eliminating through streets within the confines of the project or program. . . .

I thought the superblock construction concept was in most cases inappropriate to the needs of Manhattan communities, so I directed my engineers and planners to develop an alternative approach to ridding the borough's neighborhoods of their most obsolete and inadequate housing. This new approach, which I put forward as early as 1954, . . . I dubbed "vest pocket development." The vest pocket approach required careful assessment of the needs of each neighborhood, beginning with a building-by-building review of the housing stock to determine how the worst of it could be replaced without excessively disrupting the life of the community. In some cases this meant demolishing one or two buildings in a given block. At that rate, a minimum number of people would be dislocated, and existing sewer, water, and electrical facilities would not be disturbed. Another aspect of the plan was to make maximum use of vacant land, abandoned school buildings, etc. to provide space for new residential construction without the relocation of any families at all. By the end of my first term in office, we had pursued the vest pocket strategy successfully in several of the borough's neighborhoods. . . .

The greatest objection to my vest pocket approach for urban development came from an individual by the name of Roger Starr, who was associated with a civic organization concerned with housing. He roundly denounced the plan as being a dream that was impossible to achieve. Starr publicly associated himself with the urban renewal effort to improve housing for Manhattan's population, but it was clear even at that time his major concern was to drive people out of the city by tearing down and disrupting stable neighborhoods in the name of "urban renewal." About twenty years after he lined himself up in opposition to my neighborhood rejuvenation program, Starr came out in the pages of the *New York Times* endorsing a policy of "planned shrinkage" for America's cities. This program, for which he offered New York as a pilot project, was to be carried out by gradually diminishing the population in working-class neighborhoods,

by cutting off their vital services such as police and fire protection.

Jack's first discussion with Lyndon LaRouche, held in Manchester, New Hampshire during the 1980 Presidential campaign, was in part about how to reverse the population reduction policies of Starr (who was a *New York Times* editorial writer from 1977 to 1992), policies echoed today in the Green New Deal, now becoming known as the "Soylent Green New Deal."

Robert Moses and 'Planned Shrinkage'

Another letter sent to the *Times* regarding Jack, references the Establishment's enforcer, "British civil servant" Robert Moses. The letter states, "Hulan Jack made powerful financial enemies, including 'power broker' Robert Moses, because of his opposition to 'urban renewal,' referred to by Malcolm X and others as 'Negro removal' at the time." Robert Moses personally testified against Hulan Jack, and, according to Jack, was central to Jack's unjust conviction.

In his autobiography, Jack elaborates on his battle with Robert Moses:

I remember our controversy over the clearance of the site for Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts, between Amsterdam Avenue and Broadway in the neighborhood that used to be known as Hell's Kitchen. After all the formalities have been approved, . . . a delegation of people from the neighborhood came to my office and reported that they were being harassed out of their homes. No alternative residences had been provided for them, and in several cases, families had been physically thrown out of their apartments in the middle of the night. . . .

I had the greatest respect for Mr. Moses and his determination to complete the construction of Lincoln Center as soon as possible. Today we have an international showcase for the arts and music due to his efforts, a center of culture the entire city is proud of. Nevertheless, I had no intention of allowing such procedures as the dead-of-night evictions that were reported to me. I ordered a halt to further demolition of housing on the Lincoln Center site until my office got some guarantees that the program for the location assistance promised by the Slum Clearance Com-

mittee in its proposal would be carried out to the letter. After several negotiating sessions, my office and Mr. Moses came to an agreement on how to proceed, but only after I had reminded Mr. Moses several times that Lincoln Center was being built through the sacrifice and effort of every one of the families that were forced to relocate off the site. . . .

I can remember becoming physically nauseated by what Robert Moses did when he took the stand . . . Although we had opposed each other on important matters of policy, Robert Moses and I had maintained cordial and good relations. . . .

When he got on the stand, sworn to tell the truth as he knew it, Robert Moses used every means at his disposal to create the impression that . . . I had conceived a program detrimental to the city.

He reported no facts. But when a man of the stature of Robert Moses is paraded in front of an uninformed jury and allowed to announce his opinions under oath, what he says is very likely to have a deep effect on the average juror. There is no doubt that this was the way things worked at my second trial. When the prosecution rested its case, the jury speedily convicted me on all three counts.

Develop Africa . . . Develop the World


The National Democratic Policy Committee which Hulan Jack did much to shape, was, together with Jack's autobiography, his successful attempt to introduce government participation to people in general through an independent electorally active policy-driven third force in the United States. This became known as the LaRouche candidates' movement, which successfully engaged thousands of Americans in the first half of the 1980s in electoral politics on the village, city, state and federal level. Hulan Jack's role took him to many countries during the six years that he collaborated with

Lyndon LaRouche and the NDPC. The *New York Times* knows that to tell the truth, about either Hulan Jack or Lyndon LaRouche, would be to reveal how fake the slanders against both are.

But there is something even far more terrifying to the *Times*, on the eve of a visit by the President of China to Italy, and a subsequent potential meeting between President Xi and President Trump. It was a topic discussed in depth by LaRouche and Jack in that December 1979 meeting—the development of the African continent, particularly through the creation of a “Second Nile River” by diverting the Congo River northwards. Now known as the Transaqua Project, it was then called the “Lake Chad Congo River Basin” by LaRouche's European organization, which had held a groundbreaking conference in Paris, in June 1979 and later published a [book](#) titled, *The Industrialization of Africa*. Hulan Jack and Lyndon LaRouche formed the Committee for a New Africa Policy, whose first actions were to call for 18 million metric tons of wheat, grain and dry milk to be delivered to Congo (then called Zaire), which was in the midst of a famine, and to propose a Second Nile River Project as the true basis for permanent survival and development of Central Africa.

Is it possible that Presidents Xi and Trump might discuss the idea of joint construction of a new economic platform in Central Africa, after Xi discusses such ideas with Prime Minister Giuseppe Conte of Italy? Will that discussion of forty years ago between Hulan Jack and Lyndon LaRouche resonate in a different way, today, among United States citizens, free to think again because the true history of the United States has been revealed, and LaRouche exonerated?

Ideas, and the great men who create, propose, and defend them, never die. The “planned shrinkage” of the American mind, the long-term effect of too-frequent reading of the *New York Times*, is being reversed, even as, and because, you read this.



LaRouche South Africa Honors the Memory of Lyndon LaRouche

by Ramasimong Tsokolibane



LaRouche South Africa, led by Ramasimong Tsokolibane, met to honor the memory of Lyndon LaRouche on Sunday, March 3, in Evaton township, near Vereeniging.

We had thirteen people in attendance. Moses Thulo chaired the proceedings. In his remarks, he elaborated on how the connection with the LaRouche movement began in the early 1990s. Allen

Douglas came to South Africa to do research on the activities of Tiny Rowland. He met with Philemon Sekoatle and our movement was born. Sekoatle went on to meet Lyndon LaRouche in prison.

Jonas Radebe emphasized the teachings of Lyn and how he has been able to attract people to listen to him on radio, whenever he is on Theta fm, a local community radio station.

Jones Raseobi talked about the importance of Helga in the life of Lyn. Lyn got strength from Helga as a partner in fighting the British empire. She was “The wind beneath my wings” in Lyn’s life.

As the main speaker, I spoke about the fight against the oligarchy that Lyn had waged for most of his life, and about his teachings and how they armed us to be able to continue the fight against the British empire. The passing on of Lyndon LaRouche is not the end of the LaRouche movement. We will continue the fight for mankind against the evil empire. *A luta continua*—the struggle continues.

LONG LIVE THE SPIRIT OF
LYNDON LAROUCHE.

Dennis Speed of the Manhattan Project in New



Lyndon LaRouche

EIRNS/Michelle Rasmussen

York, USA, via pre-recorded video, spoke to us for 40 minutes on the life and work of LaRouche. He emphasized LaRouche’s economic concepts for the liberation of people around the planet—including that people, using their skills and mental powers, are the basis of wealth, not money; and that credit can be issued on the strength of those mental powers, for projects that benefit the common good.

LaRouche, he said, also emphasized our ability to make new, creative discoveries. We have this ability because the power embedded in the universe is based on the same principles that we find in the human mind. Speed referred especially to LaRouche’s [article](#), “The Principle of ‘Power’” (*EIR*, December 23, 2005). However, the slave of the British empire must first become aware of his mental freedom, in order to exercise his creativity. He made that point clear by reading a quotation from the black American leader and former slave, Frederick Douglass, a contemporary and friend of Abraham Lincoln.

Speed covered much, much more about America, Africa, and the world than can be summarized here.

The program concluded after two-and-a-half hours.

Messages of Condolence on the Passing of Lyndon LaRouche

The following is another selection from the large number of remembrances and messages of condolence over the passing of Lyndon H. LaRouche, and of tribute to his life's work, which continue to pour in from around the world. (Compiled as of March 10, 2019.)

RUSSIA

The 'Last Rosicrucian' Has Died

Published on *Business-gazeta.ru* Feb. 14 with the following introduction:

This man was, at times, a Marxist, and a Trotskyist, and both an enemy of the USSR and a friend, but he unfailingly saw Russia as a key world player. He was an adviser to President Reagan and thought up "Star Wars," but not at all for the purpose of finishing off the Soviet Union, but rather to prevent nuclear war and achieve universal progress. The journalist and political analyst Kirill Benediktov, who knew LaRouche personally, recalls his and Mikhail Diunov's article, written during the lifetime of this remarkable man.

The legacy of Lyndon LaRouche will be a source of ideas for intellectuals all over the world, for a long time to come—An incredibly powerful intellect and incredible charisma.

Lyndon LaRouche has died. He was one of the greatest men of our time, and perhaps one of the most misunderstood. I had the opportunity to know him in person. He was a man of incredibly powerful intellect and equally incredible charisma. In 2012 the *Terra America* portal published the intellectual investigation of LaRouche, done by myself and Mikhail Diunov, under the title, "The Last Rosicrucian."

LaRouche himself, after reading an English translation of the articles, was pleased with them, except for the title. He did not identify with the Rosicrucians; in general, he did not like secret societies and the culture of conspiracy. But in 2013, when my wife and I met

Lyndon LaRouche in Germany at a conference of the Schiller Institute, I was able to explain what I had had in mind in calling him the "last Rosicrucian": the fact that, like the legendary Christian Rosenkreuz, he was a true intellectual, who fought for the harmonious unification of spirituality and science.

The *Terra America* site shut down in 2014 and the materials published there can only be accessed in cases where they have been republished in other outlets. Fortunately, however, I have in my archive the text of all three parts of "The Last Rosicrucian." In memory of Lyndon LaRouche—the thinker, philosopher, politician, economist, and poet—I offer for your consideration the first part of the investigation we dedicated to him.

Then follows the full text of Part 1 of the 2012 three-part article from Terra America, which was [summarized](#) in the April 27, 2012 issue of EIR.

Kirill Benediktov

Science fiction writer and political commentator
specializing in space exploration

Russia

EIR has received a study dedicated to the memory of Lyndon LaRouche: "Report on a method for accelerating a kinetic body using a booster system based on circulating microparticles to aim and collide it with the asteroid Apophis in order to change the latter's trajectory, as well as several other areas of application for the acceleration of bodies in non-traditional power generation such as wave/wind and controlled thermonuclear fusion power." Author A. Ya. Kolp writes:

This report is dedicated to the memory of Lyndon LaRouche, the American politician known for Physical Economy, a great thinker of our time, one well acquainted and fond of Germany and Russia, and of the common aims of Mankind in economy and the power industry, in particular involving thermonuclear fusion

of light nuclei using helium-3 from the Moon, something he was unable to achieve by the end of his long life.

Please convey my condolences to Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

Albert Ya. Kolp
Scientist
Active with the International Global Aerospace
Monitoring Space System (IGMASS)
Russia

I was in touch with Lyndon LaRouche only indirectly, through his journals, which I received for 20 years, his representatives, and his friends. And since I was a friend of Taras Muranivsky, LaRouche's close friend and the publisher of his works, I was indirectly a friend of LaRouche himself.

Since I even lived in the apartment of Taras Vasilyevich [Muranivsky], I knew much about the details of the life and destiny of these people, their books, and ideas. Many of my own articles and books have been written under the influence of LaRouche's theory of "physical economy" and with inspiration from his conceptual initiatives.

Stanislav Nekrasov
Economist, member of the board of the Znaniye
(Knowledge) Society,
Sverdlovsk Region, Russia

I am deeply saddened by news of the passing of the great Lyndon LaRouche. May the earth be like goose-down for him to rest on. Memory of him will last forever.

Thanks to all of you who continue his remarkable and much-needed cause. I mourn together with you.

Tatyana Shishova
Writer, antiglobalist activist
Moscow, Russia

Please accept my condolences and convey condolences to Helga. Lyndon was an outstanding man and a great thinker, who was ahead of his time. Unfortunately we are all mortal, but when a person leaves followers and continuers of his ideas, his memory and his cause do not die.

Prof. Georgy Tsagolov
Moscow International University
Academician of the Russian Academy of

Natural Sciences
Associate of the late Prof. Stanislav Menshikov
Russia

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

LaRouche's concept of development is that human beings are capable of creating; that we are endowed with creativity as a mental capacity, which is capable of discovering the laws of the universe and is able new technological laws for improvement.

The focus of his economic work is on such new inventions, but also based on an economic tradition which goes way back to the Old Testament and the idea of development with justice for all human beings. That feature, which he calls economic creativity, is also reflected in the achievements of the biogeochemist Vladimir Vernadsky, who spoke of man as a geological force. . . .

It is important to note that, in the face of speculative globalization, a new process has emerged, which is the Belt and Road Initiative. We should be very optimistic, for example, about the fact that the Dominican Republic has established diplomatic relations with China, in which packages of productive projects are being worked on, which are good both for Dominicans as well as the Chinese, because they represent a breath of hope of what must become an important change.

Jorge Meléndez
Journalist
Dominican Republic

(Remarks made on the Feb. 23, 2019 "Cara a Cara" (Face to Face) TV program, in homage to Lyndon LaRouche, hosted by Rafael Reyes Jerez.)

George Bush [the] father, had the gall, the abuse, the brazenness to jail one of the greatest thinkers that humanity has produced, Lyndon H. LaRouche. And he sent him to jail for five years—a person who was a presidential pre-candidate in the United States various times.

It is a shame that in what has been considered the greatest democracy of our time, the greatest democracy in the world, that such atrocities are committed. We're not just talking about a run-of-the-mill politician. We're talking about a man of the highest standing in the world, in U.S. society, in politics—and he has treated that way.

The trial and jailing of Mr. LaRouche, contrary to

what those who jailed him thought, made him even greater, larger than life, to the point that, after so many years, we have the greatest admiration and affection for him. The fact is that Mr. LaRouche's voice reached far beyond U.S. borders and spread throughout the world.

We send our affectionate greetings to all our friends in the Schiller Institute in Washington, to the LaRouche organization, and to Doña Helga.

Rafael Reyes Jerez

Journalist; TV and radio producer

Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic

(Remarks made on the Feb. 23, 2019 "Cara a Cara" TV program, in homage to Lyndon LaRouche, hosted by Rafael Reyes Jerez.)

MEXICO

I do not know how to express comfort or words of condolence to Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche for the loss of Mr. Lyndon. You must continue his fight and legacy. I am a Mexican and I saw your husband when he came to Mexico in the 1980s. I have not stopped reading the publications available since that time. To you and everyone: Carry on.

Enrique Sánchez Barrales

Mexico

PHILIPPINES

First, I'm sorry to hear that Lyn passed away. I remember with fondness when I met him in Leesburg. I had a one-on-one with you and Mr. LaRouche in 2003 at his home in Virginia, and so many times I would

listen to his speeches in Washington, D.C. I think his ideas will live on. He worked for cooperation among nations, to uplift the lives of all people of the world. That's why he went around, speaking in Europe, in Asia, all over the world.

Unfortunately, some of his ideas did not match the ideas of some people in the States, that's why he was in hot water for awhile. But I think they could put him in prison, but they could not stop his ideas from spreading. So I am very sad that he passed away, but I believe his ideas will live on, through you, through the *EIR*, propagating it.

Gen. (ret.) Delfin Lorenzana

Secretary of National Defense

Philippines

SPAIN

Dear Friends of the LaRouche Movement:

I deeply mourn the physical disappearance of Mr. Lyndon LaRouche, being conscious that his passage through this life could not have been more fruitful.

What is important is not to live many years, but that those years which God permits you to live be full of happiness and that they be productive. Lyndon has not only lived many of the years a human being is allotted, but those years have been really been productive for him and for the rest of us mortals.

Receive my deepest condolences.

Fructuoso Rodriguez Morales

Retired trade union leader

Canary Islands, Spain

IV. What is ‘Human Nature’?

October 14, 2012

THE FUTURE IN SCIENCE:

The Coming of the End of the Cult of Sense-Deception

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

First published in *EIR* on October 26, 2012.

It is now a presently urgent subject of study for mankind, that we must examine, most critically, certain presumptions which have been continued to have been rather widely mistaken for a suitable quality of basis for a contemporary “science.” I emphasize, thus, the cases of those presumptions which have been intended by their proponents to serve as reflecting the mistakenly presumed “realities” of what is merely the outcome of an aggregation of what is presumed, in turn, to be an axiomatic authority of what are merely raw sense-perceptions.

By that statement, presented in high regard for the genius of Bernhard Riemann, I mean to include a certain degree of respect for persons who have been induced to limit themselves, to the extent that they are assured, that nothing proceeds explicitly further in evil, than the reductionist mathematician’s presumptions of what have been, essentially, the misconceived “principles” of sense-perception itself.

The possibility of an actual science fit for today’s needs now requires something much better than persons afflicted with outworn, pragmatic limitations. The experimentally truthful knowledge traced from roots in the principles of Nicholas of Cusa and his follower Johannes Kepler, which is typified by emphasis on what has remained, in fact, as the true foundations of all

competent modern science, is in opposition to all reductionist novelties uttered since that time.

*That presumes, again, that the foundations of principle associated with the discoveries of Nicholas of Cusa, and Johannes Kepler’s uniquely original discovery of the universal physical principle of **Vicarious Hypothesis**, is the principle on which the original discovery, by Johannes Kepler, of the true physical principle of gravitation, had depended. I mean to emphasize such discoveries’ crucial correlative: that which will be, for many, the seemingly shadowy, ontological principle of **metaphor**. It is that principle of **metaphor**, which actually supplies the true foundations of any serious degree of scientific knowledge for today.*

***Metaphor** is a principle which, for example, grips the relevant, subject person whose actually compelling passions will, like those of Johann Sebastian Bach’s **Preludes and Fugues**; represent a powerful force of influence on the mind, but a force which could not be captured by the notions of merely either hand, bowl, or net.*

*All among those passions which members of our societies treat as merely the subject of “sense-perceptions,” or the like forces experienced by man within society or effects of “nature,” must inevitably fall captive to the overriding authority of the net of that same notion of **vicarious hypothesis** whose correlative is the principle of **metaphor**. It has been the fraudulent speculations of Isaac Newton, and his dupes, or their cheating accom-*

plices, which are to be blamed in significant part for the loss of scientific insight into the meaning of the common experience of both **physical principles** of **vicarious hypothesis**, and of the impassioned drama sensed as the force of **metaphor** on both Shakespeare's tragic stage, and Johann Sebastian Bach's conceptions of the "common law" of mankind's presently known universe.

Thus, it were indispensable, to simply put to one side such outright hoaxsters as the bearers of Aristotle's and the swindler Euclid's a-priorist concoctions. Oust the essential incompetence which still permeates the virtual "blab-school rhetoric" in the popular education of presently customary forms of contemporary modern science, and the comparable opinion of the credulous generally. Abandon the folly which adopts those false "foundations" which are typical of the unfortunate students, and of others, which are to be associated with a virtually "axiomatic" adherence to the deluded perception of those "sense-certainties" which are the inherent modern expression of the popularized follies of scientific incompetence.

Look back to Paolo dal Pozzo Toscanelli, Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, and the founders of the foundations of a competent modern science among the followers of Cusa, through the succession of Leibniz, his school, of the great Carl Friedrich Gauss, Lejeune Dirichlet, and Bernhard Riemann, and, thence, into the revolution led by Max Planck, and Albert Einstein, and into the conception of mind consistent with the foundations of a physical science coherent with the specific definition of "mind," which Planck shared with what has become

presently, the rarely understood Wolfgang Köhler. A competent contemporary and future science brings us now, to a time when we must sort out that history of the flows and ebbs leading into that modern global civilization launched by Brunelleschi and Cusa, which has led us, in turn, into the present time for which a forceful reckoning on the outcome of science this far, must be conducted.

Begin with the setting of Nicholas of Cusa and the outstanding giants among his successors, and, thence into the subsequent, modern celestial physical science and its civilization, of Johannes Kepler and Gottfried Leibniz.

What shall confront your attention most forcefully in this following report, will be Kepler's most crucial discovery, his contribution to the single principle of modern science itself. That is the principle which has been, uniquely, the universal physical principle which Kepler had expressed in his argument for "**vicarious hypothesis**." What we should "see" in this, is merely a shadow cast by the efficiency of a universal reality, as Kepler presented this: as the "shadow" of a universal organization of our known universe. What we regard as that "physical universe" casts a shadow which expresses its presence as in the

nature of **metaphor**, a shadow which human sense-perception perceives as akin to a force of "**vicarious hypothesis**," which is felt as "effects" of some "shadowy" cause, as by **metaphor**, of some universal action.

So, for now, "we see as through a glass, darkly; but then, face to face; now I know in part; but, then I shall know even as I am known."



Si sabría mas el discipulo?

Francisco Goya, "Might not the pupil know more?" from *Los Caprichos* (1797-98). "The possibility of an actual science fit for today's needs," LaRouche writes, "now requires something much better than persons afflicted with outworn, pragmatic limitations."

A Capital Fallacy!

The commonly shared, great fallacy, which is spread among specialists in the designated category of “physical science,” is the misleading presumption, that “physical science,” and also “mere mathematics,” share what should be considered as at the root of the appropriate foundations for actually human knowledge. That fallacy of a presumed categorical distinction of “arts” from “sciences,” has been presently, a commonly crucial root of the systematic fallacies of public and higher education, alike. What has actually been the root of mere “mysticism,” is a mathematics of what is merely sense-perception.

It is mankind, which makes science, not the other way around. The worst of the common expressions of human culture, is the attempt to reduce the underlying quality of principled existence of the human mind, to mere mathematics. When this folly of “merely mathematics,” or the like, is complemented by mere deductions rooted in the passions of sense-perception, then the worst result is to be mistaken for expressions of the universal principles underlying man’s “practical” role within the universe.

The fallacies which I have, thus, just stated, can be sensed from the vantage-points of both Cusa, and of his great student of actually physical science, Johannes Kepler. The warning of the systemic importance of this set of distinctions, is obtained from the work of Cusa, in the realization of the implications of the cross-connections experienced between the notions of “**vicarious hypothesis**” and “**metaphor**.”

Human behavior is what moves it! It is Kepler’s adverting of those two higher principles of human knowledge, “**vicarious hypothesis**” and “**metaphor**,” which locates the actuality of observed human action. Mathematics and so-called physics, are merely the servants of the principles whose expression is located in the passions which are subsumed by the meaning of the roles of what Kepler identified as the tools of “vicarious hypothesis” and “metaphor.” It is the rejection of the higher authority carried in the action of the verities subsumed by the notion of “vicarious hypothesis” and “metaphor” which defines, and must properly define the true meaning of the consequences expressed by society.

Our power of the imagination is thus caught in such a fashion as that: between two imagined categories of objects, which, in their guise as sense-perceptions (in the imagined very large, as in the imagined very small), are essentially “shadows” of some likeness to a quality

of “vicarious hypothesis,” thus a reality which exists only as if projected from the screens of the unseen. These are efficient realities, as estimable scientists such as Bernhard Riemann and his followers, had laid the foundations of the relatively best insight of such followers of his own work, as among the discoveries of Max Planck and Wolfgang Köhler respecting the notion of a universality of the concept of “mind.”¹

In both examples, both in the very large, and in the relatively very small, we are confronted, as the work of Riemann also represents this challenge: that with the inherent quality of systemic qualities of error represented by mere, naked sense-perception. Yet, despite all that, there is a knowable universe which can be adduced from appropriate insights into the folly of reliance on sense-perception as such.

Let us, therefore, place the emphasis of our attention here, on the need to expose the hoax which is the fantasy whose consequence is fairly identified, as being the sense-certainty constituted by those delusions which constitute the domain of popularly misconceived, actually “sense-deception,” as follows.

Some among you might not be pleased by this fact, but, never doubt that it is, nonetheless, ruthlessly true.

I. The Objects, and Objectives of Scientific Knowing

Since this present report incorporates, and does that in an essential mode sculpted in the closing part of the preceding introduction above, that which the usually expected readers would consider an unusual choice of assigned task-orientation, we are obliged, on their account as follows. Instead of such commonplace opinion, I concentrate here on “pedagogical” illustrations of ongoing processes of types which had either not been known, or had been known only as most rarely considered cases of that form, heretofore. When matters are re-considered, they are to be “seen,” as being within the bounds of that opinion-making which my subject here now demands.

1. To attempt to comprehend the distinction between “mind” and “brain,” think of the distinction of a virtually “squatting” transmitter-receiver unit, from the effect expressed by the “messages” broadcast, among such units, across a part of Solar space at “the speed of light.” That example points toward mankind’s great future within our Solar system. Locate the distinction of “mind” in the “architecture” of the process.

For example, the prevalent opinion respecting the role of the human individual, when considered within the bounds of the presently ongoing, recent new century, presumes the notion of a society to be viewed as if it were a collection among “percussively interacting” individual objects among an array of particular, if interacting “objects,” which are to be expressed in a certain likeness to the conception of Kepler’s “vicarious hypothesis.” The likely reading, by our readers, of that process of interactions, were clearly erroneous as a matter of opinions, whose fault includes the fact that such views are implicitly “percussive,” rather than actually rational, both as “horizontally” in time, in forcefulness, and in attributed space. The necessary, corrected view of this matter, is reflected as in Classical drama such as the presentation of Friedrich Schiller’s **Wallenstein** tragedy, or Shakespeare’s **Hamlet**, or in Shakespeare’s **Macbeth**. Or, in the set of **Preludes and Fugues** of Bach, or of Wilhelm Furtwängler’s post-World War II direction of Franz Schubert’s **Ninth Symphony**.²

The problematic quality of the subject I have just suggested, lies, essentially, in an inherently, profoundly pathological direction, a direction which has been a characteristic expression of the oligarchical principle, as the oligarchical principle is conveniently defined, and also illustrated by the root and history of the Roman empire. The most notable feature of the cases of that and similar cultures, is the systemic quality of the viciously induced, general stupidity of the general population of such empires: a vicious trait, which has been, heretofore, inherent in the percussive characteristics, rather than competently cognitive processes, among the populations generally.

This same, relevant subject, is to be recognized otherwise in that depravity which I have pointed out as having been typical of the social system of the Roman Empire; it is, similarly, to be recognized in the inherently depraved characteristics imposed upon the mass-behavior of many of the citizenry of our United States. The surge of the “Greenie” infestations polluting that part of our population, is the relatively most extremely debased characteristic, intellectually and morally, of that population generally today; a similar echo of the characteristics of the depraved ancient Roman Empire,

2. The method of composition of Bach, and of the work of Arthur Nikisch, and of Wilhelm Furtwängler, partakes of their intimations of a creation and performance which come in from “outside” the presented score, as Furtwängler accounts for this method and effect.




Johannes Kepler, statue in Weil der Stadt, Germany. His work created the foundation of all competent modern science “in opposition to all reductionist novelties uttered since that time,” LaRouche writes.

has also been characteristic of the governing principle among leaders within the present European Union, and, therefore, also the mood-swings in existential outlook of the populations generally.

The heritage of a typical expression of this pathological tendency among national clusters within and among populations presently, is demonstrated by the popular statistical economic forecasting, as in the prevailing political and other social trends among the population of the United States presently. Such behavior as that, is an expression of induced stupidity. For example, consider the “virtual” plunge into a prolonged “new dark age” implied in any continuation of the hyper-inflationary “QE” which is now ruining and running the Federal Reserve System currently, or, the catastrophically hyper-inflationary ruin of Europe under any attempted continuation of the present “Euro” system.

The point to be stressed in connection with the case I am outlining here, shows that much of the behavior of the government and of most of the population of the United States itself, is both dulled, largely by its own embedded sense of rage, and that, not surprisingly, more and more stubbornly so. To wit: the generally accepted method of “economic forecasting” in the United

FIGURE 1



the leadership and following of the nation’s population—absolutely contrary to everything associated with that horrid, inherently homicidal fraud called “environmentalism.”

All known living processes evolve in a direction which is to be recognized as expressing an increase of the typical energy-flux density per-capita of the living species. The unique specific quality of the human being, in contrast to lower forms of life, is that mankind is the only species which has a systemic qualification for willfully formed qualitative leaps in physical progress in the use of the notion of qualitatively willful advances in mankind’s use of fire, now surging beyond nuclear fission, and controlled thermo-nuclear fusion, into the prospective reign of matter-antimatter reactions implicit in the achievements at the beginning of the Twentieth

States presently, as also in Europe generally, is systemically anti-human, in the sense that truly systemic expressions of creativity are not permitted under the continuation of the reign of such systems as those.

The proximate cause for the current threat of an immediately global thermonuclear warfare, with its implied threat of an extinction of the human species, is a reflection of the specific quality of degeneration under the influence of a U.S. participation in the present, British-Saudi empire’s grip over, most emphatically, the trans-Atlantic regions.

To understand those present implications and their motivation, we are obliged, if we wish civilization to survive, to reset the programmatic approach to the fostering of what might become an actually durable form of true civilization, and, with that effect, also the included devotion to defeating the threat to Earth from such ongoing processes as a myriad of menacing asteroids, and the haunting terror of the strike of Earth by a comet.

The essence of the same point which I have just been presenting here this far, is that the distinction of man from ape, is that the healthy human mind’s essential distinction, is based on a quality of forecasting directed toward scientific revolutions in the practice of

Century prior to the “First World War,” from the leading achievements of such as Max Planck and Albert Einstein.

The point I have been illustrating in the immediately foregoing paragraphs, is that mankind is designed to rely on the future of revolutionary progress, as measurable per-capita in intensity of fire-equivalents. These advances, when they are in a systemic mode of upward-driven, qualitatively higher energy-flux densities, are the basis in human creativity for the absolute distinction of the potential inherent in the nature of the human species, as in contrast to every other species presently known to us.

The ugly fact, to which I must now call attention here, is that the general condition of nations and the like, for most of what actual history records as civilization or pre-civilization of mankind this far, has been, and presently tends to continue to be consistent with what is named “the oligarchical principle.”

That is the same principle expressed by the evil worship of the Olympian Zeus which perpetrated the genocide against the people and even their land, of Troy. This known legacy of the destruction of Troy, has been continually expressed throughout most of the

planet now as being the model for what had once become the Roman Empire, a tradition re-incarnated in the imperial system of Byzantium, in the “Dark Age” under the original form of the Venetian tyranny, and under what became named as The New Venetian system of such as the likes of William of Orange. Thus came the nominal “British empire” which is actually the reigning system, traceable in origins to the “Siege of Troy,” and, also, to all of the oligarchical systems of economy and government in what is known as “Euro-pean” civilization in particular.

The correlative of that part of the history which I am addressing immediately here, is the “dumbing down” of nations, as that is illustrated by most of the recent history of the United States since the implicitly condoned assassinations of President John F. Kennedy and his brother Robert. The alternating spurts of progress, and then brutal regression, a pattern which has recurred throughout most of the notably leading cultures of the planet, has been accompanied by alternate surges and regressions in the inherent qualities among cultures. Within those processes, a period of growth over several or more generations, may turn, as since the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, into an accelerating shift downwards, which has never really ceased to be in progress since that steep and accelerating decline of the U.S. economy, which has persisted as a trend in economy and government since the closing interval of the Presidency of Bill Clinton, when the U.S. had been precipitated at a steeply accelerating rate, and most of the world, too, especially the trans-Atlantic regions, at a stunning rate of slide into a threatened very, very dark new age—perhaps even a thermonuclear holocaust, planet-wide, in the very near future.

Now, To My Leading Point Here

There have been, and remain two, intermingled trends of the most presently outstanding historical, and of a potentially disastrous, immediate significance. This is the presently, steeply proceeding trend, in the downward-shifting status of our planet at this presently very short-term historical instant. The calamitously downward trend of the present time, has been marked in finely detailed expression of ruin throughout the terms of the policies and practices of the British empire since its birth, in A.D. February 1763 as by its current Queen.

Without the needed historical framework, since the assassination of U.S. President John F. Kennedy, there has been a trend downward toward absolute ruin, in the

United States, and also abroad, especially in Europe, all since the concluding years of the U.S. Presidency of Ronald Reagan. Measured in physical-economic terms, the U.S.A. has been accelerating in what has become a hyper-inflationary “dive,” into a dive in the direction which the Queen herself has demanded: a presently accelerating plunge of the planet’s human population, and its conditions of life and its welfare, per-capita, as notable for its global effect especially in what had been the relatively more fruitful nations, with a specific target for genocide of the Earth’s population, from seven billions persons, to about one billion, or perhaps, much less.

The decline to which I have just pointed, the relatively higher rate of decline in western Europe and North America, has been the intended effect which the British empire and its Saudi extension has deliberately introduced there. This selective feature of the global situation has been selected, by the globally extended, British empire, as a strategically selected emphasis on the Queen’s stated goal of reducing the world population, rather rapidly, from seven billions of human population, toward one billions, all as a product of the inherently genocidal intend of the pro-genocidal “green movement.”

History, notably that of Europe and the Mediterranean regions presently, has repeatedly taken similarly steep declines, as, for example, in the genocide against ancient Troy, in the fall of Rome, in the collapse of Byzantium, in the collapse of Charlemagne’s system following his death, and the Fourteenth-century “New Dark Age” in Europe.

Now, since the coordinated collapse of the Soviet Union, and the since concurrent, hyper-inflationary death-rattle of the “Euro system,” a U.S. Presidency which is fully a captive of the actually, presently global reach of the British empire, including its Saudi component, under the Queen’s own U.S. President, Barack Obama, has recommended a vast and rapid genocide against the entirety of the human population of the planet, not only by a planned acceleration of general warfare, but even the immediate threat of global thermonuclear warfare.

Up to this point, in this account, what I have actually been doing, is to point out the general systemic principles which both indicate the source and means of the presently onrushing destruction of civilization—perhaps even its self-extinction in the burgeoning threat of global thermonuclear warfare. What is presently ongo-

ing, in that respect, mimics the doom of the dinosaurs, as a species no longer considered fit to exist, according to the trends under Her Royal Majesty currently. The difference here and now, is that there is no “natural” justification for such an extinction to occur to the human species. The motive for this criminality against mankind, is nothing other than a continuation of the ancient “oligarchical principle.” The threat is there, here and now, and the danger is immediate.

Let us, with the true nature of known science in mind, both prescribe and implement the urgently needed remedy for this royal atrocity.

II. Now, the Needed Renaissance

My associates of the so-called “Basement Team,” had already contributed a most practically useful sort of critical re-examination of the history of Earth-bounded systems of living species, including the birth of each particular category as representing a species, its evolutionary successions by categories, their extinctions, and the cardinal features of the process of evolutionary transitions, that up to recent times and their species. The net product of that study, is documented here in individually significant parts, and on record, chiefly in the categories of the relevant, so-called “Basement” records. Relevant commentary on this “history” and its implications, is continued here now; both in a sweeping overview of general trends, and the relatively great emphasis on “the human story.”

Consequently, subsuming all other general references, the principal considerations taken implicitly into account this far, have been subsumed by the conception of the deeper distinctions among the characteristics of the internal development of all life-forms as contrasted to the case of the history of the human species itself. This means our own species, as contrasted to any merely mathematical mistreatment of the bare shadows of human behaviorisms as a category unto itself.

That thus-indicated intention, had been prefaced in a goodly part, but only within the scope of the given summary presentation, and that which is circumscribed within the preceding Preface and chapters of the report, this far. It is the practical implications of those preconditions which I have already outlined within the scope of the preceding section here, and of the present chapter, which now comprise the matters presented for your urgent consideration in this publication as a whole.

The first problem to be addressed here and now, is the lack of a specifically human, general degree of competent awareness of the implications of alternating progress and regression respecting the facts set forth in the preceding parts of this report’s subject-matter in general. Therefore, the issue confronting us in this concluding chapter, is the general lack of awareness of the fact that the specific solution which I have emphasized for deliberation this far, actually exists for the consideration of nations and their varying language, and other cultural characteristics more widely.

If the two principal subjects identified in the two concluding chapters, represent the concluding treatments of our principal subject, mankind, in this present location, all other cases for mankind taken together, would then be sufficient to compose the completion of the body of this present report.

The Role of Mankind’s Future

There is, for example, the fact of the categorical distinction of the human species from all known others: only the human species is able to act willfully to change the inherent characteristics of a qualitatively categorical change of its own future, that in a qualitatively original and unique mode. However, despite the unique significance of the implied generality of the implied range of living species, the fact of the matter of the human species for itself, is unique among all known categories of life.

That much now said:

The commonplace, but valid measure of the distinction of the human species from all others, is its characteristically voluntary use of expressions of “fire-in-general.” In other words: “relative energy-flux-density.” This includes what had long been the distinction among the various qualities of fire and its applications, reaching from the relatively higher categorical distinctions beyond nuclear fission, and into fusion, the higher-ordering of humanly- and higher categories of thermonuclear fusion as such, and “matter-antimatter” thresholds defined by the work of Max Planck and Albert Einstein. Thus, “the first instance” of any known fire-place which is qualified as being defined negatively as characteristically human in itself, establishes a crucial distinction of effect, which first appears as sufficiently efficient to separate the categories of the mere animals from that of mankind.

However, while such a conclusion would not be entirely invalid, it would miss a most conclusive quality of fact. The implied margin of categorically qualitative


error within such an argument, is that it misses the crucial fact that man's willful change in the "usable" power gained by mankind, changes (e.g., increases) mankind not only in relative power to act, but also changes man's qualitative characteristics as a species, and that in a qualitative, rather than merely quantitative manner and degree. Hence, the alleged distinction of "superior" from relatively "inferior species" of human beings. This distinction actually corresponds to such categories of social phenomena as the economic and social-political power of owners over slaves, over men regarded as merely beasts, and of oligarchies over merely individual owners.

These latter distinctions correlate relatively with the "relative energy-flux-density" of man per-capita, as measured against a relative line of development measured in the standard of relative existence, measured in "energy-flux density" of the standard of the societal culture as a whole, and, also, its rate of progress in terms of relative energy-flux densities. The case of the Saugus Iron Works in the independent phase of the Seventeenth-century Massachusetts Bay Colony, is typical of suitable rough forms of the quality of existence within a society and also within each sub-category of that society.

The included conclusion to be reached, is, therefore, that a "green culture" is intrinsically a culture of relatively mass-extinctions of human beings, precisely as the current Queen of England has specified a relatively rapid lowering of the current human population of the planet, from seven billions, to approximately one billion, at a currently energized accelerating pace. Thus, a regime of President Barack Obama would be, inherently, a program of human mass-extinctions as we begin to see most clearly today.

For 'Curiosity's Sake'

The successful landing of the most recent design for operations on the planet Mars, already bespeaks a



NASA/JPL-Caltech

The Curiosity rover points the way to a renaissance of scientific and technological discovery. This graphic shows the location of Curiosity's 17 cameras, which are already sending back to Earth images that are transforming our understanding of Mars.

level of a U.S. which is already far, far above the quality of levels, as measured in human terms, far above the direction sought out during the first term of President Bill Clinton, and back to below the range of the level of technology at the time of President Ronald Reagan's initially expressed support for the "Strategic Defense Initiative," and prior to the decay which had set in economically during the set-backs instituted by the President's principal advisors into his second term, and the still greater rate of decline under successive Presidents since, measured in terms of the changing range of national relative physical energy-flux.

The achievement of "Curiosity's" landing is a part of the residue still remaining under the utterly ruinous regime under the mentally Nero-like British puppet, President Barack Obama. Despite the residual drawback in the capabilities of "space developments" which had been accumulated since the first President Reagan administration, two points of positive implications still exist, provided the policy-trends of the Obama administration are decisively reversed in manners which I have specified for the incoming new Presidential administration, to replace the mass-murderously brutish austerity of the intended, utterly bestial, British puppet-style, Obama regime.

FORGET POPULAR OPINION!

Brahms, Liszt and the Test of Immortality

by Mindy Pechenuk

March 8—There is no greater champion of truth, beauty and the creative soul of man and woman than Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. Lyndon's discoveries in music, drama, art, science, economics are the basis for a Renaissance today. With his passing, on Tuesday, February 12, 2019, I want to start this discussion with a statement from Lyndon himself, in the hope that his message will resonate in your mind as you make the crucial decisions to carry out his ideas and create a world in which future generations will be beautiful, immortal souls, never to be slaves to popular opinion again. That is the substance of real culture. Listen to him. This is from the conclusion of his [speech](#) to the Second International Food for Peace Conference, in Chicago, December 10, 1988:

There is no part of society, no constituency, which does not have the same interests. The people of no nation have any different interest than that of any other nation in this matter. We're speaking of the future of hundreds of billions of unborn souls, without whose success our lives mean nothing. That is the common interest which unites each and every one of us, such that there is no distinction among any of us on this issue, on this cause, on this interest.

If we fight so, if we fight with love of humanity, by thinking especially of those hundreds of billions of souls waiting to be born, and thinking also of those whose martyrdom and other sacrifice gave us what was our potential and our debt to them, respecting what we pass on to the future. And we think of our lives not as something lived

from moment to moment, but as a very small piece of experience, with a beginning, and not too much later, an end. And think of our lives not as things which are lived for pleasure in and of themselves, but as an opportunity to fulfill a purpose, a purpose which is reflected in what we bequeath to those hundreds of billions of souls



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Lyndon LaRouche (l.) and Helga Zepp-LaRouche with their friend and collaborator, Norbert Brainin, formerly principal violinist of the Amadeus Quartet, in Washington, D.C. on February 18, 1994.

waiting to be born, in their condition.

Such that, if we at any point were to cut short our mortal life by spending it in a way, which ensured the cause of those hundreds of billions of souls yet to be born, we could walk to death with joy, because we had completed our life, fulfilled it. We might have been denied the chance of fulfilling it a little bit more, but nonetheless, we had fulfilled it.

The joy of life, the true joy of life which relates to what the New Testament calls *agápē* in the original Greek, *caritas* in the Latin, and charity in the King James version, as referred to in *I Corinthians* 13, the quality of *agápē*, the quality of charity, the quality of sacred love, which unites us as individuals with the hundreds of billions of unborn souls, for whose love we can give our lives, and we can walk smiling with joy, knowing that in a sense, they love us, too, even though they're yet to be born. It gives a sense of the true importance of our lives, the true joy of being a living human being.

And we must work with one another in the sense of that attitude toward humanity, historical humanity, humanity which, as a great family, which owes to its past generations, and the present owes to its future generations. The love uniting that family, is in the matter of works, the practical expression of faith, from which faith, the strength to fight and win this war derives.

If we can do so, I am certain we shall win. I'm better than most at understanding the laws of nature and natural law generally, and understanding such recondite concepts as absolute time and things of that sort. And I can understand perhaps more readily than most, how faith expressed in this way, in a practical way, is assured of success. We are each little, we are each individual. But if we know we're united, we're united to this effect, then we know that what each of us as an individual does, in this united way, *will be cause to prosper*.

Thus, in this terrible moment of humanity, when civilization as we've known it for hundreds of years threatens to be removed from us, in the coming two to ten years or so, we have the risk of losing civilization. But we also have the possibility of a heroic solution to this crisis, of becoming generations, which, in our time, *faced with the cup of Gethsemane, accepted it*, and thus, *perpetuated*, in the imitation of Christ, the *cause* of the salvation of future souls.

Is not the mission of a nation, but to develop beautiful souls, whose lives are about creating a future in which mankind can continuously develop new, and higher, scientific and cultural progress for our immortal species? If this is true, then why do we accept today an

entertainment society of violence, irrationality, drugs? Or, why do we accept the debasement of Classical Culture into the category of "entertainment"?

The question is how did we get to this state? How did sensual entertainment come to replace Classical Culture? Did it start when you were born, or has this been a longer battle which goes back many centuries, and is related to the question of the formation of sovereign nation states, and how you, yourself, think?—the very axioms that govern your mind and emotions!

It is sometimes useful to step out of your immediate surroundings, and look over your shoulder, to the battles that occurred before you were born. Go back to the period of 1830-1870. In 1830 the United States had just lost a great President, John Quincy Adams; he was not re-elected. He was replaced by the treasonous Andrew Jackson, who allied himself with the policies of the British Empire. Europe was also in a crisis, in the wake of the reactionary 1815 Treaty of Vienna. The British Empire reigned supreme. Germany and Italy were not yet unified, sovereign nations. In France, the family of Napoleon was making a comeback, and building its empire, but this time as the subservient puppet of the British Empire.

It was a world in which the dynamic of the American Revolution had been blunted, and the values of oligarchism were in the ascendant. The weapons of the British Empire were banking, war, drugs, and famine, but the main tool of the oligarchy was—and has always been—its control of culture.

Step back a moment, and think about what governs your thoughts, your emotions, your actions, the axioms in your mind. You might protest that such an exercise is pointless—"I think for myself," you say. "I'm my own person." But are you really? Do you have, perhaps, a nagging suspicion that there are greater forces at play, acting to control not only what you think, but how you think? If you have the courage to investigate the way in which the oligarchy has used culture—including art, poetry, music, drama, and—most emphatically—scientific discovery to maintain their centuries-long rule, then you are at the beginning of actual liberation.

In the beginning of the 19th century, a phony separation was enforced between "the arts" and "science," a separation which did not previously exist, and one which aimed to deny that "art" and "science" are governed by the same universal principles. This phony separation was created by a British agent, Karl Savigny,—and he was not alone. At his side were equally satanic

figures such as Hermann von Helmholtz, Richard Wagner, Hector Berlioz, the school of French Romantics, and Franz Liszt. Under British direction, “science” increasingly became the realm of dead mathematical logic, and the “arts” were relegated to the arena of the irrational and romantic. Art and Music came to be judged by the yardstick of “different strokes for different folks”—whatever titillates, amuses or excites the viewer or listener.

It is for this reason that we have witnessed the continuing, escalating degeneration within trans-Atlantic culture for well more than a century. Our current musical “culture” is one based on the twin emotions of Eros and Rage, and the effect of this is profoundly dehumanizing.

The time has come for all of us to break these chains, to recognize that it is the subjective nature of man which is in harmony with the creative universe! To begin, we will go back to the 19th century. This was the turning point, when the British Empire strove to break the knowability of the Renaissance discoveries that had moved mankind forward through to the American Revolution. For our purposes today, I am going to take the case of Classical Music and the fight between the evil Franz Liszt together with his side-kick-in-crime Richard Wagner, and the great Johannes Brahms, the last great standard-bearer of Classical musical composition.

Brahms and Liszt had two completely different missions. Franz Liszt allied himself with Napoleon III and with the outlook of oligarchism. If you have given any thought to Franz Liszt as just another legitimate musician, even a “Classical” composer, I hope I can clear this up for you. Be warned, however, that this will require confronting the false popular opinion that there is no scientific standard in culture, that anything can be called creative, and that there is such a thing “art for art’s sake,” independent from the scientific principles and discoveries which have made possible the physical advancement of the human species.

Art: Beauty Surpassing Itself

There is much to be said, but I want to focus on the primacy of Classical music, in which all Classical music comes from the poetic, whether the composition has words or not. The key issues to be dealt with include the primacy of the principles of the human singing voice, which includes tuning (which must be C=256, not what has become standard as A=440 or

higher), the natural registers of the 6 species of singing voice, vocal placement, and the critical issue of the art of metaphor—musical polyphony. It is only through polyphony that you can reach the preconscious, which shapes human thought. The deductive, the logical, literal words, or mathematics—these define the disease within today’s culture, which has replaced actual creative thought.

The unique way that men and women can universally communicate ideas and validatable discoveries with each other, is through the principle that has become classically known as metaphor, and it is the ability of the preconscious part of the mind to hear the unspoken, to hear the unseen, and to allow the thought processes to engage with the thought processes of the composer of the musical composition that defines Classical music, as it also defines all truthful human interaction. So, if the composition does not unfold from that standpoint, if the intention of the composer is not from those Classical principles of what is truth and beauty, it is irrational.

As Lyndon LaRouche has often pointed out—yes, there is a natural beauty that does exist, but the difference with the beautiful in our human species is that it is both in harmony with the natural beauty, but it also transcends natural beauty with a self-conscious ability to leap, to create new ideas, new discoveries, new transformations which are measured in terms of the growing power of the individual man or woman to increase his or her conceptual ability, an ever more beautiful capability that is intrinsic to every single human being. The only true emotion that can generate such beauty is—what only mankind has the capability of—*agápē*.

That uniquely human capability is addressed by LaRouche in a 1986 [Memorandum](#), “Truth is Beauty, and Beauty is Truth: Understanding the Science of the Music,” first published in *Executive Intelligence Review* on January 25, 2019:

Beauty is not yet necessarily art. All living things express beauty. The astrophysical and microphysical laws of the universe, also express beauty. The mere existence of a human child, is beautiful. A horse, is also beautiful, and so is the song of the well-trained European nightingale. A leaf is beautiful, and so a tree, or a flower. Art is distinguished from natural beauty, in that it expresses something pertaining to the perfection of the human species.

The essence of art, is that it must both conform to the form of beauty as we find beauty in living nature, and must also be an efficient expression of that which distinguishes mankind absolutely from the beasts.

Mankind is the only species which can transform its own species-behavior. Transformations for the better, each and all occur through individual creative mental activity of a kind consistent with fundamental scientific discovery.



photo by Carl Brasch

Johannes Brahms

The Case of Johannes Brahms

In the 1880s, Brahms wrote an incredible composition, *Dem dunkeln Schoß der heil'gen Erde*, the text of which is part of a poem by Friedrich Schiller. As you will see later, this is very much in the spirit of Mozart's *Ave Verum Corpus*. Both of these compositions are very good, pedagogical short pieces, which allow the composer to deal with the most fundamental questions of metaphor, immortality, and what has defined Classical music ever since J.S. Bach's great discovery. Now, the idea of polyphony in Classical composition allows for the expression of the in-be-

tweenness, the metaphors, the discovery of truth.

If you take out polyphony from Classical composition, as was done with Gregorian Chant during the ninth and tenth centuries, and as was proposed by Franz Liszt, you end up in a neurotic world. Polyphony is the lawful process that allows the composer to express the metaphor in his mind, since the compositional idea does not lie in any one voice itself, i.e., soprano, alto, tenor, or bass. The oneness of the composition exists only in the intention in the mind of the composer, and the intention exists as from the future. As in life, what governs your actions is a higher mission of mankind's

future, the true expression of *agápē*.

In all true Classical composition, this true expression of the immortality of our species is the subject guiding the passion of the composer.

Let us now go to the Brahms, to *Dem dunkeln Schoß*. Readers can [listen](#) to the performance by the Schiller Institute New York City Chorus.

Dem dunkeln Schoß is based on Frederick Schil-

Brahms' *Dem dunkeln Schoß*: Schiller's Text

This is the text that Brahms excerpted from Friedrich Schiller's *Song of the Bell*:

ORIGINAL GERMAN

Dem Dunkeln Schoß der heil'gen Erde
[vertrauen wir der Hände Tat,]*
vertraut der Sämann seine Saat
und hofft, daß sie entkeimen werde
zum Segen nach des Himmels Rat.
Noch köstlicheren Samen bergen
wir trauernd in der Erde Schoß
und hoffen daß er aus den Särgen
erblühen soll zu schönern Los.

*Not used in Brahms' setting.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION

To the dark bosom of hallowed soil
[We entrust what our hands have wrought]*
The sower entrusts his seed
And hopes that it will grow
Into a blessing, as heaven sees fit.
Far more precious seed do we [now]
Tuck, mourning into the earth's bosom
And hope, that from these coffins,
It shall blossom to a more beautiful destiny.

ler’s poem, *The Song of the Bell* [see box]. Schiller, the great champion of the American Revolution, dedicated his life and works to the betterment of mankind. Both Brahms’ and Schiller’s higher hypothesis express the paradox between natural beauty, and artistic beauty—immortality and the future, the purpose of real physical economy.

Brahms, as does Mozart in his *Ave Verum Corpus* [Example 1], chose the key of D major, which gives you an understanding that you are celebrating the beauty of what it is to be human, and the mission of life. From the primacy of the vocal registration—and tuning—this choice is crucial. If you were to compose these compositions in C major, for example, the vocal registration would change and destroy the poetic idea.

At this point, it is necessary to take up what is a musical key. Is it a self-contained entity, and is the introduction of anything not in “the key,” simply chromatic, therefore producing an irrational sensual affect and emotion? If that is the case, then intervals have fixed positions, and chords are the root of all ultimate motion, in which you can only go from one key to the next in a mechanical fashion. The rules are established, and all one can do is add to the irrationality.

Franz Liszt would argue this is true! But this is not true for J.S. Bach, Mozart, or Brahms, Beethoven and the other Classicists.

To understand the discovery of Brahms and Mozart, it is necessary to go back to Bach, as they also did—Bach’s Revolution, Bach’s discovery—the Bel Canto Well Tempered singing voice, as developed through polyphony, multi-cross voice polyphony, which implies a completely different understanding of musical well-tempered keys. This is the only true expression of human thought, emotion, passion and action in the uni-

EXAMPLE 1
Mozart Ave Verum Corpus, Opening Measures

Original D Major:

Soprano *sotto voce*
A - ve, a - ve ve - rum cor - pus,

Alto *sotto voce*
A - ve, a - ve ve - rum cor - pus,

Tenor *sotto voce*
A - ve, a - ve ve - rum cor - pus,

Bass *sotto voce*
A - ve, a - ve ve - rum cor - pus,

Transposed to C Major:

Soprano *sotto voce*
A - ve, a - ve ve - rum cor - pus,

Alto *sotto voce*
A - ve, a - ve ve - rum cor - pus,

Tenor *sotto voce*
A - ve, a - ve ve - rum cor - pus,

Bass *sotto voce*
A - ve, a - ve ve - rum cor - pus,


Mozart composes his “Ave” in D Major. When you transpose the “Ave” to C Major, the singularities and poetry are destroyed. In the transposed “Ave,” the soprano and alto are forced into the first register in an arbitrary manner. The yellow shading is the second register; pink indicates the first register.

verse—upward!¹

1. From Lyndon LaRouche, “The Axiomatic Basis for Musical Theory in the Physical Sciences”: “Bach’s, Mozart’s, and Beethoven’s keyboards were tuned precisely to a well-tempered scale, with middle-C set strictly at 256 cycles. The dominant concert keyboard instrument into the early nineteenth century, was the fortepiano; this instrument has a registral balance on which the intent of Mozart, Beethoven, et al. was premised, and has a balance with the chamber-music ensemble, which is of importance to hearing works of the ‘pianoforte’ period performed as they were intended to be heard musically. During the middle of the nineteenth century, keyboard instruments underwent certain radical alterations, which fitted them to the Romantic compositions.

EXAMPLE 2

J.S. Bach: Three-Part Ricercare from "The Musical Offering"




Are the above measures 1-9 simply an unfolding of C minor, followed by a chromatic descending line? Or, is J.S. Bach creating a paradox, unfolding from a "one," C Major/C minor, generating a "multimodality" with the Lydian cross voice?

Here is the irony: Bach's *Musical Offering* [Example 2] is in the key of C minor/C major, and the multi-modalities of the cross voicing, between the voices, unfolds the Lydian modality as a "one."

So there is a boundedness, but it is a transfinite. In other words, A does not produce B, B does not produce C; the higher hypothesis in Bach's mind is governing the unfolding of a universe which is constantly changing and developing lawfully.

The Six Species of Human Singing Voice, and Their Registers



"The wind voices of the orchestra were redesigned in such a way that the out-of-tune character of modern wind instruments makes it impossible to perform a Mozart or Beethoven symphony in which the winds' voices cohere exactly, contrapuntally with the strings.

"The upshift toward 'concert A,' seems a small difference in pitch, until we note the discomfort of trained vocalists who attempt to sing their usual repertoire at its original reference key of middle-C at 256 cycles. Often, a shift in pitch has significance for the singing register at which a passage is delivered, a matter of no small importance in well-tempered compositions.

"In classical composition, succeeding passages for a single singing

or instrumental voice are often intended to be a different voice than the preceding passage; in effect, a singer, for example, may be singing two or three parts, each at different points in the composition, often in successive lines of a strophe. The skilled composer places passages within tonal ranges which tend to aid the singer in producing different registral 'color' for each of the two or more voices that singing part must represent in the composition as a whole. A slight shift, away from classical values of well-tempered middle-C, toward a modern 'concert pitch,' can thus either muddle the performance of the composition, or at least create difficulties for the singer's attempt at contrapuntal 'voice transparency' in the rendering." *EIR*, Feb. 8, 2019, p. 42.

Take the descent from the G to F \sharp , F \natural , E \flat , E \natural , D, D \flat , C, B \flat , A, G. Herein lies the *intention*, not a literal reading of the score. Is Bach unfolding a chromatic line, or is there a higher geometry of bel-canto, well-tempered multi-modalities implied? This difference between linear chromaticism and the higher geometry of multi-modalities will become very important in the matter of Franz Liszt and his degenerate school.

Throughout Brahms' entire life, not only did he study all the works of Bach, but he was one of the editors of Bach's Complete Works.

Compare the opening of *Dem dunkeln Schoß* [Example 3] in measures 1 through 8. In measures 1 through 3, it would appear that all voices are singing together; however, that is not true. Herein lies the truth of tuning and registration. Even in what looks like unity, there is polyphony.

Immediately, Brahms escalates the rate of development (measures 5-8), unfolding each voice in contrapuntal motion, generating cross-voices, creating a series of modal paradoxes. What does this imply? Brahms, through the music, is already developing the higher powers of artistic beauty, and truth, about man's creative capabilities—the ability to go beyond nature. In the soprano voice, the G \sharp is introduced, which creates a Lydian cross-voice, within the key of D major/D minor. This is further intensified by the tenor voice—B natural—as well as the alto, which introduces the paradoxical F natural. Let me be clear; all of this is *bel canto* voicing; there are no chordal structures—unlike Liszt, who believed in a fixed, predetermined world in which man is a wretch. The pounding of chords, and linear, chromatic motion is his universe.

In the following hypothesis (new idea)—*Noch köstlicheren Samen bergen*—Brahms, governed by a more beautiful destiny, transforms the opening statement. The tenor and the soprano for the first time develop their third registers, while the bass and alto their second registers. Ah, a new idea!—the freedom of the

EXAMPLE 3

Brahms: "Dem dunkeln Schoß der heil'gen Erde" Opening

Take measures 1-3. Brahms unfolds a crucial irony: he composes all four voices singing together in what appears to be the same idea simultaneously. But, are they all singing the same opening just at different octaves? No, at the proper tuning of C=256 Hz, and with the natural vocal registration of the singing voice, Brahms has created a polyphony between the voices.

Take measures 5-8. Brahms, by increasing the rate of the singularities, creates through the cross-voicing, of the Lydian modality, unfolded in D Major/D minor, a more intense new idea—an "aesthetical tension" as Lyndon LaRouche would say.

The yellow shading is the second register; pink indicates the first register.

potential of the new destiny. So now, you have not only a transformation to a new degree of freedom with the register shifts, but also the opening idea is now in a new domain. This is the fugal quality of polyphony.

Brahms reaches to new heights at the end, with the question of *Erblihen soll zu schönern Los*. Brahms repeats: *schönern, schönern Los, schönern Los*—let the future determine your present actions! As Brahms increases the singularities, so the mind is lifted upward, and reflects back on the entire process! Such is the true nature of metaphor.

There is no mistake in saying that Brahms' political


identity was anti-oligarchical, anti-imperial. His music was his vehicle to fight this evil, creating a culture in which his fellow men and women could rally around the fight to bring empire down, as well as to create what did not yet exist—the nation of his beloved Germany. Brahms was conscious of his responsibility and role in creating a sovereign nation of Germany, as well as the need for this to happen throughout Europe.

Brahms openly allied himself with the great Bismarck. In fact Brahms carried Bismarck’s writings with him when he traveled, had his portrait on his wall, and supported Bismarck in his actions against the British Empire puppet—and Liszt’s hero—Napoleon III, including the Franco-Prussian War. Brahms, like Schiller, was also a great supporter of the American Revolution, and lent his hand to help America. When our dear United States was in trouble in the decades after the British assassination of Abraham Lincoln, Brahms sent his associate Anton Dvořák to New York City, and two friends, George Henschel—a singer, composer, and teacher—and the conductor Arthur Nikisch went to Boston.

In the earlier cited 1986 [Memorandum](#), “Truth is Beauty, and Beauty is Truth: Understanding the Science of the Music,” LaRouche addresses profoundly the interlinked, interactive dynamic of beautiful truth-seeking:

The relationship between the principle of beauty and the creative principle, which we have just identified, is of the form we call “doubly-connected” in synthetic geometry. . . .

In the case of art, beauty and creativity are, respectively, “independent degrees.” The one cannot be derived simply from the other, and the action of neither can modify the other moment as such. At every imaginable point, in the physical space-time of artistic composition, beauty is acting upon creativity, and creativity is acting upon beauty, such that the effect is their com-



Franz Liszt

photo by Nadar, 1886

bined action, but that neither action as such is altered by the other. At least, this limitation is the first-approximation case, pending consideration of more advanced principles derived from the elaboration of this case.

The Case of Franz Liszt

We begin with Liszt by examining his composition, *Ave Verum Corpus*. Readers can listen to a recording [here](#).

Think about what you are hearing—Is Liszt celebrating immortality, is he challenging you through the music to take the same cup of Gethsemane that Christ passed on to you with his life, or is it rather the death that a

wretch dies, and there is nothing more?

Franz Liszt was not an artist; he was a student of Carl Czerny, an individual whose method of piano playing could turn anyone into a trained monkey at the keyboard.²

As Czerny attacked the Classical principles in music, so Liszt adopted the mission to ensure there would be no more Beethovens, Bachs, Mozarts, or Haydns. It is no accident that Liszt’s view of man is that of an animal—relying on the lower senses and mechanical skill, not creativity as the Classicists had developed since the revolution of J.S. Bach. As far as Liszt was concerned, there was never again to be a Bach, Mozart, Haydn, Beethoven, Mendelssohn, Robert and Clara Schumann, Brahms, or Verdi. They were the “old” music, and Liszt defined, as his mission, to create a

2. “Beethoven himself upon meeting the 11 year old Franz Liszt— ‘It is unfortunate that the lad is in Czerny’s hand.’”—Alexander Wheelock Thayer, *The Life of Ludwig van Beethoven*, p. 847. Also, Frédéric Chopin writing to his friend and student Delfina Potocka on Liszt—“He is a strange man; he is unable to wring from his own brain the least thing that has worth before God or man. . . . You know, Liszt takes an enema tube instead of a telescope to look at the stars. Then he pulls his chosen star down from the heavens, dresses it up in an ill-tailored garment with ribbons and frills and enormous wig, and launches this scarecrow upon the world. There are people who admire him, but I still say he is a clever craftsman without a vestige of talent.”—Jan Holcman, *The Legacy of Chopin*, 1954.

“new” music, through the destruction of lawful Classical polyphony. Such was the sensual, mathematical Romantic school.

By 1848 Liszt had set up his center of operations in Weimar, Germany, formerly the center of operations of the great Schiller. Liszt was to be the king of the “New Future Music.” Culture was to play a role as a source of entertainment, an escape into hedonism. Like Immanuel Kant before him, and in the reactionary environment of the post-Congress of Vienna years, Liszt and his circles were out to ensure that the creative principles would become unknowable to mankind.

Liszt was explicit as to his intention in a letter to Agnes Street-Klindworth, dated Nov. 16, 1860:

If, when I settled here [Weimar] in 1848, I had decided to attach myself to the posthumous party in music, to share in its hypocrisy, to flatter its prejudices, etc., nothing would have been easier for me through my earlier connections with the chief bigwigs of that crew. By so doing I would certainly have won myself more esteem and pleasanter relations in the outside world; the same newspapers which have assumed the responsibility of abusing me with a host of stupidities and insults would have outdone each other in praising and celebrating me, without my having to go to much trouble about it. They would have gladly whitewashed a few of my youthful peccadillos in order to laud and boost in every way the partisan of good and sound traditions from Palestrina up to Mendelssohn.

But that was not to be my fate; my conviction was too sincere, my faith in the present and future of the art was both too fervent and too firm for me to be able to be content with the empty objurgatory formulae of our pseudo-classicists, who shriek until they are blue in the face that the art is being ruined, that art is being ruined. The mind’s tides are not like those of the sea; they have not been ordered: “Thus far shalt thou go, and no further”; on the contrary, “the spirit bloweth where it listeth,” and this century’s art has its word to contribute, just as much as had that of earlier centuries—and it will do it inevitably.

Although incompetent musical historians often

group together various—sometimes opposing—19th century composers into what they ignorantly call the “Romantic School,” Liszt’s assault on the principles of Classical composition contained key specific components:

1. Chromaticism—to destroy the lawful *bel canto* Well Tempered Cross-Voice Revolution of J.S. Bach, and those great composers who developed this Revolution—Mozart, Haydn, Beethoven, Schubert, Clara and Robert Schumann, Mendelssohn, Brahms.
2. Replacing the real tuning of C=256, with A=440 or higher, therefore destroying the actual poetry, and the natural tuning of the human singing voice—thus, eliminating the poetry of the cross voicing of the register shifts, as well as the modalities.
3. Eliminating the moral dimension of music, through the introduction of romanticism based entirely on Eros, on experiencing the world through your senses. *Agápē*, the touchstone of all true musical and poetic composition, was to be eradicated from composition, thus denying the immortality of the human spirit!
4. Through the introduction of these techniques and axioms, to make true Classical polyphony—the cross-voice development of new ideas, new lawful discoveries—impossible.

It is important, in considering these matters, to take a reflection from LaRouche, whose life work has been to discover the beauty of the creative process of the human mind, In his “[A Philosophy for Victory: Can We Change the Universe?](#),” he wrote:

Thus, man’s mastery of nature, through the progress of physical science, depends upon man’s mastery of the development of the social processes within which the unfolding of history and the practice of statecraft are situated. That is the meaning of Classical science, and Classical artistic composition, as expressed, for example, by the 1776 U.S. Declaration of Independence and the 1789 Preamble of the U.S. Federal Constitution.

The quality which separates Classical from Romantic and other vulgar art is the difference in the quality of emotion which is essential, respectively, to each. In vulgar art, the relevant

emotion is, predominantly, sensual effects. In Classical art, it is the cognitive sensation of a “light turning on in the mind. . . .”

That “light” of the act of cognitive discovery, or of recognition, is a special quality of passion. That passion is the quality of movement in Classical art, and in physical science. This quality of passion, associated with cognitive, rather than deductive-reductionist thinking, is the basis for the emotions described, in thinking about man’s physical relationships to the universe, as motion and force in the universe. In all Classical artistic composition and related thought, this is apprehended as Classical inspiration, and, as the quality of Classical-artistic action . . . (*EIR*, March 2, 2001)

Eros—the Emotion of Liszt and the New School

Listen again to the opening of the Liszt *Ave Verum*. Think back to the incredible opening of Brahms’ *Dem dunkeln Schoß*, where the rich polyphony enriches your creative powers, where the entire composition is an organic through-composed whole. Where is the *bel canto* polyphony in Liszt? Listen to what Liszt composes! What is Liszt’s idea of key and modality?

In the opening, Liszt hits you over the head with a series of monotonous chordal sounds, creating a sensual effect of death, without any future generations! What about vocal registration? No voice ever develops into the third register through the entire composition. The dissonances are all literal, no paradox. Where is the polyphony that allows the pre-conscious of the mind to find the truth of the actual intention, of the new ideas being created among the voices, the metaphors to bring to life the ideas in the pre-conscious?

This was the intention of the liberal British Empire in creating the Romantic movement of Liszt, Helmholtz, Wagner, Savigny and their circle of friends. Suddenly—when you replace paradox with chromaticism—no more celebration of the creative mind of man and the universe, no more universals.

The world becomes deductive. Such is the case of the first 10 measures of the Liszt’s *Ave Verum*: measures 1-5 are repeated one step up in measures 6-10.

Now, compare the opening of Liszt’s *Ave Verum* with Mozart’s *Ave Verum* [Example 4]. Think about the difference between a mind governed by Eros, and one motivated by the highest of all passion, *agápē*. Readers can listen to the Mozart composition [here](#) and the Liszt [here](#).

Mozart goes right to the soul and preconscious in the first four measures. He generates a crucial paradox by composing two *Ave Ave*, in which he presents the paradox between deductive logic (eros-entropic), where all relationships are *a priori*, inhabiting a fixed position in time and space, and the bounded, but transfinite (anti-entropic) true nation of the universe and man’s mind. As Mozart discovered from J.S. Bach, the well-tempered universe is multi-modal; musical keys are bounded, but are multi-modalities, that is, there is a multiplicity in the oneness.

In the key of D major—with the descending A, G#, G natural, Mozart creates a crucial paradox governing his intention throughout the composition. So, right in the opening of the *Ave Verum*, Mozart presents you with this crucial paradox! He then unfolds throughout the composition, not from beginning to end, but, from the future determining his present actions, his intention.

Unlike the erotic Liszt, and the music textbooks today, this descending A, G#, G is not a chromatic line; the G# is not just passing through. Just the opposite, the G# is a singularity in the key of D major, creating—as Mozart sets it with the D in the bass—a Lydian paradox.³

In comparing Liszt’s *Ave Verum* and Mozart’s *Ave Verum*—what happens between the different intentions? Why does the Liszt *Ave* create an eerie sensual effect? Ask yourself, where is the development of an unfolding of an upward idea? Why does Liszt open with a Gregorian chant-like repetitive subject—one in which he moves from G minor to A major, thus the “Lydian” interval does not create a beautiful tension, but becomes your Romantic chromatic tone?

Mozart, on the other hand, creates in the key of D major an idea which unfolds lawfully the multi-modalities as a One. The discovery by the great violinist Norbert Brainin, is Motivic Thorough Composition

3. Examine the inversion of how the minor generates major, and major generates minor, as a doubly connected lawful process. The intervals are not fixed, the new modalities that are created, which are between the cross-voicing, create an entirely new idea—something new, as if “out of the blue.” This discovery by Mozart was made around 1782, when he discovered the compositions of J.S. Bach. Mozart and Haydn had been invited to the musical meetings of Baron van Swieten, where the genius of Bach’s compositions was presented. In the hands of Rameau earlier, and with the all the Romantics later, the keys are fixed, and you go from one to another key, by a mechanical, defined process, the intervals are fixed, the tuning is A=440.

EXAMPLE 4

Comparison of Liszt and Mozart *Ave Verum Corpus*

Liszt:

2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Soprano I
A - ve, ve - rum cor - pus Chri - sti, na - tum de Ma - ri - a Vir - gi - ne;

Soprano II
A - ve, ve - rum cor - pus Chri - sti, na - tum de Ma - ri - a Vir - gi - ne;

Tenor
A - ve, ve - rum cor - pus Chri - sti, na - tum de Ma - ri - a Vir - gi - ne;

Bass
A - ve, ve - rum cor - pus Chri - sti, na - tum de Ma - ri - a Vir - gi - ne;

Chromatic passing tone

Mozart:

2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Soprano
A - ve, a - ve ve - rum cor - pus, na - tum de Ma - ri - a vir - gi - ne;

Alto
A - ve, a - ve ve - rum cor - pus, na - tum de Ma - ri - a vir - gi - ne;

Tenor
A - ve, a - ve ve - rum cor - pus, na - tum de Ma - ri - a vir - gi - ne;

Bass
A - ve, a - ve ve - rum cor - pus, na - tum de Ma - ri - a vir - gi - ne;

Lydian

Mozart, Brahms, and Liszt all use the Lydian interval. This raises an important question about the intention of the composer, his world view, and his mission for humanity. The truth lies not in the “interval,” or “modality.” In Liszt’s rampage to destroy all Classical anti-entropic principles, he eliminates all singularities and paradoxes, and replaces them with chromatic passing.

(*Motivführung*).⁴ Thus, the Lydian modality is unfolded as a multiplicity of the D major/D minor modality, and the inversion of D major to G minor. This creates, as Lyndon LaRouche calls it, an “aesthetical tension,” a tension of true passion, in which you find in yourself the sublime *agápē* to do the good with your life for all

mankind, generations into the future.

Mozart’s musical development of ideas, throughout the *Ave Verum*, stands in sharp contrast to Liszt who, from the *vere passum* through the *cujus latus*, continues to drone on with his Gregorian chant-like nondevelopment, once again going up in step-wise motion. What is Liszt expressing about the creative nature of man? What is Liszt positing as the nature of the universe? Is it creative and full of living development? Or,

4. Lyndon LaRouche, “[Norbert Brainin on Motivführung](#),” *EIR*, September 22, 1995.

EXAMPLE 5A

“In mortis examine” from Mozart Ave Verum Corpus

The image shows a musical score for four voices: Soprano, Alto, Tenor, and Bass. The key signature is one sharp (F#) and the time signature is common time (C). The lyrics are: "in mor - - - - - tis ex - a - - mi - ne." A callout box labeled "Lydian interval" points to the interval between the notes G# and A in the Alto part. Vertical lines connect the notes of the same syllable across the four staves, showing the polyphonic texture.

Compare the very last phrase of the work, sung on the words “in mortis examine,” with the very opening (see bottom of Example 4). Note the greater density of Lydian intervals here. Ask yourself, what governs the density of singularities in the “in mortis examine,” as compared to the opening “Ave, ave.” Do not perform this comparison “analytically,” but, rather, “synthetically”; what is crucial here, is the process that governed Mozart’s generation of ideas. You will discover that “in mortis examine” is transformed, in relation to the opening

“Ave, ave”—it is related, and yet it is different. Ask yourself, what has changed, and, more importantly, what has ordered that change?

Mozart challenges you to understand how the future governs your present actions. For Mozart, as for Plato before him, the relationship of God, Man, and Nature, of cause and effect, is not to be found in a mechanistic notion of “causality.” It is not as most people think: that the past orders the present, which in turn determines the future.

is Liszt’s world a mechanical, dead world, where no living human being can express true passion for the creative future?

In Mozart’s final *In mortis*, the bass voice has a descending A, B \flat , A, G \sharp , G \natural , F [Example 5a]. Once again Mozart presents you with the question of what it is to be human; what kind of passion does it take to live an *agapic* life, a life creating a future for all mankind? What unfolds, through this descending line in the bass, is a polyphonic dialogue with all the other voices. Mozart creates this most crucial of paradoxes—for you the listener and performer. Will you, like Christ, take the cup of Gethsemane? Or will you take the path of Franz Liszt—in which this descending bass line would be treated as a chromatic irrational descent to hell?

By the end of the Liszt *Ave Verum* [Example 5b], you have no idea, no insight, into the real relationship of the individual human soul to the universal development of all mankind. That is Liszt’s intention—to leave you within a state of pessimism and Eros, where your only concern is for yourself and the very small.

The Test of Death—Immortality

The *Ave Verum Corpus* raises an important question of what your life is about, what your relationship is to the entirety of mankind. I hope you can hear—in listening to the Mozart and Liszt compositions—the two different views. Mozart, like Bach before him, has a profound understanding of the “future governing your present actions.” The composition is not composed in a linear fashion from beginning to end, but rather from an intention (hypothesis of the higher hypothesis) in Mozart’s mind, with the deep understanding of Classical principles—that time does not work as a clock does, but rather in the Simultaneity of Eternity! Always unfolding from a higher placement, creating new hypotheses, new ideas.⁵

The degenerate Liszt could not be more the opposite. The treatment of *Ave Verum* becomes a death dirge—life ends when you hit the grave. There is no

5. For a pedagogical proof, see Mindy Pechenuk, “Mozart’s *Ave Verum*: A Crucial Proof of Mozart’s Discovery, and a Short Pedagogical Exercise in Musical Memory,” *Fidelio*, Vol. 5, No. 4, Winter 1996. Pp. 34-45.

EXAMPLE 5B

“In mortis examine” from Liszt *Ave Verum Corpus*

mor - tis in ex - a - - mi - ne. *pp*

mor - tis in ex - a - - mi - ne. *pp*

mor - tis in ex - a - - mi - ne. *pp*

mor - tis in ex - a - - mi - ne. *pp*

un poco riten. *pp* *perdendo*

A - - - - men, A - - - - men. *pp*

A - - - - men, A - - - - men. *pp*

A - - - - men, A - - - - men. *pp*

A - - - - men, A - - - - men. *pp*

Mozart understood the profundity of the Christian, Judaic, Islamic notion of Immortality, and that your life is a test of what you did to create a future for humanity. Mozart understood Christ’s life and death, representing an upward motion for all mankind, and that men and women were not meant to exist as wretches, serving an oligarchical Empire!

Contrary to that, Liszt’s outlook is made explicit in a letter to Agnes Street-Klindworth, recounting an anecdote about Mozart in Prague in 1790 that had come to his ears:

After the first act of the *Clem[enza] di Tito*, H.M. [his majesty] left the theater: the manager rushed in great dismay to convey this disastrous news to Mozart, who, loftily aware of his own genius, replied point-blank: “Um so besser, da haben wir einen Esel weniger im Theater!” [“So much the better. Now we have one donkey fewer in the theater!”] I am a long way from endorsing such remarks; ...⁷

paradox, no metaphor, only repetitive, anguished slow chromaticism, which leave the listener in a state of sensual despair. There is no future, no potential for development. This is lawful for Liszt, who hated the idea of republican nation-states, unlike Mozart and Brahms, who supported both the ideas—and the concept of Man—unleashed by the American Revolution. Liszt, as demonstrated in his allegiance to Empire, not only hated those principles, but lived to create imperial New Music as a weapon.⁶

6. “Here lies the essence of the difference between the Romantic methods, of both composition and performance, of Rameau, Liszt, Berlioz, Wagner, et al., and the Classical methods of composition and performance of Bach, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert, Mendelssohn, Schumann, and Brahms. This is underscored by the way in which that young pupil of the Romantic Czerny, Franz Liszt, went on to attempt, as shown by Liszt’s performance transcription, even to turn a Classical composition such as Schubert’s *Wanderer Fantasy* into Romantic slush.

In Liszt there are no paradoxes—only the droning on of harsh dissonances, which repeat themselves chromatically. There is no celebration of man or woman, living a life which has created further new discoveries for mankind. I would go as far to say, for Liszt, Jesus Christ’s life and death was not a higher-order resolution, one whereby an individual may be led to discover immortality. Liszt was a *fundamentalist* Catholic; he, himself, was ordained an abbé later in his life. His pessimistic view was made very clear when he com-

In Classical musical compositions, and their performances, it is the resolution, as Classical metaphor, of what appear to be contrapuntal dissonances, created by Bachian inversion, which is the distinctive quality of passion in such music. Furtwängler’s ‘playing between the notes,’ typifies the method of performance, as opposed to Romantic score-reading for sensual effects, consistent with the Classical world-outlook.”—Lyndon LaRouche, “A Philosophy for Victory: Can We Change the Universe?” *EIR*, Vol. 28, No. 9, March 2, 2001. p. 36, footnote 35.

7. Pauline Pocknell, ed., *Franz Liszt and Agnes Street-Klindworth: A Correspondence*. Pendragon Press, 2000. Letter 54, p. 106.

posed the *Evocation a la Chapelle Sixtine*, in which he combines Allegri's *Miserere* and Mozart's *Ave Verum Corpus*.

Liszt states,

I have not only brought them closer together, but, as it were, bound them together. Man's wretchedness and anguish moan plaintively in the *Miserere*; God's infinite mercy and the fulfillment of prayer answer it and sing in [Mozart's] *Ave Verum Corpus*.⁸

What you will hear, in listening to this piece is not the love of *Agápē*, but that of the irrational *Eros*!

Liszt and Napoleon III—The British Empire

The relationship between Franz Liszt and Napoleon III is not a question of connecting the dots. Liszt was very clear in his actions and allegiance to Napoleon. In an 1870 letter to the Princess Carolyne Sayn-Wittgenstein, during the Franco-Prussian War, he states:

If the Empire were to collapse, I should personally feel extremely sad. I absolutely do not believe that the personal rule of Napoleon III has been corrupting and oppressive for France—but quite the contrary, it is demonstrably necessary, conciliatory, progressive, and genuinely intelligent and democratic in the best sense of the word.

When the news came that Ludwig II of Bavaria had committed troops to support Bismarck in the Franco-Prussian War, Liszt remarked:

Timely warning was given to my son-in-law, Emile Ollivier, to the French diplomats, to the Empress, who was rather inclined to enter the war, and to the Emperor, Napoleon III, who at first hesitated but was at length swept along with the tide ... but all this good advice was a voice crying in the wilderness. The die was cast, and its fatal consequences have been written in some of the gloomiest pages of history.⁹



Painting by Wilhelm Camphaus, 1878

After the Battle of Sedan in 1870, a triumphant Prussian Chancellor Otto von Bismarck (r.) is depicted in conversation with the defeated and captured Emperor Napoleon III.

On January 10, 1873, Liszt authored a eulogy for Napoleon III:

Napoleon III, is dead! A great soul, an all-embracing intelligence, experienced in the wisdom of life, a gentle and noble character—with a disastrous fate! He was a bound and gagged Caesar, but still closely related to the Divine Caesar, who was the ideal embodiment of earthly power. In the year 1861, when I had a pretty long interview with Napoleon, he said, "Sometimes it seems to me as if I were over a hundred years old." I replied, "You are the century yourself, Sire!"—And, in fact, I honestly believed at the time, and so still, that Napoleon's reign was the one most in keeping with the requirements and advances of our era. He has set noble examples, and accomplished or undertaken great deeds: amnesties which were protection of the Church in Rome and in other countries; the rejuvenance of Paris and other great cities in France; the Crimean War and the Italian war; the great Paris Exhibition, and the rise of local exhibitions; the earnest attention paid to the lot and to the interests of the

some of the most notorious agents of the Anglo-Dutch Empire, such as George Klindworth and his daughter Agnes Street-Klindworth. This duo acted sometimes as agents directly of the British Empire, Palmerston, at other times for Metternich, at times for the French, and for a certain faction in Russia. Agnes Street-Klindworth was also one of Liszt's mistresses. For Liszt, the world of the British Empire and its minions was home to him.

8. Alan Walker, *Franz Liszt, Vol. III, The Final Years: 1861-1886*. Cornell University Press, 1997.

9. Alan Walker, *ibid.* Franz Liszt was involved in many intrigues with


country people, and of the working classes; the generosity and encouragement to scholars and artists,—all these things are historical facts, and are things in which the Emperor took the initiative, and which he carried out in spite of all the difficulties that stood in his way.

These things will not be eclipsed by the misfortunes that befell him, however terrible these may have been, and, on the day of judgement, France will fetch the coffin of Napoleon III, and place it in all honor beside that of Napoleon I. It can be affirmed without adulation that throughout life the Emperor unswervingly practiced those great virtues which are in reality one and the same thing and are known by the names of benevolence, goodness, generosity, nobility of mind, love of splendor and munificence. One of the fine traits of his character that he is acknowledged to have possessed, was his never-failing kind heartedness and his deep gratitude toward those persons who had ever done him a service. In all humility and lowliness of spirit I will imitate him this, and begin with himself by blessing his memory and addressing my prayers for him to the God of Mercy who has so ordered things that nations may recover from their wounds.¹⁰

The Test of Death— The Immortality of Our Species

Reviewing what we have covered so far—including Liszt's oligarchical loyalties and counterposing that to the dedication of Bach, Mozart and Brahms to human discovery and advancement—this raises the question for all of us: Shall we, as individuals and as a society, throw off the chains of the Anglo-Dutch Empire, and the erotic entertainment they call “culture”? Shall we rise to the occasion that this incredible moment in history has handed to us?

10. *The Letters of Franz Liszt, Vol. II: From Rome to the End*, collected and edited by La Mara [Marie Lipsius]. Constance Bache, translator. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1894. Pp. 209-210.



Johannes Brahms in his study.

In the [wise words](#) of Lyndon LaRouche:

The knowable measure, in principle, of the difference between man and all among the lower forms of life, is found in what has been usefully regarded as the naturally upward evolution of the human species, in contrast to all other known categories of living species. The standard of measurement of these compared relationships, it that mankind is enabled to evolve upward, and that categorically, by those voluntarily noetic powers of the human individual will.

To grasp that point, and to understand fully Liszt's evil folly, it will help to read LaRouche's 2012 article, “End the Folly in Sense-Perception: Metaphor!” just [reprinted](#) in the March 8, 2019 issue of *EIR*.

The choice is yours. Make the right choice, for the future of humanity is in your hands. We have an opportunity to realize a great future. The discoveries and leadership of Lyndon LaRouche and Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the Presidency of Donald Trump, and the potential of friendly relations with President Xi Jinping's China, President Putin's Russia, and Prime Minister Modi's India, all portend a great breakthrough for the future of the human species. Think hundreds of years ahead, now, and let that determine your actions.

SUBSCRIBE TO

EIR Executive Intelligence Review

EIR Online



EIR Online gives subscribers one of the most valuable publications for policymakers—the weekly journal that has established Lyndon LaRouche as the most authoritative economic forecaster in the world today. Through this publication and the sharp interventions of the LaRouche Movement, we are changing politics worldwide, day by day.

EIR Online includes the entire magazine in PDF form, plus up-to-the-minute world news.

EIR DAILY ALERT SERVICE

EIR's new Daily Alert Service provides critical news updates and analysis, based on EIR's 40-year unparalleled track record in covering global developments.



SUBSCRIBE (e-mail address must be provided.)

EIR Online

- \$ 360 for one year
- \$ 180 for six months
- \$ 120 for four months
- \$ 90 for three months
- \$ 60 for two months

EIR DAILY ALERT SERVICE

- \$ 100 one month (introductory)
- \$ 600 six months
- \$ 1,200 one year (includes EIR Online)

For mobile users, EIR and EIR Daily Alert Service are available in html

Name _____

Company _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____ Country _____

Phone (_____) _____

E-mail _____

I enclose \$ _____ check or money order

Make checks payable to
EIR News Service Inc.
P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390

Please charge my MasterCard Visa
 Discover Am Ex

Card Number _____

Signature _____

Expiration Date _____

EIR can be reached at: www.larouchepub.com/eiw
e-mail: fulfillment@larouchepub.com Call 1-800-278-3135 (toll-free)