

# What Is Mankind's Mission?

August 1, 2015

**Dennis Speed:** My name is Dennis Speed, and I'd like to welcome everybody here for today's dialogue with Lyndon LaRouche. We're going to start right in. Mr. LaRouche has an opening statement, and we'll start with questions immediately thereafter. So, Lyn?

**Lyndon LaRouche:** Yes. This operation we're doing here in Manhattan has a very significant meaning to it. First of all, Manhattan actually is the real capital of the United States. Now, some people may quarrel about that, but I can assure you that that's the fact, and we're talking about the initiation of the George Washington administration; but then you had another man [Alexander Hamilton] who was also making that all possible. So that is extremely important, and it's important to recognize what that principle is.

Because that principle is the principle on which the United States was put into motion, actually in motion, on behalf of George Washington in particular. And that is the standard which we sometimes lose track of, especially in the course of history, because there have been a number of Presidents after Washington—about four of them—who were really not deserving of the position of that; then we had one or two good Presidents, and then we had a bunch of bums, more or less; and then we got into Abraham Lincoln, and then we got a great general [Ulysses Grant], who finished his military service as such, and he became a President of the United States with two terms of office.

So, there is an unresolved problem inside the existence of our United States: that we've had

some great Presidents, who have some great movements, Presidential movements, terms of office in general. We've had a lot of bums. And we are, in the Twentieth Century, fortunate in one or two Presidents, or actually three, and we got a lot of bums; especially after Franklin Roosevelt left office, things began to get very bad.

And now, the condition of the United States is *horrible*. There's a general deterioration in the mental life of our citizenry, since a decline which began at the beginning of the Twentieth Century. We have been going downhill, worse and worse, in our mental life, and the effects of our mental life in terms of voices, exchanges, and so forth. And so, we would hope that by going back to a reference to a great President, and to a great man

---

**We're now on the edge of the greatest threat to human existence throughout the planet, right now. With Obama still in the Presidency, we're in the danger of being dragged into a thermonuclear war, a global thermonuclear war, from which very few people, if any, would actually survive.**

---



U.S. Army/Sgt. Alexander Skripnichuk

*FLASHPOINT: U.S. troops maneuver with Ukrainian troops in the Rapid Trident exercise on July 27, 2015—one of an escalating set of U.S. and NATO maneuvers being carried out on the Russian border.*

who backed him up, that we can recover the meaning of the Presidency of the United States, as under its first President.

That, to me, is crucial, because unless we can achieve that, and get rid of some of the mistakes that came in during the Twentieth Century, and now in this present century ongoing, we've been going downhill, morally, intellectually, otherwise, in general. And my hope is that by going back to Alexander Hamilton's standard of performance, his great genius,—that by going back to reach that level, which was the level reached by the best people in Manhattan, that the spirit of Manhattan, carried from that time, can be reaffirmed.

And that's what my mission is, here in particular. We're now on the edge of the greatest threat to human existence throughout the planet, right now. We're now presently, with Obama still in the Presidency, in danger of being dragged into a thermonuclear war, a global thermonuclear war, from which very few people, if any, would actually survive, even the very brief introduction of that war. So, my immediate concern is to prevent that thermonuclear war, which would virtually exterminate the human species. And, my concern is to get Obama out of office, because the existence of Obama—if continued during this last month—would be the death of most of humanity, and the death of the meaning of all the history that's come before.

So, I think that we, who represent a selection of some people (and more), who are devoted to that mission, may be the forces which will lead the way, to escape from the monstrous conditions that threaten us, under the continuation of the Obama Administration.

**Q:** Good afternoon, this is A— from New York. Your recent remarks regarding this very threat of thermonuclear war—you mentioned that we had a very narrow period of options coming up, as the summer progresses; and then we have—I wonder if you could help clarify the provocations and the set-up that's taking place within Syria; Turkey's involvement in that, and how the United States has been coming out now, and is continuing its provocations and pivot into Russia.

The Russians have been very clear that they're monitoring this; they're very well aware of it and ready to respond. Now, in our government, we are getting the response and echoes, and a fight around Glass-Steagall—we're aware of that—but we're not hearing anything, from anybody, in the form of leadership about this threat. We know, through you, that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are doing all they can to avoid this, but of

course, Obama has this window now with Congress out.

So, I'm wondering if you could help us further understand. What particularly I'm wondering about is what is going on in Syria with the Turks, the threat of a no-fly zone (which is an act of war), and just more in terms of what's required in terms of leadership within our house to remove Obama?

### **Obama Threatens Russia, and Us All**

**LaRouche:** Well, the basic thing that has to happen,—the keystone comes from Russia. Russia's gone through a lot of history; I've enjoyed, shall we say, some of the taste of Russia's decline, and its attempt to bounce back up. I was active in those efforts, on behalf of Russia, after the post-Soviet period.

And, I was able to make contributions. I was associated in that effort with Bill Clinton, when he was President, during the first term and what was left of the second term after the British Monarchy got through with him, and others.

So, these conditions are ones I understand very well. And I understand precisely what the problem is: that if Obama were to have his druthers—. And now, you have to realize that Obama is merely a patsy, he's a patsy for the British Empire; that's what he belongs to, why he got his job as President. And as long as he remains in control, willful control over the policies of the United States, we are now sitting proximately to the extermination, or virtual extermination, of most of the human species.

Because, in one case, the war issue is defined by only one issue: Russia, including China as a part of the picture. But Russia and the United States are the essential elements which threatens the extermination of the human species. And, it is likely, that it would be possible, or likely possible, that once Obama—if he's successful—launches a war against Russia—Russia will not launch a war.

But if the United States, under Obama, launches a war, then in response to the launching of a war by the Obama Administration, then we have a *global* thermonuclear war; in which it's doubtful that humanity, as we've known it heretofore, would survive even the initial launching of such a thermonuclear war.

Back in history, there was a time when a great President dealt with Russia, in a recent time out of the Cuba business; and this President—this Presidency—protected the United States, and the world, from a thermo-

---

If Obama is able to maintain control over the policies of the United States, during the period of this month, then the doom of most of our nation, and most of the planet will go down with it. That is what must be prevented, and that is what I'm dedicated to prompt the people who should know better, to know better, and to do the things to get Obama thrown out of office, and to realize a great peace.

---



*FLASHPOINT: Ukrainian fascist groups which have been supported by Obama and NATO, rally against President Poroshenko on July 22, 2015, demanding a more aggressive policy against Russia.*

nuclear holocaust. The government of Russia destroyed its own nuclear arsenal, in order to secure peace and avoidance of war, and a great President of ours, who was to be assassinated pretty soon, did the job to negotiate that peace.

Now, we're in a situation where Obama, who's merely a stooge for the British Empire in fact, but he's the agent right now; and if Obama is able to maintain control over the policies of the United States, during the period of this month, then the doom of most of our nation, and most of the planet will go down with it. That is what must be prevented, and that is what I'm dedicated to: prompting the people who should know better, to know better, and to do the things to get Obama thrown out of office, and to realize a great peace. As great Presidents who had been general officers during World War II *did* take the actions to prevent a thermonuclear war; as Kennedy did take the action to prevent a thermonuclear war of that nature.

But now, who's going to defend us against what Obama represents? And, the question is, in my mind, are there still members of the Congress, and other insti-

tutions of the United States as such, which will kindly throw Obama out of office, so that we can avoid a general thermonuclear destruction of, among other nations, our own United States?

### **No Alternative to Removing Obama**

**Q:** Hi, Mr. LaRouche. This is H— from the Bronx. Today we have the news about the apparent default on \$58 million payment of a Puerto Rican corporation, or “state corporation”; and this also involves hedge funds who are demanding austerity, cuts in education, and so on. And, I know that you are familiar with the Puerto Ricans in New York. I once read your paper on the Puerto Rican Socialist Party, and the funny relationship between the Puerto Ricans in the

United States, who now outnumber the Puerto Ricans on the island.

Also I was reviewing that the collapse of Puerto Rico dates particularly to the 1996 period, when they lost certain tax benefits, and they lost their petrochemical industries, and their pharmaceutical industries; and this is also at the same time that we lost our Glass-Steagall, when we had free trade agreements, our NAFTA and so on. So, I was wondering, what is your opinion about these questions of trade and development for Puerto Rico, and also as a potential flank against our situation right now?

**LaRouche:** The Puerto Rican situation is one of a great injustice. That's a fact! Now, the fact that there is a great injustice in that case, what do we do about it? What *can* we do about it? Well, there's nothing we can do about it, unless we get Obama out of the Presidency! Nothing you can do, for Puerto Rico, as long as Obama remains in the Presidency. And there are a lot of other parts of the planet which are threatened similarly to Puerto Rico.

Now, the point is, you can say, you want to fight for that cause. Well, can you win that fight? To win that



U.S. Navy

*FLASHPOINT: U.S. guided-missile destroyers in the Pacific Ocean have been deployed by Obama in maneuvers threatening China, in the South China Sea and environs.*

fight for Puerto Rico, you must remove Obama from the Presidency; otherwise you're not going to succeed.

That's mostly true for other parts of the world, especially the trans-Atlantic community. France is going into a disaster. Hopefully, the British Empire, the British Monarchy, will be shut down, early, because it was the British Monarchy which had actually organized Obama and created the Obama hate business.

So these are the kinds of problems, and we cannot take a particular issue under these conditions and say that there's one place which is the most important place, to give relief to around the planet, or around the Americas. There is no such choice.

*If you get rid of Obama and what he represents, then the gate to freeing Puerto Rico is possible. If you depend on somebody else, some other way, to try to rescue Puerto Rico, you're wasting your time. Unless you can remove both the British Empire, and in particular, Obama—who is nothing but an agent of the British Empire—you cannot save Puerto Rico in any way.*

That's the challenge: Are you willing to concentrate on taking action of a type which will actually solve the *general* problem? Don't try to pick one local issue, however important it may be. Don't presume that you can devote yourself to concentrate only on Puerto Rico, for example, or other situations similarly. *That will not work.* You must, first of all, remove Obama from the Presidency. Otherwise, you can't succeed.

**Q:** Good afternoon, Mr. LaRouche. I wish to introduce at this moment a musical question for you, because I'm concerned to run down the scholarly background to J.S. Bach's use of the tuning pitch of 432.

We know that he did not use this in Leipzig; he couldn't. His organ was tuned a half a step higher than 440, and J.S. Bach himself had his singers and instrumentalists playing at a half tone below; and the organ part, if the cantata were, let's say, in D minor, would be copied out in C minor, a whole tone lower, so that it would be consonant with the singers.

But you see he couldn't go to 430, which apparently is what he wanted, I would gather from reading Kepler—I know that one of Kepler's books was in his library. So that would explain my reading, years ago, that both Quantz and Bach favored 430, but I haven't been able to run that down.

We are in contact with the greatest living Bach scholar, Prof. Christian Wolff of Harvard, and he's promised to try to look into it, to find out where this came from. I'm convinced it came from Kepler.

The point is that Bach was not able to tune at 430 simply because the organ was too high. You tune it down half a step, you get 440. You tune it down another half a step—you can't tune it down by micro-tones obviously—and you've got 415, a half-tone below, which is where Bach operated all the time he was in Leipzig.

The question is, where is the scholarly proof that Bach advocated 430 or 432? I seem to have read that, but I can't get to the source. Can you help me out, here?

### **Between the Notes**

**LaRouche:** Well, I think so. I can give you an indication of which way to look at it. Look, Bach understood what he was doing. He understood the intentions.

Now the point is, where the problem arises, is when people try to take the string values of tones; that often is a mistake. Because the real issue, the underlying issue, which deals with the question of Bach, essentially, is the placement of the singing voice, as opposed to the placement of the note. In other words, this distinction between the placing of the voice, the singing voice, and the placement of the note are not exactly the same thing.

Otherwise, everything is true as what was done by our great Italian musicians, who did much of the work,

most influential work, which I was exposed to, considerably, during my visits in Europe. But that does prevail.

*But!* Verdi—Verdi had a deep insight into the true principle of Bach. But the principle is not located on the note as such. It's located in the placement—the placement, like in Furtwängler's treatment of Schubert's Ninth Symphony. You notice very carefully in the opening section of that piece, you see very clearly how Furtwängler approached the problem, by playing *between* the notes, *not* on the notes. And if you look carefully, also, you will see that Giuseppe Verdi also had a similar approach.

I never met Verdi personally, but I was part of a memorandum on his work, and it was held by the people of Italy, the best Italian performers. So that's the situation: The placement of the note, *between* the notes, is the solution for the problem.

Otherwise, the approximations which can be achieved in that way, are relevant to that. But, if you tune into the note,—*on* the note you may miss the precise point—that's important. You'll find this in the best of great singers and performers. You'll see that. The best performers work not *on* the note, but *between* the notes. And that's where the placement lies.

**Q:** Thank you. Good afternoon, Mr. LaRouche. This is J— from Brooklyn. I remember in the past that you've talked about strategy and outflanking the enemy. So I'm just curious: what would you say about advancing Glass-Steagall through interventions in the state assembly districts, not to create a local initiative but to force the legislators to take a position that aligns with O'Malley or Sanders, or even someone on the Republican side like Rick Perry, who is a total character, but he has, at least, come out with something positive about Glass-Steagall very recently. So, what would you think about that type of strategy?

**LaRouche:** I would say you're pretty much working in the right direction, toward the right goal. There are technical things, and details, which are specific. But for your purpose, in raw terms of your stated question, I would say that's the case. You can accept that.

**Speed:** Yes. I will refrain from making a comment about that because I was thinking that about Glass-Steagall myself. Can you go ahead, M—, with your question?



White House/Pete Souza

*FLASHPOINT:* Obama's alliance with radical Islamic groups, from Libya to Syria, threatens to blow up into global conflict. Here Obama confers with another NATO sponsor of the jihadis, Turkish then-Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan, in September 2009.

## Lessons of Obama's Benghazi Treachery

**Q:** Hi, Lyn, hi. It's M—, born in Manhattan. You put forth how important it is for the safety of the country, that we, in the next week—that would be the best—somehow or other prompt Hillary Clinton to come clean on Benghazi, to admit what was really going on. Frankly it was easy; I knew it when it happened.

The whole process of shipping the arms to al-Qaeda, and probably to ISIS through Turkey, through Benghazi. Benghazi was the seat of al-Qaeda, and my sons, veterans who were in that war, were devastated when they found that there really was no adequate protection for Ambassador Stevens. My other friend, who is Turkish, she said to me, "You were so right, 187 villagers, Turkish villagers along the border, have been murdered, M—!" And I told her this when it happened, that these were no rebels.

What would you suggest? How can we go about getting Senator Clinton,—she was the Senator when 9/11 happened, and when the parents and the wives and the husbands had to see these buildings come down on their loved ones; how can we get her to come forward and admit that it was an inside job, Benghazi?

**LaRouche:** Of course, it was an inside job. It was a complete inside job, but Hillary got to a point, and I think you probably have seen some of the record on

this; what was reported at the time, where Obama had actually set up the assassination of officials of the United States in that area. Obama did it, and his crew of women also did it.

Now, Hillary was a different case, but also her complications are really significant on this account. She resisted at first, resisted Obama's intention. Now Obama was the one who set this thing up. And if you don't focus on Obama, and concentrate on getting him thrown out of office immediately—that is, in the immediate future, before he can start the war that he intends to launch, or the British and other kinds of sources.

Under those conditions, Hillary is a very doubtful person, morally. She is a stooge for Obama. She became a stooge for Obama because she wanted to serve under him, and that was her mistake. And she didn't realize what she was getting into when she got into it. But she's a person of ambition, of political ambition, and therefore she made mistakes in various ways, which showed a problem in her judgment, a systemic problem in her making of judgments.

So now, what e're left with is the fact that if we don't get rid of Obama, from the Presidency during this month, you're probably going to all be dead or something like dead, within the course of this month. That's what the threat is. In other words, it's not a question of raising a protest. It's a question of getting this guy *thrown* out of power. Getting him thrown out of power will do the job.

We had histories of that. After Franklin Roosevelt's death, we had a couple of Presidents, of military background, who actually did make a great contribution to preventing the United States from being involved in major wars. About three Presidents, in particular, intervened to prevent war; I think other Presidents had also made a contribution in that direction.

The problem now is that Obama is a British agent, in fact; that is, he got his post through the British Empire, the Queen herself, and he's now,—because he was able to pull this swindle by getting Hillary to sell herself, sell her soul virtually. She got out of office, she walked out of the office, yes. But she refused to tell the truth, even though she *knew* what the truth was. She *knew* it, and we have it on the record.

Bill Clinton had been beside her at the time that this discussion occurred. And she just flubbed it, and then she just went out and began to get more decayed in her

judgment, her morality and judgment. And there are a lot of things you could say about her, if you want to write a book about Hillary and her experience in life; that's a whole story in itself. But I'd say the simple thing is, that Hillary has so far failed her obligation to save the United States, from the *horrible* thing that

---

### Hillary has so far failed her obligation to save the United States, from the horrible thing that Obama is about to bring down on the entire United States, and more.

---

Obama is about to bring down on the entire United States, and more.

### Musical Placement and Morality

**Speed:** I just wanted to say one thing, which just came to mind when you were talking to T—. There was a documentary that's done on Furtwängler. It's up on YouTube; it's available, and it has a lot of valuable footage. But it has a very specific [story](#), which is told by a critic and a musician, Hans Keller, I think is his name.

Anyway he tells a story that Furtwängler once attended a performance of the Ninth Symphony by Toscanini. What happened was that he heard the opening phrases; he got up out of his seat; he shouted, "Bloody time-beater," and walked out. Now Keller says, what had happened was, Toscanini was taking the opening phrases, which are in the sextuplets, and he was playing the notes. And he said, that was because he wanted to be precise. He said, "Furtwängler does the opposite." And within the documentary they play the two performances; he says, because Furtwängler understood that *imprecision* "was what Beethoven wanted, that the idea here was a completely different musical idea, and that the idea was the opening before the opening." That's how he says it, that's what Keller says.

But the more important thing was—I just wanted to insert this because of what you were saying to T— before—this issue of placement, and how you talk about it. Because you've also outlined a project for people here, although you saw part of it, around the chorus, and what the purpose of it is.

Why do you think this is so central to doing exactly the things you are asking us to do politically?

**LaRouche:** Modern civilization, particularly since the beginning of the Twentieth Century was a disaster for the people in Europe and the United States, as

well—a moral disaster, but a moral disaster with strong characteristics, as worse things to do.

Technically, the point is, what every great musician, composer, knew, was the principle of Bach, and the principle of those who followed Bach, such as Mozart, notably, Beethoven, and so forth, up through Brahms. This was very well known. There were differences in the way they approached something, but that was not a contradiction in their effort; it was a different expres-

---

**What is the principle which makes a composition, of music, for example, beautiful? And what otherwise is not beautiful? That is the placement of the tone which is between the notes; not on the notes, between the notes.**

---

sion, but based on following: for example, Beethoven followed Mozart. Beethoven was followed by such great people as Brahms. Brahms ended his life within the context of the Nineteenth Century.

And then suddenly Furtwängler came along, and Furtwängler provided the means to continue the mission, which had been handed down through Brahms. In other words, Furtwängler was actually a follower, in that sense, of Brahms. That is, he added something to what Brahms had accomplished, and it was beyond the achievement of Brahms himself.

So, that's the way to look at these kinds of things. What's the point here? The point is there's a principle, the principle of music among other things—the Classical principle. Why do we say, not *on* the note? Why *between* the notes? Why do we say *between* the notes? Because the significance of music, when it's decent music, when it's good music, is that the tone is placed between the notes. That is, in the movement from one note to the next note, and so forth and so on, there's a process which identifies the meaning, the actual meaning of the performance, and the way the performance is composed. And that's the principle.

So, the problem is, that most people today, do not have any actual efficient comprehension of what that means, and unfortunately we have terrible music, and we have also terrible science. They're both incompetent. Physical science, as defined by almost everybody in the Twentieth Century and today, is rotten, from the standpoint of science, because they don't know that principle that human beings. . . .

Yes, they do have tones; they do place tones, and

things like that, but that's not the answer. The answer is, what is the principle which makes a composition, of music, for example, what makes it beautiful? and what otherwise is not beautiful? And that is the placement of the tone which is *between* the notes; not *on* the notes, *between* the notes. And the fact that the orchestration of performance lies between the notes rather than on the notes.

### **Satanic Bush vs. Alexander Hamilton**

**Q:** Hello, Mr. LaRouche, I have a question about a different type of note, actually, specific to our currency. I was wondering if you could comment on a recent item that's been in the news, and that's been removing

Alexander Hamilton from the \$10 note and replacing him instead with one of our amazing women? And if you feel it would be better, perhaps, to remove Andrew Jackson from the \$20 note and put somebody new there instead?

**LaRouche:** Obviously, we've got to get rid of Jackson. Jackson was one of the most evil men who ever occupied the Presidency. The man was a Satanic kind of character. And if you look at his history, this man was intrinsically Satanic, in everything about him; and also his successor, equally Satanic. And that's the way to look at it—this guy; you don't want to waste time on him, once you know that he's Satanic. You don't need to run around.

The problem is: In the history of the Presidency, we had the first President, who was actually promoted by Alexander Hamilton. Hamilton was the person who orchestrated the policy of our economy, our system. The papers he wrote, the four papers that he published, are the principles of the U.S. economy: Alexander Hamilton. And Washington supported that, accepted it. But Hamilton was the genius who came up with the solution.

And over the course of the history there were occasional Presidents who were of that kind of commitment. I will not go into the whole list, but there were a number of that character. And I honor those men, in particular. They were great Presidents.

And unfortunately since the Bush family began to invade the Presidency of the United States. . . . You have to understand, that the Bush family—the boys, shall we say—were really jokers, totally incompetent, stupid jerks; but they came from a father, Prescott Bush, who's

quite capably Satanic, purely Satanic. And anyone who knows that history, knows that what you had, was a certain kind of punishment of Prescott Bush. That he was a Satanic creature, but Satan played a dirty trick on him, by making all the Presidents in his name, got them to be *absolutely stupid*, as well as nasty.

### Russell Destroyed Science

**Q:** Hi, Mr. LaRouche, how are you doing. My name is M—. Good afternoon everybody. I want to ask you, are we ever going to go back and open up the NASA program? I worked on the LEM (Lunar Excursion Module) program in Bethpage, Long Island. And during those years I was the ground support engineer liaison, the liaison engineer between ground support equipment and the vehicle. Will we ever have a program like this again, as far as NASA is concerned? The Pluto program we have now is nothing like what we had in the '60s.

**LaRouche:** You're right in pointing out the problem, as such, in practice, but the question is a deeper question which has to be faced. What happened at the passing point from the Nineteenth Century into the Twentieth Century—in the Twentieth Century you had predominantly Satanic forces who were in charge of science and pretty much everything else, and they were all recruited by Bertrand Russell, and Bertrand Russell was truly the true servant of Satan, if there ever was one of that type! So that's where the problem lies.

The problem is that we believe, according to the doctrine of the Twentieth Century—remember, all leading scientists, so-called scientists, of the Twentieth Century were followers of a Satanic cult: Bertrand Russell. And what happened was, there was only one person, in science, who was actually competent in physical science, not Bertrand Russell. And so the problem has been, that what we had instead of having an actual *physical* science, we had mathematical pseudo-science. And what has been taught during the Twentieth Century and now during the present century, again, is a consistent degeneration in the mental powers of the typical member of society in the United States and also in Europe. There is no competence in suggesting that



creative commons/Ibrahim Qasim

*FLASHPOINT: Obama's backing of the Saudi attack on Yemen this summer, threatens an expanded conflict in the region against Iran—and then potentially against Russia and China. Here, the aftermath of a Saudi airstrike on Sana'a, June 12, 2015.*

mathematics is the basis for science. That's the point. And until we get that thing corrected, we're still going to have the problem.

We may have a lesser degree of the problem, but we do not have a competent standard. We have individuals who are scientists, and they tend to feel out the principles which had been known, in the end of the Nineteenth Century. We had a period of great scientists in that period, a few great scientists, in that period, and they accomplished something. But since that time, since the beginning of the Twentieth Century, science has become fraudulent, except for Einstein.

Einstein was the one man who was truly competent as a scientist. All others are merely poor approximations of that. And that is the issue which has to be really understood and taken up, because we're going into what? We're going into Galactic studies and such. The Galactic principles are now really the principles which are now the principles which are most important for us. So we have to have a systematic change, in the way we define the meaning of science. Get rid of mathematics. Mathematics has a function, but it's not a scientific one, and that's the problem.

**Q:** My name is F—. I'm a political activist for years and my question is, you say that we must remove Obama, and impeach him. And I work a lot to try to get the people to know what's going on. I was involved in Clinton's impeachment proceedings. That was about



the 1993 World Trade Center bombings, about the Oklahoma Federal Building controlled demolitions, and about Clinton ignoring monopoly laws, and during his impeachment proceedings, he deregulated media, leaving us with six corporate conglomerate media outlets. So, the facts of Clinton's impeachment proceedings were never brought to the public.

So how do we replace Obama? You know, it will be

---

**All animals are animals, but human beings are not animals. Why? Because the human being, unlike any so-called natural, living personality, does not depend on practical considerations. People are going to die,—that is, the human body is very susceptible to being killed in one way or the other; but! the question is, what does mankind, while living, produce and generate, for the future benefit of mankind as a species?**

---

the same thing. And how do we regulate the media, banks, and military? Those are the real problems. The real problems and the banks, the military, and the media, and the military-industrial complex and the prison-industrial complex. So, I was told to say, if we remove Obama, who's next?

### **Man Is Not an Animal**

**LaRouche:** That's a pessimistic view of matters. I'm not a pessimist. I can find myself disgusted by what's going on around me, and I have been steadily, mostly disgusted by most of the things I've experienced, in my lifetime. So I've got a good record there of being disgusted about bad things. And I've always rejected, for example, mathematics. I haven't rejected it absolutely; it's a toy you can play with, but it's not science, and *that's* the issue. So, mathematics is fake science! It's the attempt to imitate, from a distance, what is really science, what we mean by physical science.

This is the same thing that just came up in the previous discussion: That mankind is unique. Mankind is not animal. And that's a very important point: Mechanical devices can be taught to perform certain kinds of procedures. These procedures which are called mathematical procedures, sometimes called science; they're *not* science. They're anti-science.

Because the question here is, what's the nature of mankind as opposed to being an animal? Well, mankind is not an animal! Animals are animals! All animals are animals, but human beings are not animals. Why? Be-

cause the human being, unlike any so-called natural, living personality, does not depend on practical considerations. The purpose of mankind is that mankind—while people are going to die, that is, the human body is very susceptible to being killed in one way or the other; *but!* the question is, what does mankind, while living, produce and generate, for the future benefit of mankind as a species?

Now, the obvious thing is that mankind is unique in that respect. We die; all human beings die. But the human principle does not die. It merely passes on to the next step, preferably the next step up. Scientific progress, *not* mathematics, real science, physical science; the discovery of new physical principles which give mankind the power, new powers, previously unknown powers to all

mankind, which enable mankind to achieve things which no other species can accomplish.

And this is well known in terms of the history of religion, for example. Kepler was on one of the followers of this thing, and he was the first person to discover the Solar System. He didn't do much beyond that, because he died in the process, after having made that achievement. But the issue here, is that mankind is a being, intended by implication, to be a creative force, a creative force which can create, in itself, powers in and over mankind, in and over the Solar System, in and over the Galaxy. And mankind has those powers of discovery, of scientific discovery, *which no animal species has ever been able to duplicate.*

And the whole business of mankind, which is the actual basis of Christianity, for example, as Nicolaus of Cusa, for example, illustrates this, that there's an intention in the existence of the human species, such that even the death of a member of the human species, is not finality. What continues is the contribution of the once-living person to bring into knowledge and into practice things which mankind would never have known otherwise. New things, new discoveries.

Now today, for example, we're talking about the water problem. What about the water problem on United States, for example, or Earth in general? Well, the solution is there. The greatest supply of water for people on Earth, is provided under the control of the Galaxy, a superior body. Now it's only recently that we've begun to understand what the Galaxy is and what

it does. But that's a discovery *by mankind*. That's a typical example of the progress of humanity: That we live and we die. But, if we do our work properly, we will be part of those people who make the discoveries, which enable mankind to reach new levels of achievement, just like Kepler discovered the Solar System; just like today, the Galactic System is understood to be the superior system, under which mankind's Earth operates.

So this distinction of mankind from the animal, is absolute. And therefore, what is the achievement of mankind? It's to make discoveries and to make practice of discoveries which enable the human species to accomplish something useful for the future of mankind's existence, which had never been known, or had never been *knowable* before. And that is what the real, underlying principle is; when you get through all these questions, *get* to that point!

Don't try to interpret what somebody says is their experience—forget it! People talk about their experiences, they talk about the judgments they reached by their experiences, it's bunk! Very few people, living so far as today, actually have the ability *to foresee* the meaning of human life. But nonetheless, mankind's progress to higher levels of achievement, is a symptom of the fact that mankind is a species *like no other*. And that is the principle of the Creator and the relationship of the Creator to Creation. [applause]

### Discoveries That Change the Future

**Q:** Hi Lyn. I've had the chance to organize in Manhattan the past few weeks a couple of times, and it's a lot of fun, but it's also very difficult to engage people. And one of the difficulties is as if,—you know how Edgar Allan Poe describes in the *Purloined Letter*, where the solution to the problem is right in people's faces, especially people who are living in Manhattan and working here, because of Wall Street, 9/11, the Saudi faction, and all that; it's all around them. But they don't see it.

And I think one of the ways to overcome this problem is to show people that the reason they don't see it, is because they think mathematically, like the *Purloined Letter*. Whereas, the way to organize people is to be a poet yourself, and to show them that you have to approach your thinking, not from a mathematical deductive nature, but from a higher standpoint. And I just wanted you to comment on that, because that's what

was brought up this week by some members on our briefings and our organizing here.

**LaRouche:** I'm certainly and fully in support of that argument that you make, because it's valid, absolutely valid! And I'm very glad that you exist, because it reassures me that we have some people who are really, shall we say, on the ball.

**Q:** Hi, Mr. LaRouche, this is E— from the Bronx. I would like to ask you, if we were able to land the rocket, manned or unmanned, on all the other planets on our

---

**The issue here, is that mankind is a being, intended by implication, to be a creative force, a creative force which can create, in itself, powers in and over mankind, in and over the Solar System, in and over the Galaxy. And mankind has those powers of discovery, of scientific discovery, which no animal species has ever been able to duplicate.**

---

Solar System, how would that improve life, or make a better life on Earth, on our planet? Is there any relevance to doing that, or would it not make a difference? ... Would we be able to benefit from that? Would we learn something from that? Would we be able to make a better life for the people on Earth? Or would that not make a difference in what is going on, on our planet today?

**LaRouche:** [Let me redirect the] subject a little bit. Don't try to make a deduction, in the future. In other words, don't assume that you can make a deduction which will lead to a discovery of a higher principle. That's where the mistake often comes up. The problem is, that you have to see a problem, you have to see a fallacy in the nature of human behavior, currently.

In other words, mankind is perplexed, and doesn't know what the future is going to be. He knows the future has to be *in* the future, not as a product of what has happened up to now; in other words, it depends upon successful progress beyond what had been known already. A change in quality, a higher principle which corrects the error, of the assumption that we know what the answers are.

And that's called science, real science, as opposed to this fake science which is called mathematical physics; mathematical physics is a complete fraud, inherently, by very definition. Because it does not answer the question of creativity. And mankind's behavior, what distinguishes mankind from the animals, is that mankind *is* capable of making discoveries which change the



U.S. Air Force/Tech Sgt. Joseph Swafford

*FLASHPOINT: Obama has kept over 10,000 U.S. troops in Afghanistan, after the so-called withdrawal of the NATO force this spring. Here U.S. soldiers enter a U.S. Army CH-47 Chinook helicopter at an Afghan combat outpost.*

future, that is, the future of mankind, the future of the Solar System, the future of the Galaxy. *That's* what's important.

That means that the question is, the discovery of a new principle, which had not been known before, but it's now known and it's proven. And the idea is that every generation of mankind, in the normal course of events, must be superior, in that generation's capabilities, beyond anything that mankind had known up to now. And the idea is that pursuit of the successful pursuit, of the unknown, the unknown triumph, which is the meaning of the future.

For example, someone has made a partial scientific discovery, or some other related kind of discovery, or great poetry. New ingenuity in the concept of poetry, for example, can be very useful in this respect, but the point is, you have to have in yourself, the devotion, the efficient devotion, to make discoveries of universal principles within the universe, but which mankind had not known before.

### Science Is the Measure

**Q:** Good afternoon. My name is R—. I'm from Brooklyn. I'd like to know, is there anything new on the British Empire and its demise? See I have a slightly different attitude from some people. Some people say, "God save the Queen." I say, "God save the Queen,

because I won't!" [laughter]

**LaRouche:** OK! Well, the Queen, I think, is probably on the skids right now. It's not only because she and her husband are about my age, which is an embarrassment to me, to find that at my age they still got some rumpus characters like these, the British Royal Family. But the solution is simply, in the characteristic of the British system in particular, like some Satanic kinds of religious beliefs, or similarly that way; but it's the idea that mankind treats mankind as merely something disposable, like those who say we've got too many people; we've got to reduce the population of mankind. Well, these ideas are essentially, intrinsi-

cally Satanic, and should be rejected at all times, in all places. And that's what the issue is.

The point is, mankind has a unique capability, which no other known species of life, has ever been able to manifestly achieve. Mankind is intrinsically capable of making discoveries, discoveries of principles, not just discoveries of fact; discoveries of principle, of universal physical principles, and mankind is able to do that with the help of education, with the help of hard work and things of that sort; or lucky strokes, even. And that's what's important.

When people die—you know people you know die—a great sadness comes over you in that moment of sharing the experience of the death of a person who you have cherished, or even wished they had not died, to say it simply. And the issue is, what reconciles mankind with the death of another human being? And that is a contribution to the future of mankind's development and powers to solve problems, which mankind has not understood yet, before.

That's what the principle is. What do we live for? We're all going to die. All human beings are going to die. So what's the meaning of their life? The meaning of their life is something good and new, at least for them and for humanity, which opens the gate for mankind's achievement; just like the progress of Kepler—Kepler discovered the Solar System. He was the one who dis-

covered it, absolutely unique; no duplication known.

And thus, science in that sense is the measure of a meaning of human life. That is, the meaning of the future of the person who had died, the person whose death celebrates what they had achieved for mankind. Great art, great music, great things that impassion mankind, by which means mankind is able to muster himself, to reach out and achieve necessary discoveries and practices which will improve the future of mankind as such.

### **Mankind Is Going to Grow Up**

**Q:** Good afternoon, Mr. LaRouche, my name's A—, and I'm from New York City. I have a question I'd like to ask you: If you were the person in charge, say, starting Monday, and we wanted to know what can be done about immigration in our country today—what's going on with immigration—how would you handle it? What are the steps you would take, in sequences, and how do you think they would affect our politics, and our economy in our country?

**LaRouche:** Certain conclusions can be drawn right at this time. First of all, for a long period of time, we have prided ourselves on observing the achievement of great nations, and we assume that the great nations are somehow intrinsically situated as such. Now, if we look carefully, into areas like China, for example, into some South American nations and others, we find that the way we think, the way we talk and argue, from the United States and from Europe, is a little bit different, than what's happening now, as in China. And in other parts of the planet.

So therefore, there's a tendency now to produce a kind of nation-state, which is not a solid nation-state as such, but is a temporary arrangement which is called nation-state; a national principle. We find that nations are coming together, with some difficulties. China and India have a close relationship; it's not perfected. There are things that are not perfect, shall we say, in relations among some of these states.

But, what you're seeing in looking around the planet as a whole, is a development among nations, of quasi-states; they're conditional states, they're temporary states; and they're divided according to languages, and social processes and habits, and so forth. But mankind is now moving into a unity of mankind.

There are certain things that are different. We're not

equally practiced in all respects on all cases, but the tendency of mankind is to come to common aims of mankind. And gradually, we will evolve into nations or groups of nations, which really becomes the planetary system. We may have different accents, we may have some different memories, historical memories, and so forth; all that is there.

---

**Science in that sense, is the measure of a meaning of human life. That is, the meaning of the future of the person who had died, the person whose death celebrates what they had achieved for mankind. Great art, great music, great things that impassion mankind, by which means mankind is able to muster himself, to reach out and achieve necessary discoveries and practices which will improve the future of mankind as such.**

---

But we can see already, in certain cases in South America, in some parts of Africa, in some parts of Asia, you see a process where the idea of the nation-state as being some kind of hermetic institution, is doomed—not doomed in the bad sense, but doomed in the sense of growing up: That mankind is going to grow up.

And, for example, we had the discovery by Kepler; Kepler discovered the Solar System, which meant that Earth as such, just Earth, plain Earth, is not the basis for human existence. And then we go further, and by what Kepler did in discovering the Solar System, we now find the Galactic System, which is a superior system relative to the Solar System, the old system.

And mankind now finds, man is faced with reality. For example, water: Now, the supply of water on Earth is pretty good. As a matter of fact, if we used our heads a little bit more, we would have less arid conditions, but we just haven't paid attention to things that could be improved. I mean, the control of moisture, of circulating moisture in general, around Earth, and beyond Earth, and bringing that moisture into a useful relations to conditions on Earth. That's not too well developed, but it can be.

And so, that's the kind of situation that we are living with, or we have to live with. The point is, we always have to come back to the point, that mankind's destiny is to achieve what mankind has never achieved before in terms of progress, in conditions of life, just like what Kepler did in discovering the Solar System; or what we now understand as the Galactic System. And that Earth

is merely a subject, of the Solar System and the Galactic System. And other things as well in the universe.

So we have to change our values, and we have to change the way mankind *treats* mankind, because what we want to do is to bring a kind of unity of function, within the mass of the human species, with a purpose of reaching goals which have not been achieved before-

---

**What you're seeing, looking around the planet as a whole, is a development among nations, of quasi-states; they're conditional states, they're temporary states. And they're divided according to languages, and social processes and habits, and so forth. But mankind is now moving into a unity of mankind.**

---

hand.

I could go longer on that, but I think that, for this occasion on this timeframe, I think that's the answer.

### **Mankind Must Progress**

**Q:** [followup] Excuse me, I'm still a little confused. Did you think I said "irrigation"? Because I said "immigration," and I don't think you really answered the question. I said, knowing what's going on around the world of the immigrants and the borders and all that. I don't know why it went over my head, but did you answer the question, about what would you do if you were in charge? What are the steps you would take, to control the immigration and how it would affect our politics and our economy?

**LaRouche:** I've been working at this goal for a number of decades. [laughs] More than a few decades. That's my business, that's my profession, as I've indicated: My profession is to cause the human species to discover principles which mankind had not previously understood. That's my approach to this. It's the only way it's going to work.

**Q:** [followup] Do you think the way the borders are now, they need improvement, or what would you do about that?

**LaRouche:** I would say a lot of improvements! But mankind—it's not a matter of improvements in this, in the sense that it's too much like statistics. And statistics are not a very good measure at all. Statistics have much exaggerated importance.

The important thing is, mankind must progress in order to achieve powers on Earth, and beyond Earth as such, as the Galaxy; and that mankind's power, or de-

velopment of power to control the Galactic process, or to influence the Galactic process as a matter of control. *That's* what the mission is.

Because we all are going to die. The question is, what is the future of mankind? If we are all going to die in our time, what's the meaning of the future of mankind, for the experience of the individual human being? And that's the question that's very rarely treated.

**Q:** [followup] OK, thank you.

**Speed:** This will be our final question for today.

**Q:** Good afternoon, Mr. LaRouche. My name is R—. I wrote a letter to my Congressman, and I got a response. And he sent a response, and he's for regulations, but he'd not say

anything about Glass-Steagall. So I want to push this guy to go forward, to support Glass-Steagall. What do I do?

### **No Simple Solutions**

**LaRouche:** You're on the right track—first of all, you're on the right track! No question about that.

What do you mean by Glass-Steagall? The problem is, if somebody treats it as some kind of a scheme, that doesn't explain anything; not really. The importance of Glass-Steagall is that mankind—or, let me go back and do something, just to make this clearer.

First of all, what's called Glass-Steagall is not really understood competently. That doesn't mean that it's wrong. It means that they don't understand what they're doing. They don't understand what they're using as an attempt to make things better for mankind in the planet. They just haven't grasped that, yet. Because they don't understand the future. That mankind's identity is intrinsically located in mankind's awareness, that is, efficient awareness, of the existence of the future.

That is to say, something which has not happened, heretofore. In other words, a discovery of fact, which has been unknown previously, and the case of Kepler, for example, same thing. Einstein, the same thing. Einstein made unique discoveries, and he was the only one who made such discoveries, within the term of his lifetime.

So the issue is mankind's creation of new, higher principles, higher than mankind had ever known before, and that man's purpose in existence is to achieve the realization of the future, in those terms. In other words, to make a discovery, which mankind had not discovered heretofore, a useful discovery, a necessary discovery; and that's what the principle is.

Now, what's happening in the schools system, for example? What's the education system in the United States today? Or, take the whole period from the beginning of the Twentieth Century on, there has been a consistent degeneration in the powers of thinking, within the policy of the people of the United States, in particular.

The people in the United States, each generation, are going through a *de-generation*! Now there may be exceptions in individual cases, but the general tendency is: for example, let's take the education in schools. The school system, the education system, both for universities as for ordinary schools, is *incompetent, intrinsically*. It's not entirely useless, but as an intention, it's useless. It does not answer the question of how mankind can progress in mankind's condition, within the Solar System, etc., etc.

So that's where the problem lies. I think the greatest criminal has been the Twentieth Century notion of science. And that notion which is commonly practiced, by people *except* for Einstein, is the folly of the United States. Look at what we do. What do we do? We are actually driving,—the average citizen, as the citizen is born and educated, the citizen in the typical case is *de-generating*. The typical person in the United States is degenerating with each generation; in other words, every 25 years. Every 25 years you get a new generation, or something like that, and every time, the person you are promoting, is more stupid, more corrupt, than the person before.

The education system is stupid, it's deliberately stupid. It's destructively stupid. The skills for production are being lost; fewer and fewer people share the powers of competence in production. We're all living under the green idea, the green policy, and the green policy is tragic destruction of the human species as a whole. But the Greenies are servants of Satan in fact, in their effect. So these are the kinds of problems that have to be considered.

And people would like to have simple things, which can be simply described, simply explained, but none of those simple things will do anything for the future of



U.S. Navy/Lt. j.g. Alexander Perrien

*FLASHPOINT: Despite repeated statements by the Russians that they see the Europe-based BMD system as a threat to their national security, and the conclusion of the nuclear deal with the nominal "threat," Iran, Obama has refused to abandon the deployment. Here, the Naval Support Facility being prepared in Deveselu, Romania—which will be part of the Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense System.*

mankind. We're going to Hell right now, in the United States in particular. We're going to Hell! And you look at the degeneration after generation, and generation to generation; a *degeneration*, progressive degeneration, of the mental and moral life of the young generations as they come along. [applause]

### **Mankind's Mission—in the Galaxy**

**Speed:** Lyn, we're at the end for today, but I want to take something up which has come up *clearly* in the discussion. I want to address it, and give you a chance, Lyn, to respond, and conclude us for the day.

What has been happening, for particularly the last two weeks, is that people are having, at least in their estimate, a helluva time getting across anything that you're basically saying about Hillary Clinton, nuclear war, etc.

Now: What's actually happening is, instead of discussing this, forthrightly and simply and straightforwardly, we get a lot of individual issues. Whether it's Puerto Rico, whether it's this, it's that, because that's what's talked about in the street. That's what people run into in the street. And then they say, "I have this question, should we do this or that?" Like this issue of immigration is another one, or many other issues. There're issue after issue after issue! People are bombarded by issues, in this and that.

Now we know, there's a term we use to—we're in

polite company, but you know, “issues” can mean, shall we say, something emanating from the posterior. And people get continually bombarded—and then they say, “but this is what’s really on my mind, you’re not addressing this, and I wanted to say something about this, because it’s what’s been represented as the problem.”

Maybe people don’t think that’s fair. I think it’s fair, because I’ve been in these discussions, I know what’s being said. And so, I just wanted to ask you, since the Manhattan Project is your project, you’ve been very clear about what you wanted. You talked about us having a several-hundred person chorus; you talked about us talking to people about very difficult musical ideas. John Sigerson’s here with us; we’re working on these ideas, and the problem that’s coming up is [whispers], “Why are we doing this?” Hmm? “Why are we doing this! Shouldn’t we be talking about things which are much more issue-oriented, or practical?” etc.

So I thought I should express that to you, as we come to the close.

**LaRouche:** I think there are many ways I can approach this subject, so let’s pick one! One of the ways, the famous formulation, “one of the ways.”

Anyway! The question is, what’s mankind’s mission? Mankind’s mission is to progress as a species. I’ve emphasized this already in several remarks I’ve made hitherto today. We have to understand, that unless you have made a discovery of a new principle, a real, true principle, a physical principle, then you haven’t made any progress. As a matter of fact, if you’re operating on that basis of not doing something in that way of progress, you’re engaged in decadence.

I mean, for example, what happened? What happened is, with Bertrand Russell, in particular, destroyed the idea of actual science! That’s what he did. And there are very few people in the United States today, who actually believe in physical science as a science. They will talk about mathematics, which means they’re idiots. Because that doesn’t explain anything.

The issue is mankind is distinct, in the fact that we have the power, as a species, to progress, to get more power for mankind, why? Because it’s wanted. Because mankind’s mission is to do that, is to make discoveries and to get along the process of trying to get ahead someplace, get ahead for mankind’s future. And that is not what is taught today! What’s taught today is mathematics, and mathematics is a design of evil, actually. Because what it does, it says everything can be explained by mathematics: Well, actually, almost nothing can be

attributed to mathematics as such. But that’s what’s taught. That’s what the schools system is! That’s what the education system is; there are exceptions to that, of course, but they *are* exceptions.

And therefore, the problem mankind has is: we have not met the challenge, as Kepler for example, Kepler defined the Solar System. And most people would not understand that Solar System concept. Now we understand, the Galactic System; we don’t understand it perfectly, but we understand its implication of its existence, which means that mankind must *go forward* into higher layers of ability of mankind, as a species, to achieve things that mankind has never achieved before.

And that’s the purpose of living! That’s the purpose of life. And when you die, one hopes that you will have made a contribution to the future of mankind. That’s the proper purpose. I mean, giving birth to children, human children, is what? It’s a contribution to the future of mankind. It means you’ve got to get some kind of an education system for these children; that they give them the powers to go to a higher step upward, beyond what mankind is capable of doing today. And to take any part of the planet where you find young people, or even middle-aged people, who are rotting away at the same old, same old, same old. No future, no meaning to the future of their life.

What mankind does not have, or lacks, the sense that death is not a terrible thing; it’s an inevitable thing. But the point is, what’s the purpose of going through the process which leads to death, *among* human beings, *within* society? And it’s the progress in developing mankind’s ability *to make discoveries of physical principle*, as we call them, and those physical principles are the things on which the prosperity, of mankind as a species depends. Conquer the Galaxy, which is the challenge thrust before us, now. The major challenge of mankind today, is to understand and to better, the idea of the Galaxy, which is, so far, the thing we’re best informed on, among all the things that we’re not yet informed on.

But mankind’s progress, in effect, in terms of the effect of the role of the human species within the Solar System and beyond, *that’s* the issue! And if that’s not your motive, your motive is very, very shallow! [applause]

**Speed:** Tough and irritating messages that are nonetheless absolutely essential. Thank you very much, Lyn, for what you had to say!