

LaRouche: Democratic Debate Was a Fraud!

Excerpts from Lyndon LaRouche's telephonic [Fire-side Chat of Thursday, Oct 15](#), hosted by John Ascher.

LaRouche: Well, first of all, the event which happened on Tuesday [Oct 13] of this week, was a general fraud. Now, Hillary Clinton was, of course, the chief fraud in the whole thing, but Obama was also behind it; and you had some other people, who were also of doubtful morals, who were chief operations people in this thing, and behind it was a team of British agents which I intervened on, indirectly,—but intervened on them,—last Friday [Oct 9].

And we knew that the British had set the whole thing up. The entire idea of fundraising, or so forth that was going on out there, was essentially a general fraud. And the people who were listed as the players, as the candidates, so-called, were actually suckered in. And probably, maybe two or three of them, not always the people you might choose, will survive this operation.

My question in this matter, is who's going to survive? Is Hillary going to survive? Because what's happened now really has built her lack of credibility, to the point that she could be knocked out permanently as a candidate. She's gone too far with "El Cheapo" swindles that will probably set up a public reaction of resentment against her. But there are other aspects which are extremely important.

But the thing right now, is that thing was a fraud. It was set up by an organization which had no business trying to run a Presidential event like this; the swindlers who did it are well-known to me personally, and they are swindlers. And the swindlers ran the operation. And the suckers were taken in.



CNN anchor Anderson Cooper presided over the infamous Oct. 13 Democratic debate according to the British script.

Ascher: I know everybody wanted to know what you had to say about that. I'm going to turn on our Q&A queue. And we will probably get some reports also from the Days of Action this week on the question of reinstating Glass-Steagall, so I imagine we will hear some reports from around the country, Lyn.

Q1: Hi, C— from Boston. I was wondering, I know that you were talk-

ing about the Democratic debates that happened this week. But I saw something on the news today, and I was wondering if you had some information, or could comment on it. They were talking about the Lockerbie Pan Am plane crash in 1988, and they're saying they know who did that. I was wondering if there's some backstory to that, or something they're not telling us.

LaRouche: The issue essentially is this fake debate—on a fake call for candidates for President. That system was set up by an operation, and it was actually backed,—which I found out about Friday at noon-time,—was actually run by the British Empire. And it was the British Empire agents operating within relevant areas in Texas and that climate-area; and a whole bunch of British agents were out there, staging what was done by a faker who set up the whole operation.

So there was nothing Constitutional about the character of that event. And you have to look at the thing: Here you have a whole hooting bunch of idiots, screaming and yelling like the devil, taking a bunch of candidates and separating them in terms of their role. And the whole thing was occupying a great deal of time, relative to the whole proceedings. The discussion was disgusting; it had no relationship whatsoever to truth, and it was run by people who were, in my view, crooks. So this was not a

U.S. government campaign; it was a racket, which a bunch of people who thought they were candidates, were sucked into.

Ascher: Lyn, we've received a number of questions which we've combined, largely from Facebook, from the Internet; some people have taken your assessment that the Democratic Party debate was a farce, and that the candidates acted as stooges, as an endorsement of their fears—that the whole process is rigged, but that you can't do anything about it.

What do you say could be different about the situation?

LaRouche: First of all, I wouldn't allow that thing to happen. Because the way it was set up, and the arrangement of the whole setup, was a fraud, from beginning to end. The key fraudster was Hillary Clinton. She was the one who played the key role, as the sucker, the official sucker in that whole fraud.

Now, you had a couple of candidates in there, who were actually candidates, several of them,—the two leading ones, and some others who should be considered serious. But otherwise, the whole thing was one giant fraud. And Obama was one of the players in rigging this operation; at least he was the guy who made a speech to authorize it.

But what was done, was done on a private interest, with backing of the British agents who were imported into that territory for that period, at least no later than Friday. So on Friday, I knew the British were running that operation. This was not a U.S. operation, it was a British operation. And people got sucked into this thing.

Now, the whole thing,—if you look at the way the whole proceeding was run,—it was a bunch of lunatics, hollering lunatics, hollering without articulation, hollering without any mental processes visible in that mob. It was a very large mob and it was howling all the time. The whole procedure was disgusting; it was immoral, in the worst, most extreme sense; and it was something that should never have been allowed to happen.

We're going to have a serious election, not a side-show, not a clowns' sideshow.

Music and Manhattan

Q3: This is W— from Virginia. Mr. LaRouche, when you speak of this process [in musical performance] that occurs “between the notes,” when I was



Schiller Institute

The great Italian tenor Carlo Bergonzi (1924 - 2014) gives a master class in New York City under the auspices of the Schiller Institute in 1993. Bergonzi performed at the New York Metropolitan opera at least 300 times over his career.

listening to the Democratic debates—if that's what you want to call them—I definitely figured out pretty quickly that there wasn't anything that was occurring in *that* process between the notes. It was actually on the contrary; they were just being so mechanistic.

Ever since I became aware of this process, you know, I've been listening to a lot of [Wilhelm] Furtwängler's conducting of the works of Brahms, and Bach, and Schumann, and it's amazing! It makes you think. Whereas when you listen to other conductors, where it might sound nice, it just sounds a lot like what we were getting with the Democratic debate. And I was just wondering if you could speak more about that.

LaRouche: Well, sure. We are working on that, actually, significantly especially centered in Manhattan, because Manhattan has the greatest concentration—Manhattan and its immediate vicinities, has the greatest concentration—of great musicians, who are actually qualified, superior concert musicians.

And what has happened recently, is that in the processes which have now developed, we are having a recovery of the real, qualified, Classical musical concept, based on the most famous director in music, [Carlo Bergonzi] from Italy. And he's now of course deceased, but I have a deep memory, because I spent a good deal of time in Italy on that and other interests. And so we had a European and American tradition, but especially centered in Manhattan and around Manhattan. Manhattan has attracted a great number of great musicians, because of the celebrity of Manhattan itself.

So what we have now is a base organization of

people as great musicians, who have great musical talent, and others who are not necessarily great musicians, but are competent musicians.

And this is the basis on which we should use our nation as a whole, as like an audience, a place where people go to celebrate this great event, which is the next Presidential election in the United States. And at that point, if we take the proper approach, the proper cultural approach that's required, we can actually change the situation now. And that means not only the change in the particular situation we're talking about in terms of economy, but in general.

When we look at what has happened to the people of the United States since I was on the team of Ronald Reagan, which I was on for a number of years, and from about that time on, and from the period of Bill Clinton, who also played a credible role in chief, actually—and still represents that today—but apart from that, our nation has been driven down, into garbage. And especially the Bush family garbage producer, and the Obama garbage producer, and also, of course, Cheney, the worst beast of them all!

Our Power to Awaken Mankind

Q5: Hi Lyn, it's B— from L.A. The last time I spoke to you, I spoke on the basis of the spirit of mankind: How do you actually awaken it? And you made it clear that we have the tools to understand humanity.

I was reading some of Nicholas of Cusa's *De Docta Ignorantia*, and the reason why I bring this up is that, in the past weeks there were incidents of putting myself out there and getting a devilish (shall we say) reaction, because we bring up the concept of the future.

I got an interview with a talk show host on Monday, and the direction of the discussion was leaning towards the future. We got a call-in from a person who basically was pessimistic: he was so angry that he couldn't calm down to see that he could actually do something, like the implementation of Glass-Steagall, or thinking of a credit system. But it was a case of the interaction of trying to organize the population so they see themselves as a vehicle to lead mankind, and to actually progress, in such a way that they see that they themselves and others around them, could actually be forced to move mankind into the direction that we did *not* see at all in the Democratic debate, so-called.

For our team on the ground in Las Vegas, and for me, it was like what you just said about how everything was—even before the debate started, you had these protesters—everything was just fake, all around! And the

only real thing was our intervention on some of these people, in talking to them, and you could tell they needed leadership! They needed an awakening in themselves to see that they needed to take responsibility. Nobody else will actually do that except themselves....

I can give them a briefing, you know, as in some of my interventions with others, but without conveying the role of Manhattan, it just seems as if none of these interventions are effective. In order to bring mankind out of their dark age mentality ... it just seems like we have to ignite the power to get everybody onboard with you, your conception.

I want to get your response if you can.

LaRouche: Sure. The point is, I think the keystone is the fact that Manhattan is still the center of recruiting people into the United States—the fact that this has been the chief point of mobilization for citizens of the United States, or people who *became* citizens, and that is very important. The number of competent citizens who became citizens there, and who became part of the stream of families which gathered around Manhattan, and had the effect of their influence in New Jersey, in other places and other parts of the East Coast, and into California, especially northern California, and the farm section of California,—these were very important things.

What has happened is the character of those colonizations, from then, in the past up to now, has been discouraged. Why? Well, it's obvious. When you have Bushes elected to be President, for example, and then you had some bad people like Obama, along with the Bushes, and you think of the number of years that Bushes occupied the dominant position in the Presidency of the United States, despite what Bill Clinton did....

And then look at what the Bushes came back to do; and what came out of Obama, who is the most evil and most Satanic of all those Presidents, and still is the embodiment of Satan himself. He's a killer; he kills people! He kills them arbitrarily; he has a kill score. He appoints people to be killed, citizens of the United States to be killed, on his caprice!

Well! The time has come to dump any memory of Obama, and to pay no attention to the claims of the Bushes. And taking that as the top of the list of miscreants, I would say that we've got a pretty good perspective, if we can pull ourselves together and *remember what this nation is and was*, as Alexander Hamilton, in particular, exemplified that.

Ascher: B—, who just asked Mr. LaRouche that question, was involved about a week ago in a major in-

tervention at a big political event in Los Angeles, which was followed by the radio show that he referenced. And then this past Tuesday, B— was also part of our team out at the hall in Las Vegas where the Democratic Party debate took place.

Our Goal: the Highest Level

Q9: Hello, my name is E—, from Columbia, Maryland. My question is, during the Democratic debate they did mention Glass-Steagall, but it was only from two candidates. The other two, they should have said something. If you had to vote, would you support O’Malley or Bernie Sanders? And it was Bernie Sanders who believes in the idea of socialism.

LaRouche: Bernie Sanders, to my knowledge, is not an appropriate choice of candidate for President of the United States. O’Malley is a different case. O’Malley is a man who has intrinsic honesty in the way the history of his politics has been; and everything I know about him is honorable. There are possibly other people who should be considered.

At this point, people usually think, we want *a* President. Now, according to our national law, we do get a President, *a* President, one President. We also get a Vice President, and we hope he’s not a President of Vice.

But then, on the other hand, what we need is a *team* of citizens who are qualified to lead the formation and institution of a system of government under a Presidential system. In other words, you can’t just say, “this is the President, now everybody’s going to listen to him.” That’s not right.

You have to have a President who is acceptable, who’s qualified to lead the nation. But no one person can control the United States as a nation efficiently. There has to be a team, based on the kind of team that we have when we compose a Presidential system. It also means we depend on the way we can deal with our members of Congress in the House of Representatives in general, and so forth.

So we need that office, of people who don’t always agree with each other, but we need that kind of office as a deliberation process, in order to have the people of the United States find that they have a core of agreement on goals and purposes which suit the requirements of the Presidency.

Now, the other part of that is—it has another feature



youtube

The Democratic candidate debate was a fraud, LaRouche stated. “Clinton was the chief fraud in the whole thing, but Obama was also behind it.”

to it—when we try to create a Presidential system, we don’t try to create a Presidential system *per se*; we try to incorporate the best features of our existence and our history; our intention is to introduce *new* conceptions, more appropriate conceptions, more brilliant, more fruitful, than any team before. There may be some who are only rivals. But our goal is to go to the highest level of achievement of the improvement of our system of government, and create a team of people who are qualified, and actively qualified, to conduct the business of our government as a whole.

And that’s the way we have to look at it.

Go Beyond ‘My Nation’

Q10: This is R— in Oregon, and concurrent with what Mr. LaRouche just said, I think we’d like to see a vision of collegiality come back to the Executive Office. We’ve had enough of this so-called unilateral executive agency which really turns out to be not much more than just a curtain, behind which Britain gets to manipulate the Presidency.

But my question was, there’s been a lot of talk over the last 10 years or so about reinstating Glass-Steagall, and now you’ve got the BRICS system pretty much underway, Mr. LaRouche. And I wonder if the BRICS agreements that are taking place, if they’re going to supplant the need for a New Bretton Woods conference, which we often used to hear about. Or whether currency exchange agreements are part of the BRICS banking proposals, or if you’re still going to need a New Bretton Woods conference as one of the items on your agenda?

LaRouche: I think one of the key things on the

agenda is Glass-Steagall. Because if you have a money system which is not in accord, or similarity, with Glass-Steagall, you're not going to have a modern society which is qualified to function for the benefit of any nation.

So we have a change which is now in process, a global change in progress which is not yet generally discussed in the United States, but it's a very important consideration. What we have now is that China is the greatest nation on the planet. That's a fact. The rise of China, again—because it did have a rise and fall at various points—but China is the most powerful nation, in terms of people, on this planet right now.

Now, there's also India with over a billion people; and they are a power, and they will become a power under the current new leadership, if it's continued. And we find that also, in the course of this, we can affect nations which are now in great quarrels with each other. We find that it's possible for us, as Putin has demonstrated for the area he's operating in now, to demonstrate that we can make peace, where strife and bloody strife has been a problem.

These changes will occur. The idea of national sovereignties, and the protection of individual national sovereignties, is a required achievement. But mankind is not just a collection of competing states. These different states have different colorations, in terms of their history and their character. But eventually, as we see in South America, in the best developments in South America, and in other places, we find out that the idea of "my nation as itself, for itself" is not acceptable. We must have national standards which are *our* national standards, but which lead into an efficient accord with other nations. In other words, our sovereignty is our sovereignty; we will not give it up easily. And more exactly will not give it up; we don't have to. Because we will find that we will go into more and more stages of international cooperation.

And therefore, what we want to do is take that idea. Use that for the United States, to revive the United States from the mess it's become, and build a kind of system back in the United States, our Presidential system, our Constitutional system, and make that work for a change! It did work at times in the past. We now have to make it work, and we have to make it work as being a part of a family of nations which are seeking to



Petr Pavlicek/IAEA

China at the Forefront: Chinese scientists in the control room of the experimental high temperature gas-cooled reactor at Tsinghua University, Beijing in June 2004.

find ways not only to cooperate, but to make achievements which take the power of man beyond the limits of the Solar System, and into areas which are beyond, the larger part of the system.

So the time has come for us to realize that the accelerated advances in technology,—creative technology, not the usual stuff,—but that kind of development is the future of mankind. And you find that in the case of China, for example; there is a mood in China now, at an accelerating rate—that doesn't mean it's perfect, but it means an accelerating rate—it's a leading nation on the planet and it's moving in a direction which seeks cooperation with such as our United States and other nations in that group.

So we have to understand, we have to have an honest and truthful vision of where mankind—where the nations of mankind—must go, how they must achieve new levels of cooperation and efficiency. And that's what we ought to concentrate on.

A Beautiful Devotion

Q11: Lyn, I have a question which is somewhat similar to the theme that you just brought up. This is from M— in Dearborn, Michigan. He says, "I have noticed that there have been many meetings between Israel and Russia lately, and Saudi Arabia and Russia. My question is, what is being discussed in these meetings? Is it just short-term—how to stop terrorism and prevent

wars from expanding? Or is there also a discussion of mutually beneficial relationships that can create a lasting peace in this region based on real, universal principles? Also, is China involved in this discussion? Thanks very much.”

LaRouche: China’s very much involved in these matters. My wife is very familiar with a lot of the important details of what has happened in China over much of her lifetime in particular. And that kind of development,—as in Russia today: Russia, for example, revived itself from the tumult and trials it went through. And Putin has brought the thing into order. I wouldn’t say it’s perfect order; but I wouldn’t say that Putin would say it’s a perfect order! But the point is, the idea of the cooperation between Russia now, and with nations in its neighborhood—its relationship to India, its conspicuous relationship to China, and so forth—this is something which is of precious value, and can lead to that result.

And that’s the way we should look at it. Because what we have to do, is we have to understand that the basis,—let me lay this out because this is something which is touchy, but it’s also true and I believe in it: The question is, we all are human—we hope! If we’re not human, we don’t extend that courtesy to other strangers. [chuckles.]

But we know that mankind dies. Every human being dies, on the record so far. And there has been no recipe to say that human beings will not sooner or later die. Well, you say, what’s the meaning, then, of human beings, if they’re going to die? If that’s the trash-end of life, as it might be called.

The point is, if we as human beings develop what we call technologies,—by which I mean really scientific technologies, *real* scientific technologies, not gimmicks,—then mankind is capable and has the power, and we know—as those of us who are in on, shall we say, the scientific history—we know that mankind is not going to be confined to living on Earth.

Now, we don’t know all the complications that involves, but we know that what mankind is able to achieve—as mankind, for the future of mankind, for the human species, for the *meaning* of the human species as a continuing process—depends upon a process of development. It’s not just a process of getting rich. It’s a pro-



NASA

“Mankind is already ready to go back to space.” Here, Expedition 43 Commander and NASA astronaut Terry Virts prepares camera equipment for an upcoming documentation session from the Space Station’s Destiny lab, on June 15, 2015.

cess of achieving something which is greater than had ever been achieved before. That’s the mission of life.

We all live. We will all die. There is no known exception to that rule. But if we have lived in the proper way, and devoted our living in the proper direction, then we have an answer,—an opportunity of an answer,—to go out beyond the bounds of Earth as such, and realize that mankind is already ready to go back to space; despite Obama, we’re going back to space. We’re going to do things about Mars, we’re going to do things about other things.

Why? For a joy ride? No! Because we know that we have to deal with the challenges which are embedded in the existence of the planetary systems like the Solar System, the Galaxy,—these things cannot be ignored. Even the idea of the Moon, the Moon system, the Earth system, we have to have that.

So mankind is going to depend upon the development of the powers of mankind, which are supplied in increase by the scientific creativity of mankind. And that would tell us that mankind has a beautiful devotion, a devotion to the heavens.

Slap It on His Desk!

Q15: Hi, Mr. LaRouche. This is K— from Massachusetts.... I was calling everybody down in the House of Representatives and the Senate, and they were saying how Obama would never sign his name onto Glass-Steagall. I said, “Then, slap the 25th

Amendment on his desk!”

LaRouche: You got it! That’s right! [laughs] That’s an absolutely appropriate tactic!

Q15: They said, “How would we do that?” I said, “What d’ya mean, how would you do it? You just have it in your hand, and you slap it on his desk. I know that’s what I would do!”

LaRouche: That’s a good idea. That’s an excellent idea. I think you’ve got the spirit to know what to do about that.

Finding Those Who Want Ideas

Q16: This is T— from Lake Arrowhead, New York. I went to the debate and stood there in the shadow of the golden Trump Tower there, 500 foot tall with gilt windows, and watched one group of suckers going into the casino to lose their money that way, and another group of suckers going into the Democratic [debate] to lose their money and their souls that way.

And I’m watching people go through the motions, and there were a few people—well, there was one particular lady—I was just wandering among Hillary supporters, trying to talk to *somebody*—get through the shouting, you know. And there was one lady standing there, and she didn’t have a Hillary shirt on, but she was carrying it. And she seemed open somehow. I handed her your seven-point program, and she told me, “I’m not interested in cheering for a candidate, I want to hear about ideas!”

And I go, “Oh my goodness, have I got the ideas for you!” And then I was able to sell her your full recovery program for five bucks, and your “Join the BRICS” one, so she’s someone you could talk to—but one out of how many? I wish I knew how to spot those people or how to get through to them, because I know there’s a lot of people there who’re just going through the motions; in their heart they know it.

LaRouche: Well, some of us have to take the leadership in a competent way. I’m an old man now, so I



creative commons/Diliff

The Rose Main Reading Room at the New York City Public Library in Manhattan. The free library has the second largest collection in the United States (after the Library of Congress), and the fourth in the world, as befits Manhattan’s status as the cultural capital of the United States. It has more visitors by far than even the larger libraries—18 million a year.

have obviously some more experience than some other people do. Particularly, I’ve been professional in this whole field anyway.

No, it can be done. It depends upon having teamwork, or creating a teamwork system, which can discover among themselves how to proceed to get their voices heard—and that means being efficiently heard—where people have to turn around and think and listen to what you say, as teamwork. And that works; it will work.

I think that in the case of Manhattan, for example,—which I spend a lot of special attention on, not only because it is Manhattan, but because Manhattan is a leading element in the process of the United States as a whole. If we understand what Manhattan represents in terms of its influence over the nation as a whole, you appreciate that. You don’t turn down other parts of the United States as such, but you recognize that Manhattan has a very special authority, since Alexander Hamilton brought the United States into being by his leadership.

So I think that view of Manhattan, as being a central reference point for the nation as a whole, stands pretty well. And from that standpoint, you operate on that basis. Wherever you live, wherever you work, you may have to have a certain respect for Manhattan, because you know it has more influence on the national functions as a whole than any other part of the system.