

# What Is Our Mission Really?

Saturday, July 18, 2015

**Dennis Speed:** My name is Dennis Speed, and on behalf of the LaRouche Political Action Committee, I want to welcome everybody here today. Two individuals are in New York City today: Barack Obama is downtown watching a hip-hop Broadway play about Alexander Hamilton, and here with us, is Lyndon LaRouche. [applause]

We had an eventful week, and we're going to go right to our Q&A, so that we have an opportunity for everybody to figure out how to help LaRouche do what he's trying to get done. Let's go right to the first question, here at the microphone.

**Q:** Hi Lyn. My question is around Glass-Steagall. Dennis just mentioned a number of things have happened this week. You had the intervention around Hillary's speech; then the subsequent rally. Four Senators, of course, are holding their ground so far, with Sanders just joining in now, in terms of his support for Glass-Steagall. At this point, anyway, Hillary Clinton seems to aligning with the White House; and I haven't read the latest reports from the organization in terms of the Wall Street reaction, but I'm assuming there's a big freakout going on, and a big panic of sorts.

My question to you is, what type of reaction should we continue to expect from this crowd? What's the next phase for us, now, after a week of activities in our deployments? And how would this lead to the impeachment of Barack Obama?

**Lyndon LaRouche:** Well, the situation now is that Obama is really bringing us to the edge of a thermonuclear confrontation. Now that's generally been the direction of his intentions; because everything he's done is in terms of the attack on Russia, in particular, which

is what his focus point is,— because Russia is selected by the British monarchy, the British Empire, and by Wall Street, essentially is opposed to it, in this process. So there is a preparation in the direction of going toward an actual, general thermonuclear war, in which the British interests, represented by Obama, in the planet would be going after a general war throughout much of the planet. This would be coming very fast; it would happen almost in an instant; we're getting down to a question of actually instants, between what is the point between Russia's holding back on its ability to fight, and the launching of the actual war by Obama in particular, but essentially by the whole British Empire system. Because it's the British Empire system, which brought Obama into popularity, shall we say: that is the problem here.

So, our problem is to understand this, and to catch up on what this is all about. Now, the proper way to look at this thing is, don't look at this as some kind of audio/video whatever. Don't treat it that way.

What happens is, when that thing is ready to go, and the U.S. side, British side, starts to move, the move by



Federation of American Scientists

*"On the edge of thermonuclear war:" Once developed, this B61-12 bomb would be the world's first guided nuclear gravity bomb, and, when deployed to Europe, would be a significant upgrade of NATO's nuclear capability—and, in the Russians' view, intention.*

Russia will be very brief,—a very brief interval between the launching of the war, and Russia's response. Russia's point is not to become itself involved as the provoker of thermonuclear war, but to leave that job, shall we say, to the British Empire in general, and to Obama in particular. That's the intention.

We don't know how fast that will come; there are many factors in this thing. The idea of very precise calculations in this kind of thing is really wrong. There are points at which the "go" goes, and the followup action goes similarly. But there is no real plan, that we can pre-calculate on our side.

So we have to understand, we're into a situation where we're on the edge of a thermonuclear war, and where Germany would be on the edge of this thing, but Russia will be the defending party. The British Empire and Obama will be the aggressive party. That much is clear.

Now, obviously there are certain things that can happen, which would change some of these things, but this is what we've got. Because you don't have a perfect conclusion as to what the actions are going to be. But we have a very good estimate of what the nature of the action will be.

Now, of course, if Obama is removed from office, then this would probably prevent the actual launching of a thermonuclear war. And the best estimate is, that if Obama were removed from the Presidency, the war might not be launched. Because people in our government, in the U.S. government, would not want this war. Some people, yes, around Obama and so forth, yes. But the people, the responsible institutions of the United States, *do not want a thermonuclear war*, particularly one launched from the United States under the direction of the British Empire.

So that's where we stand, and there are lots of things we can do, to respond to this. There are no simple mechanisms of predetermined conditions which operate under these kinds of conditions. You've come into an area where the probability is acute, and you try to work from the probability, to handle the countdown which might lead to an actual warfare situation.

**Q:** My name is S— from New Jersey. You just answered all my questions on that. But I want to know, if the military from the United States and people who are in here with any sanity, would back Obama, or just tell him to buzz off? I just want to know if the military would have enough sense, *not* to go, and fight the Rus-

sians? You think they'd stand up and tell Obama where to go. I would, if I was still in.

### **What Happened to Hillary?**

**LaRouche:** [laughs] Well, I would say, in response to that, that we have a role in this. In other words, we're not spectators; if we are spectators, we're idiots. Our job is to understand the way in which we can influence the process. For example, let's take what happened to Hillary Clinton. And this is a fun kind of thing, but this is typical of the way history really works: Now, we had one of our members there, when Hillary was giving the

---

**The precedent is, as this little incident demonstrates out of Manhattan, that the situation is never predetermined completely. There are always the possibilities of interventions, impromptu or pre-prepared, which may change the whole course of events.**

---

address. And at the end of that process, where she was gasping out the closure of what she had to say, our representative who was there, just as an observer, said, "Yes, what about Glass-Steagall?" And he repeated the statement, recapitulating it. She said nothing; she froze.

But the result was an immediate reaction through the audience and people like that, and so the thing very quickly spun out, becoming a national case. I mean, this is really one of the things, where a single statement, or a single pair of statements, from an observer, to a large audience, causes everything to go off but the fireworks. But this is quite useful. But the reaction was even more indicative: that people realized this was idiocy; that her policy which she expressed by the way she managed to bring her statement to a conclusion, proved that she was not fit to be a Presidential candidate of the United States at this time. And that's the essential thing.

Now therefore, the precedent is, as this little incident demonstrates out of Manhattan, that the situation is never predetermined completely. There are always the possibilities of interventions, impromptu or pre-prepared, which may change the whole course of events. And in a certain sense, that's exactly what happened in Manhattan, by the immediate close of her address.

So therefore, all of these kinds of situations are possible up to the very last possible moment,—that is, serious things are possible. And the importance is, to have

a population which responds in such a way that it, the population in concern, actually is prepared to make a reasonable, and convincing intervention, in the process of what is threatened to be a thermonuclear warfare.

**Q:** Hi Lyndon, this is Daniel Burke. I feel very fortunate that I was able to be at that moment earlier this week, and that it simply was not possible to stay silent, as the opportunity presented itself.

But my question is about how the advances of the BRICS nations, how—I'm thinking about the 600 or 700 million young people in India, who suddenly are extraordinarily optimistic. And I'm thinking about the

---

**If you look at the history of warfare, of modern major warfare, you'll see that even in the Eighteenth-Century, Nineteenth-Century levels, the element of surprise is crucial. And what is wrong with what most people think, is that they think that the surprise is not going to occur.**

---

15-year-old in China, whose whole life has been characterized by huge progress. And at the same time, I'm reflecting on the horrible degeneration in the United States population, and in the young people, especially, that we intend to fight to organize to a higher level. So I guess I'm asking about—I know that there's been a huge advance in the creative powers of man in the BRICS process; and what can be done, how does that affect our ability to prevent the war from happening? How does that affect our ability to advance the United States population, who are so far behind at this point?

**LaRouche:** Look, the first thing is to consider the standpoint of warfare, because this is what we're up against. The important thing is to prevent the kind of warfare which is being threatened now. Or to prevent the kinds of actions which could lead into the activation of such a form of warfare.

Because warfare on a continental, transcontinental level, is not something that you can control once it starts. It has a logic of its own. If you look at the history of warfare, of modern major warfare, you'll see that even in the Eighteenth-Century, Nineteenth-Century levels, the element of surprise is crucial. And what is wrong with what most people think, is that they think that the surprise is not going to occur. That it will be a preplanned attack, by calculable forces, and in the course of most warfare, there are certain things, as a

larger process, that can influence the process which happens.

But in the particular case, where something has broken out, just like what happened with Hillary,—Hillary decided to muff it, and there was somebody in the audience who was ready to say “what about Glass-Steagall? What about Glass-Steagall?” And what happened was, the unexpected happened! It happened because there was a predetermination to do something good, as a single individual with friends, of course, in the environment, which changed the course of history!

And this is always the factor you have to keep in mind. I, of course, have been through this for a long time, because I've been operating in operations for most of my life, and it's a very long life by most people's standards. But the point is, there is no predetermined plan, which cannot be, as we say, “screwed up,” as what happened to Hillary. She had no expectation of finding that thing; but what she did by not responding, *she lost her chance of becoming a Presidential candidate in full.*

**Q:** Good afternoon, I have one question for you: Do you have any news on Greece and Iran to share with us this afternoon?

**LaRouche:** Yes, something. That Greece has been butchered. Now, of course, the danger of this butchering of Greece, which has happened, was a possibility all the way through. It was a question, what would the British Empire do? And what happened in point of fact was that the British Empire intervened in the situation, to bring about the sequence of events.

In other words, what happened was, you had a situation that was ready. Schäuble in Germany was ready to do the job. But then, what happened, the Queen of England made two interventions into Germany in that context: The first time was to propose, simply, “well, let's explode it, let's kill it.” So the British Empire, or the Queen herself, personally, intervened, to cause the Germans in particular, particularly Schäuble and Merkel, but Schäuble is most prominent in this thing, to cause a destruction of what was an otherwise difficult, but feasible first step toward solution, in the Greek case.

And so, again. This was not an accident, though it would appear to have been an accident. In other words, it would appear that the British Queen *had not* intervened in the way she did with two interventions in Germany, to organize this attack on the Greeks, but the situation was there potentially. But then, what hap-



White House/Pete Souza

Barack Obama toasts the Queen in London, May 25, 2011.

pened is, the British Empire again put a heavy hand on Europe, on Germany in particular, and a faction in Germany sold out to the British Empire! And sacrificed the Greeks in the process.

Now, that leads to conclusions: because what was done to the Greeks, is going to have a response. It doesn't mean that the Greeks are going to do it. It means that the logic of the situation is going to impel the situation in Europe to change course from what it would have been, if the Greeks had not been kicked around the way they were this past week.

So we're now in a new situation. The question is, what are the parties that were concerned, were dealing with the effects of this scheme, what are they doing to do, in terms of reaction? And if you look at the history of warfare, modern warfare in particular, but warfare in general, that is major warfare, or very serious warfare, we're in that kind of situation. We have not begun, *yet*, to experience the kind of operation which threatens us at this moment, as a result of what the Queen of England did in Germany against the Greeks. So it's not just a Greek issue: It's the consequences of what was done to the Greeks which is going to set off a chain-reaction effect, which has various routes to take. So now you're on the hot seat! But you don't know which end, to get your rear end off!

**Q:** Mostly what I do in my political activism is I write, because it's hard for me to express myself. In 1991, a conspiracy began and since 1991, the U.S.A. military has increased every single solitary year. April

15th—and I'm against the military and the prison industrial complex—on April 15th, 2013 that was a Patriots Day and a Tax Day, and on that day in the morning, I heard that War Resisters League was going to meet on 42nd St. in Times Square, and being an activist, I wrote to four different public schools about the military and the economic crisis; and by 12 o'clock when I got to Times Square, the Boston Marathon bombings had already happened. And I believe that was related to the Tea Party and the FBI.

But anyhow, during that time period, Rahm Emanuel came to Boston and took down the entire city.

And during the time period, of immediate crisis, Obama was sending military—he was offering millions of dollars of military to Israel, Saudi Arabia, and United Arab Emirates; and at present they want to execute the boy who was a scapegoat.

I don't know what my question is, but it just really is very disturbing to me, a lot of the things our country is doing, so could you respond in any way? Thank you.

### What is Actual History

**LaRouche:** Look, what happened? We had a reaction in the Senate, provoked by one of the senators; so we have four Senators who made a policy decision and the policy decision is still rolling around; it's still there. The question is, what is the activation, the next step which that implies? What *is* the next step? And what will we do about it? Then you have to anticipate, what's going to be the reaction? If you make that step, what's the reaction?

What's involved here. Look, Wall Street, as we know it, like the British Empire and like most of the trans-Atlantic community,—where most of the nations in that particular spectrum, as distinct from the trans-Pacific section which is completely different; but they all will come together with one big collision, if this thing goes in a certain direction. But right now, it's the question of the British role, in shaping the policy of the United States and the effects of this on the question of the trans-Atlantic/North Atlantic area in general. So that's what the issue is.

So the point is, how do we play this? See, it's not

like throwing balls, rolling balls around or something, and letting them hit each other; *this is not what happens in history*. What happens in history, is that mankind, either by negligence or by determination, changes the course of history. In other words, the whole history of mankind, is the history of mankind's changing of the course of history. And they can have *non-participation*, which is also an effect. What you don't do, is an action. That's the nature of mankind. I mean, aren't you alive? Don't you do things, don't you move or don't you

---

**It's not like throwing balls, rolling balls around or something and letting them hit each other; this is not what happens in history. What happens in history, is that mankind, either by negligence or by determination, changes the course of history. In other words, the whole history of mankind, is the history of mankind's changing of the course of history.**

---

decide not to move, as a human being when these matters come up?

Now this applies to you, personally. It applies to the little things you do or don't do in life; they're important; the education you got, or didn't get; the opportunity you got or didn't get;—all these things are factors. And the process of history is always *very active*, and therefore, you either act, or you don't act. And this applies to a large, broad part of the population of the planet. One area or another area reacts or the other one doesn't, or so forth. But the *interaction*, is constant! There is no such thing as a fixed system, which would be the idea that "it happened here, because he did this and she did that," and so forth. That is nonsense!

As you saw in the case of what happened to Hillary most recently: What was that? That was a very significant development, in the course of history, now. Hillary will never be the same, as she was up to the moment that she goofed. Then this caused an explosion. People in the area, a significant number of them, press and so forth, suddenly had to add a new factor to their policy, that Hillary was not the obvious Democratic Presidential candidate, *no longer* the obvious! She was the fake! She was the fool! She was a person you couldn't trust, the guy who was a swindler.

Then people reacted! The people who reacted, reacted in their way. The course of history was changed: History, in its essential nature, always moves. And the

idea is that you have to be aware of the situation in which you're operating; not merely what happened yesterday, but what you did yesterday, is going to do for the next coming period of history. And that's what we have to do.

So the idea of trying to get neat formulas, like drawing on paper and so forth, that's nonsense. History is always that. And the most important thing in history, is discoveries of principle; discoveries of principles which mankind in general had never known before, or a large part of the population had never known before. Or, they have *failed*, to recognize what should have been recognized before!

There's no such thing as a simple, mechanistic way of measuring the course of history. And you look at the history of military warfare, major military warfare, in the course of the Nineteenth Century, the Twentieth Century and so forth,—very much that. But the problem is, that the practical person, so-called, the individual person, tends to be stupid, on this issue. They think that they are going to intervene in history; well, people do intervene in history. They can do that, yes. It's a good thing to do, if you do it the right way. But the point is *mankind is always moving*. Mankind is never at a standstill until it's dead, and even the death of a person has an active effect on the process, the political process as a whole.

So all these simple questions, simple answers, simple questions,—forget it! The question is to rise to an active understanding of what you feel is happening around you right now. And its effects on... you have competent leaders; well, if you don't have competent leaders, that's a bad thing! If you have good ones, you're lucky.

But always, things like scientific discoveries, you know, competent scientific discoveries, are really the thing that makes mankind live. And therefore, you have to be one of the active people in society, who's making things happen, which are in the effect of either new discoveries, or old discoveries which need to be moved. [applause]

### **Glass-Steagall and Impeachment**

**Q:** Hello Brother LaRouche. I'm from Brooklyn. We all know how important Glass-Steagall is, and it needs to be reinstated to stop Wall Street and the global bankers. My question is, how will Glass-Steagall enhance the impeachment of Obama?

**LaRouche:** OK! Well, first of all, you can't make a fixed object, even a good one or a bad one; you have to move yourself. The answer's going to be in what we do, or what some people do to change the situation, or don't change the situation. And sometimes not changing the situation can seem to be the worst thing you can do, but sometimes there are cases you will regret, that you ever did it!

So this is really what's going on. Mankind has to function in society as an active force in society. Like you have to care about people. You have to care about them. And if you know something's going to happen that's bad to them, you should intervene in some way to try to make this bad thing go away.

Mankind has to be always on the alert. And mankind doesn't always know everything, but most of us know something, something we know from experience in particular. And we have to think about that, and think about the opposite choice. We have to think about them, we have to make decisions.

Now generally what we want to do, is increase the productive powers of labor. Now, that's not just simply work, that's the way you live. In other words, you want to fight disease, all the time. You want to defend people against disease, all the time. You want to improve your ability to conquer disease, all the time.

You want to create new discoveries; for example, now we're making great new discoveries. One of the greatest discoveries we're making right now, is the study of the Galactic System. In other words, mankind heretofore, had believed, that what happens in the Solar System in terms of action is the nature of man's condition in life. But then, we come up with new discoveries, and we discover that the Galactic System, is actually the dominant feature determining the fate of the human species. That is, in that context.

So therefore, if you don't do something about that, if you don't recognize that, all your dreams and all your fantasies don't mean too much. Because you're not in reality. And the characteristic of mankind is—you know, animals die, that is, species of animals die. But just think about what the history of humanity is. How



NASA/JPL-Caltech

*A NASA scientist calibrates two finger-like mini-booms on the Mars rover Curiosity, in preparation for its voyage. It landed on Mars in August 2012.*

many kinds of animals have died out, during the time that mankind was also occupying space on this planet? What's the difference? Mankind has the creative powers. *Animals do not have those creative powers.* Only human beings.

And the question is, to what degree do human beings develop improvements in their understanding and practice of reaching progress? For example, right now, what's the great danger now? The great danger now, happens when the British Empire took charge of the Pope. At that point, the British Empire, by pressing the Pope, began to push a process of cutting the population of the planet, cutting it from about seven billion living people, to less than one billion living people: That's the policy of the British Empire now! The British Empire is the actual director, the mother and director of Obama right now; the Bushes also tried to be this kind of thing as Presidents and similar types.

So the problem here, is we have to understand the responsibility of mankind to be mankind, which means to always move toward progress, to better health-care systems, for example. Not just health-care systems, but the protection of the life of human beings. Those are the opportunities, to survive and rise to a higher level of achievement, for the cause of mankind in general.

This is the only thing you can count on. There are no fixed advantages in history. Especially in terms of human history. Human beings are a unique species. We have no evidence of any other such species, that is

living species as we know of living species. The human species is the only one that's properly in permanency. And the progress of mankind is like the discovery of the United States, the creation of the United States, in opposition to the British Empire, which was a force of Satanic evil in itself. The failures in Europe, compared to what the United States Constitution and its organization under Alexander Hamilton's leadership and guidance on many of these issues, created the United States as a superior culture. And the problems we have mostly in the United States today, is people forgot the name of the person who made the greatest specific barrage of changes in policy which made the successful establishment of the United States possible.



*LaRouche PAC activists rally to revive Hamilton's program at Federal Hall, Manhattan, on July 16, 2015.*

EIRNS/Robert Wesser

### Conspiracy Theories

**Q:** The people, or the masses: how do you go about breaking them up, informing them, or you know, because it's hard to get them to say that it's not a conspiracy theory and turn their brain off?

**LaRouche:** Well, I think a conspiracy theory in this case is very useful. As a matter of fact, it's mandatory. Without a conspiracy theory, you wouldn't have the United States, for example.

**Q:** It would be good, if they didn't just turn off. It's like, if you know, if you say "conspiracy theory," that's it, it's just a different—they don't—

**LaRouche:** Exactly! That's what I do! This is my profession!

**Q:** I know, I know. I understand! But they don't. . .

**LaRouche:** Don't let people do that, don't let them! Stop it! Let them come alive, and find out what the news is that they should be getting, on which they should operate. It's the question of the person who rises to a more fully developed dignity, in terms of their self-estima-

tion of what their responsibility is in society. Call them the "creative leaders," the people who care! The people who come up with the solutions, where other people see no solution. Wars and so forth, they all come in that same category, you know.

The point is, you've got to mobilize the people, and you have to mobilize them by inspiring them to recognize what they have in themselves. Look, let's take a case, a good case: Let's take the case of the Civil War in the United States. Was the Civil War in the United States necessary? What was wrong with the Civil War success? It wasn't permanent enough. It's that simple!

So therefore, the actions that should have occurred were suppressed. We had a couple of Presidents, you know, general officers, two of them, and they were really good; and we had some later, very good. We won our wars, where we won ones, actually by having good leaders in the military leadership and in the political leadership. But it was always creative! Coming up with new discoveries.

What's happened to us? We don't make discoveries any more, we don't *want* discoveries to be made any more! We're cutting this out. We don't have nuclear

power to use any more, generally; we don't! Do you know what that *does* as a threat to the existence of the human species, to lack the benefit of thermonuclear power and its improvement? Now we can control it; mankind knows how to control this. We have the technology! But they don't want to do it, they say well, they want to go back to the "green."

What's killing us? *The green!* The green philosophy is the greatest source of murder, of citizens of the United States today! It's a mass killing!

So my point here, is you cannot come up with prefixed, fixed kinds of things. Mankind is an active species. It's a species that is destined, by its nature, to rise to higher levels of achievement of the human species. Look, mankind is now on the road, like what happened in the Pluto case, just recently in experiment; not completed. But it shows that everything we thought about the Solar System was greatly underestimated, and that the Solar System is a much more interesting phenomenon than we had ever thought before.

Similarly, we are going into a position where we are looking for water. Well, how can you get adequate water supplies, under all kinds of conditions? Well the only way you can do that, essentially, comes down to, we have the largest source of water available to mankind which happens to be located in the Galaxy. That is a phenomenon which seems to us far removed from anything on Earth. But precisely that thing which seems so far removed, is actually greatly close at hand and decisive!

So the problem is, we don't *think* properly! We call it being *practical*, and what kills people is the foolish idea that they should be practical. [applause]

### **LaRouche, Putin and Clinton**

**Diane Sare:** This is a question from someone who's listening and reflects their own intimidation by this extreme wartime propaganda that we're experiencing around Russia. The person writes that a few months ago, the Senate passed a law to control the news media about Russia, and that there has been spectacular anti-Russian propaganda, in the radio, television; and the person says, "they must have paid them a lot to get them to do this." So it's a very aggressive campaign against Putin in the United States, and they would like your comments on dealing with this.

**LaRouche:** Well, I happen to be something of an expert on Putin, and also on Russia from that whole period of my life, where I first visited Russia. And I went there a number of times, and I have a pretty good



NASA/Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory/Southwest Research Institute

*This photograph, taken July 13 just hours before the New Horizon spacecraft's closest encounter approach to Pluto, shows extremely varied and complex surface features and geology that were unexpected. Upon closer examination, the heart-shaped feature in the lower center; measuring about 1,000 miles across, was found to be an ice-covered surface, divided into segments of irregular shapes. It borders a dark region of ice mountains, rising as high as 11,000 feet. It will take more than a year to acquire all of the data New Horizons has collected during the first investigation of the largest outer Solar System icy body.*

knowledge of it.

I didn't actually know Putin directly, when I first knew of him, but I did come to know of him, when he took up a leading role in the Russian organization at that time.

But before that, with the breakdown of the Soviet Union or the destruction of the Soviet Union as such, it wasn't working any more; and so in that period, and up to the time that Putin became obvious to me—that is, I knew of him before, but not in the terms as the leadership of Russia. But in his appearance as a leader of Russia, I got to know him at a distance, but in fact, because I had good sources, I knew what the things were, and I actually did some studies on him.

But what's happened is, that Russia has gone through a number of wrestling matches of various kinds, with itself, its own membership, its own disintegration in part, with the odd deal and problem.

And when I worked with, in a sense, but in a funny

way, though, with Bill Clinton, with Bill Clinton before he got the thing thrown at him by the British Monarchy; it was the British Monarchy that really ruined Bill Clinton's life, and that happened at a period where Bill had made a delayed move on behalf of what I had recommended to him, that we do, that we do on the basis of what I'd received in Russia from the experts in the Russian government at that time, and they asked for my opinion on what we could do to deal with the economic crisis which Russia was going through then.

So I came up with a proposal, in reply to the request to me from the central Russian leadership at that time. Of course, I was in touch with Bill, and Bill said, in his own way—and he had his own way—, I'm not going to do it now. What he meant was he was going to wait until his re-election for a next term as President. He actually adopted the policy which I had recommended be adopted on behalf of the Russians. But it came a little bit too late; it was a crisis.

And then the Queen of England—and she was the one who did it—intervened to set up a trap to discredit Bill Clinton. Unfortunately, his wife never really understood that. It was just beyond her comprehension. She's not a bad person, but she has stubborn convictions, which even Bill can't cut through, and was making big mistakes. The last time I met Bill, I met him at a point Bill had left office, at the conclusion of his second term; and I met Bill and Hillary, encountered them when the reception for Bill of coming out of his position as President occurred. And she had no understanding of what this was all about. Really! She was just confused. "I don't understand. I don't understand." Bill understood very well. But Bill has made some mistakes since that time, because he's been through the mill, and he tried to survive by adapting to the mill. Therefore, he made some very serious mistakes; but under great pressure, including from her, and so forth.

So that's the way things work sometimes. The problem is, you always have to recognize that these kinds of problems, these opportunities and problems, alike, are things which lie in the future, and you can't know them unless you *know* the future, or at least know a very significant part of it; as I do, when I made my forecast in response to the Russian leadership, at that point, where I had transmitted my recommendation for Russia's



*Hillary Clinton at The New School in New York City on July 13, 2015—before the surprise struck.*

physical economic recovery to Bill. Bill had got a message to me: we're going to do it, but we're not going to do it right away. And I was not happy about that.

But, then in the opening of the second term as President, he moved immediately on that policy. *Then*, immediately, the British Queen, the present British Queen, the old biddy, personally intervened, and she used her instruments in Britain as the convoy, the channel, to take over the control of the leadership of the Republican Party. Also, Bill's Vice President, who is a bit of a political whore, and Bill knew that by that time, so this was the problem that set him up. So he was set up.

This whole thing was really a booby-trap. The story about Bill and sex and so forth at that point, is not exactly the story. The story is it was a set-up, the set-up he was trapped into, and he was set up by his Vice President. His own Vice President set him up on that one. And that's the way history goes often. [Laughs] You have to take into account real history, not the, shall we say, the manufactured version.

Speed: [laughs] There are many baffled faces in the audience. But we have more questions. I also have one, but go ahead.

### **After Glass-Steagall**

**Q:** Hi Lyndon, It's Daniel again. I felt as if I wasn't totally prepared, when I came up the first time, because, I was thinking—here we have what you're saying on the Queen. If people haven't seen it, there are wonder-

ful pictures of the Queen as a young child saluting in the Nazi salute that came out in the British tabloids today. So if anyone has any doubts at all about what Lyn is saying, these people are much worse than Hitler.

And so, I'm thinking about, after what we did on Monday with Hillary, I was able to talk to people all over the country about what's changing. And it's been changing every moment. There's a rapid consolidation of the Glass-Steagall movement within the Democratic Party. And it's clear we're in a completely new terrain on that front.

But when I was talking to many people who are contacts and friends of ours, and supporters, from various parts of the country, it occurs to me to think again about your Four Laws statement that you produced just over a year ago, and I'm asking, Glass-Steagall flushes the evil, it separates the fraud from the reality, and therefore it's entirely and utterly necessary, and in that sense it's exactly the same thing as bringing down Obama, and so the victory on this is so absolutely needed.

And it's not nearly enough. And what we have to do is instruct the American people, in particular the leadership of the American people, about what it means to create real value, and how Alexander Hamilton returning to life, or, that is to say, continuing to live ever greater through us, is going to be needed to actually deal with the immediate consequences of restoring Glass-Steagall. We're going to have to extend long-term credit to build up the nation. We're going to have to achieve the increase of the physical productivity of our nation rapidly and protect our people who are going to be in a very vulnerable state, as they're watching this great change around them. I think they'll be very optimistic, but they'll be vulnerable at the same time.

So what occurred to me, having talked to these many people all over, is to ask myself how am I going to give them a sense of what real human economy is? If Glass-Steagall flushes the toilet, what comes next?

**LaRouche:** (Laughs) That's not a nice image. I think we should find a better image for that. The problem is the question ... the existence of the human species depends upon the equivalent of scientific progress. We can say that's the *category*; it's not just scientific progress per se; it's the category. It's the ability of the human species to rise from the evil, the Satanic evil, of Zeus, for example, who was the ancient Greek image of Satan, literally Satan. As opposed to what Nicholas of

Cusa did in resuscitating civilization, together with other people who were part of the same pattern that he was leading, in leading to do things in Cusa's own work, which is really revolutionary.

At that point Greece, for example, when Cusa first reached, and examined Greece, went to the temple areas, which had excellent records, but the Greeks weren't practicing it any more. And so Cusa, Nicholas of Cusa, then turned around and said, "We've got to bring this back." So his understanding of Christianity, this principle, was based on the fact that here was something that Cusa brought back and worked on and developed, that corresponded to the reality of a Christian doctrine, the reality of the law which should govern mankind, but mankind's progress.

The key thing here is always mankind must progress. Mankind must progress by improving the powers of mankind as a species, to do things that no person has ever done before. And that's the principle: what has never been done before is what must be done next, including fixing up some errors that had been run up in the process in the meantime. But that's what mankind depends upon.

And what's happening now in the Green policy, what has now become popularized in the trans-Atlantic region: the Green policy is actually Satanic, explicitly, in its own essence. In other words, the British Queen is a Satanic force, by that standard, because mankind's ability to exist depends upon mankind's achievement of what are measures which are tantamount, in effect, to new physical principles or higher physical principles. That is the sense that mankind will and should be able to progress scientifically in order to get more control over the water that mankind needs on Earth, through control of mechanisms through the Galaxy, which is a very far distance from the surface of Earth as such. Mankind's scientific progress, the development of nuclear power, and higher orders of power which were generated in terms of echo of the successful nuclear power,—that is the standard on which the continued existence of the human species depends.

Progress! Green is the devil. Devilish poison. Green is bad; it's rotten; it's evil. It destroys the minds of people. It destroys their ability, makes them beasts, because they become like beasts. They become like slaves. Slaves weren't allowed to have progress. That didn't do them any good, did it?

And you saw what happened with the Civil War—people who had been slaves for a long period of time,

suddenly emerged as talented geniuses, and things like that. They got freed. And since they lived in an environment, even as slaves, where in some parts of society, they had access to knowledge that there was a way of living which they were denied, which they knew about, they were cheated. Brick-layers, for example. African slaves, came into the Southern states, and some of them functioned as bricklayers, and the bricklayer was a step up. And the very fact that they get this kind of thing, some degree of skill, they recognized, why can't we use our skills and our brainpower as skills, to do what mankind should do? And so the problem in mankind's history is when people say, "Let's be practical." And you should say, "Well, you mean you want to die?"



*After the Civil War, "people who had been slaves for a long period of time, suddenly emerged as talented geniuses..." Here, leading botanist George Washington Carver (c. 1861-1943), born into slavery.*

**Speed:** I'm exercising the prerogative of the moderator. I can't resist; this is too good. The issue that you are bringing up here, and which has been central to my discussion with you my entire life, which people call race, all the time, and they talk about Obama in this same regard, and so forth: what's the truth? This business with the Queen of England, and the videotape where she's seven years old and she's giving the Nazi salute together with her uncle Edward VIII. He's teaching her that, yes, but, that is her outlook from the age of 7, and the thing that we're talking about now, with the reduction of the population from seven billion to one billion, is a completely conscious and deliberate outlook.

Now, this makes me think of the following. Lyn, as you know, in the Catholic Church, the issue of reason at the age of seven, is the issue of the sacrament of Confirmation. In other words, it's said, when you're a child, you are a child until the age of seven. That age, reason takes over, and you receive what's called the sacrament

of Confirmation, which is sometimes given at the age of eight, and in this sacrament, there's a very specific thing that happens: you're given a name, you take a name, and you have a confirmation name. So for example, in my case, my confirmation name chosen by me was Jerome, after St. Jerome. And what they do, when you have Confirmation is, you're slapped on the cheek, which is supposed to symbolize your being oppressed, but defending the faith. So you take that slap on the cheek, okay, as an expression of your conscious defense of it.

Now, the reason I'm pointing this up is, because this woman, the Queen of England, and everything she represents, is not only Satanic, it's consciously that from the age of seven. Obama, who works with her, is consciously, deliberately, and fully a Satanic figure in every sense that Lyn has ever said.

Now this is often been, and everyone here knows it, it's thrown in people's faces, that Lyn is being a racist because he's attacking Obama, ostensibly because Obama is black. The truth is, Obama, the Queen of England and these people, are willfully, they're racist: They're opposed to the human race. [applause]

I just want to take this up, because what you've been talking about here, in the last period, is not just a matter of race It's also the other side of what you keep saying, which is, if you intervene in history the right way, if you do it on behalf of the love of people, and against things like the green policy, these other things—*this* is the way that history is actually changed.

This is the same thing that's done with Lincoln. Lincoln is often referred to, and Grant as well, somehow they have differences, they vacillate—no such thing is the case. Without Lincoln, there was no end of slavery. There was a deliberate fight, but as Lyn just said, it was

never concluded. King, Martin Luther King, and others attempted to do that.

But this thing that you keep hitting at about the choice of being human, and the idea that these people are pursuing a Satanic policy, and that what we're doing is the opposite of that—it's a Promethean approach, as opposed to a Zeusian approach—whenever you bring this up, this just gets me most excited; but I love it because it's so stark in terms of the truth that people can *make this choice*. It's in everybody's power to choose to be human, and it's in people's power to choose to *not* be. And there are people who have done that, you can't deny that. You can't act like that's a formal question or a political question: It's a moral question. I'm sorry, Lyn, but I had to say that. . . .

### Our Species Goes to School

**Q:** B— from New Jersey. Again, Daniel has pre-empted something. And Dennis brought this up again, also. I have seen the video—it's now been spread through the internet—of the Royal Family practicing their Hitler salute as Hitler was being brought to power in Germany. And again, here in the U.S. we had a similar circumstance with the Bush family, you know, with Prescott Bush and others.

On the other side of that, you had Franklin Roosevelt, who was taking that on completely, particularly through Glass-Steagall and other measures that would allow the U.S. to take that fight on. And again, it was his understanding of both his place in and also looking back to Hamilton, that allowed that to occur.

You've brought this up many times, that within, effectively, the bones of the American people, are the capability to overcome what we now face domestically and internationally, and you've also brought up the role of the Presidency, which can clearly be seen with the George Washington Administration, Lincoln, and particularly Roosevelt, and you've brought up the role of the Presidency *now*, in being able to take this on again. And I'd like you to give us your insight into that, the present development of a Presidency.

**LaRouche:** Well, I just made some reference to that general area, and you've spoken on this thing, adequately in general.

But to make a more specific point, is what I've said earlier, which you've emphasized: science, true science, physical science. We understand things that man-

kind is able to use, that mankind had always had available to mankind, but mankind began to learn how to use it. Each step in that process brings mankind to a higher level in the Solar System, and also in the Galaxy as such—as such.

And the problem is that mankind's progress, like a child going to school, that the human species must go through that kind of progress, a special kind of higher school. Where mankind through development, is able to make changes in the universe, or at least parts of the universe, important parts on Earth, in particular. And nearby Earth. And mankind's ability to master these

---

**And the problem is that mankind's progress—like a child going to school—that the human species must go through that kind of progress, a special kind of higher school. Where mankind through development, is able to make changes in the universe, or at least parts of the universe, important parts on Earth in particular. And nearby Earth.**

---

technologies, as we call them, is the precondition for the continued existence of the human species, of mankind. And therefore, everything we do should be under a schooling system.

Now we used to have an idea what a schooling system was in the United States and elsewhere. You would have people who would get promoted for their skills, for their apparent skills, those skills were encouraged. Sometimes the effort to encourage was successful, sometimes it was not. But the process was, in the net effect, in the course of mankind's development, there were people who *did*, like Einstein in the Twentieth Century, for example, who *did* make general revolutions in man's knowledge and practice, which are still resonating as new conceptions today.

So therefore the issue of life is not what you achieve, *per se*—it's what you contribute to the progress of mankind's powers to create. And that's the difference. Only mankind can do that.

Also, by derivative, that no man is free, unless mankind is actually progressing in the equivalent of scientific skills *and their application*. It's not only the discovery of physical principles, and related things, it's the discovery of how you *use* those discoveries themselves to create new instruments from those discoveries, which open the gates for mankind's rise to a higher

level, not only *on* the surface of Earth, but now, beyond Earth. What we saw this little funny thing that happened in space nearby—not so nearby—which is still being puzzled-over by the specialists. And that effort is going to open up something new. We don't know what that is going to be; we have to wait 'til we get it. Once it's delivered to you, then you'll know what it is, maybe.

**Q:** Good afternoon, Mr. LaRouche, I'm P— from Connecticut, and I have a quick question. When Glass-Steagall is reinstated, and the commercial and investment banks are separate, what would happen to the depositors' money, like investment banks and the stock market?

**LaRouche:** Okay, simple. The problem with what the stock market is doing is actually destroying the economy of the United States, including the welfare of even rich people. Because most of these guys who are involved in Wall Street speculation are already hopelessly dead. They just haven't been buried yet.

What happened is, to take a practical case— We had a meeting of the Senate. One Senator brought that meeting around in the form of an action. Three other Senators joined her. The program that's now there; it's stirred the mud, shall we say. And it will continue to do so, I think, so far. And there's a knowledge that Wall Street is hopelessly bankrupt, and that the wealth of Wall Street is worthless intrinsically. We're going to have to do without all that money that Wall Street claims to own. We're going to cancel it. Why are we going to cancel it? Because it's cancelling itself.

Wall Street is now broke, totally broke. Just like a parasite, sucking on whatever it can suck—it's not producing anything anymore. So what's needed—we cancel Wall Street. That means that all the money that's listed as Wall Street assets pretty much *vanishes*, permanently, will never come back again. Good.

And the people who were practicing on Wall Street are going to have to find a new career for themselves, because the old one isn't going to work anymore; it's over, it's already over. That's one of the real reasons.

The whole trans-Atlantic community, in terms of



*The WPA (Works Progress Administration) was a “school,” “a parking place to keep people alive economically, until we could get them employed in real skills.” Here WPA workers pour concrete on a storage unit in Ogden, Utah, in 1936.*

Wall Street and similar kinds of financial systems, is *bankrupt, hopelessly bankrupt. Nothing can be done to save it in that form.* And the answer is, we have a Presidency, a national system, a national Presidential system. And our system provides automatically—okay, as Franklin Roosevelt demonstrated, this stuff is worthless, Wall Street assets are worthless, they're a threat to humanity, they're a poison. Franklin Roosevelt made that clear. Did the people of the United States lose, relative to the decade of my birth, which was a farce in the economy, and then when I, later, 1932, suddenly I found around me—and I was still just a young squirt, ten years old—but we found a change was going on. The education was improving in many places. The operations were gradually improving.

We went through the WPA (Works Progress Administration), for example. That was just a school, this thing; but it was a parking place to keep people alive economically, until we could get them employed in real skills. Like our miracles, in our efforts in building up for World War II. We *lived* on World War II. We fought and died, in the course of World War II. Why? For the sake of humanity. And we have not lost that.

Since Franklin Roosevelt's death, almost the moment he died, the general social trend, and the social

practice in the United States, has overall degenerated at an accelerating rate since Franklin Roosevelt died.

As a matter of fact, when I worked under the leadership of Ronald Reagan as President for a short period of time doing a crucial thing called the Strategic Defense Initiative, which was my particular assignment, we were making progress even then. But then when the President was shot, and took some time to recover, then the Bush factor began to be pushed. That is, the Bush family descended from Prescott Bush; who was Mr. Evil himself; he was an intelligent Satan, the other Bushes were dumb Satans. That's generally a fair way of putting it.

So, we've now gone into a period—since that time—that is, since the end of World War II, since the end of the life of Franklin Roosevelt, in the general direction of life throughout the United States and throughout much of the planet, especially the trans-Atlantic period, that has been a failure. And if you want to see what's going on out there; you just have to see that. And I've lived long enough, since 1922 when I was born, to know as an adult, an active adult, that thing. I was already an expert at that point in economic function, back in 1944. So, we've gone to Hell since then. You know that some things were still good, some things were still nice; there were some opportunities and so forth.

But look at it today. Look at it under the most recent Bush administration; that's horrible, it's monstrous, disgusting. But under Obama is far worse; it's Satanism itself in practice. And the British Queen runs the show, globally. Some parts of the planet have resisted; some parts of Asia, some parts of South America, a spot here and there into South Africa and Africa. But otherwise, the whole culture of mankind since particularly the end of 1944 until now, since I went into the business of becoming an official, things of that sort; it's been going down, down, down, down, down, with no net improvement. Not even sustaining what we had achieved earlier.

Look at it; just take the conditions, just take the short time. See, most people in the United States today don't know what the truth is about their own history, or their own family's history; because they live in a period where they, as children—four to five years of age, where they begin to understand something—they don't know the past. They only know the past as a future; you know, what they attribute to its future; they don't know it. They don't really know often what happens at their

age of 20 years of age, 21 years of age; and that's what happens.

Most of our young people, who are young people below their 30s, have very—on the average—are completely incompetent. They have no competency whatsoever; that is, the things they do, do not contribute to the welfare of humanity. As a matter of fact, the effect is, that each decade since that time, has been a decade of decadence as such for the population of the United States as a whole. We have a few fat cats who sit there, supervising the thing, but doing almost nothing to fix it. [applause]

**Q:** Hello Teacher, and Helga. This is Mr. U—and M—saying hello to you with our Christian. Would the new Presidency that you are organizing be based on the attributes of the Rushmore Four; Jefferson's Virginia Statute, Lincoln's Railroad, Washington's Hamiltonian bank, Roosevelt's Glass-Steagall?

**LaRouche:** Well, I think we know now, that we have to cancel the influence of Wall Street entirely; there's no room for Wall Street anymore, it has to be wiped off the books entirely. That means a cut, a very large cut, in what's called the circulating money. Why is it cut? Because it can't circulate anymore; it's like you got blood, but the blood doesn't move, so you're going to die of quiet blood. And that's the case here.

If we restore Glass-Steagall, that in itself will be an included feature, an essential feature on which the recovery of the economy of the United States and its conditions of life will depend. That's the issue. We can fix it, but we have to have the opportunity to fix it; and we have to have people around us who know how to fix it. But essentially, it really is not much different than the intention of the Franklin Roosevelt administration. The details are different in terms of technology, but the principle is the same.

## Social Conditions in New York

**Speed:** We're going to take two more questions.

**Q:** That's H—from the Bronx. I just thought since we're centering this process in New York City, just thinking of the conditions of life in New York City, where because of things like the real estate market, it's getting difficult to exist in New York City. The oligarchy around the world with their little *pied-a-terres*, these little apartment buildings and 100-story things on 57th Street. And obviously, they don't even live in them. And some of us are somewhat sheltered because we have either public housing, or cheap condomini-

ums, cheap co-ops; but we also have new regulations, like what you said, the green energy coming in to make things more expensive for us. And you have the high level of homelessness; some people can work but they can't pay the rents, or other people, they just need supervision and the services aren't there.

So, I just want to know if you have any reflections of what we have in New York City. And then, just on a different subject, in the drug industry, we have cures or near-cures for things like hepatitis B, hepatitis C, and they don't even seem to be used at the rate that's necessary; that's something else I wanted to bring up. We have drugs, and they're not even being used.

**LaRouche:** We got a general problem in this whole area. New York City is a good subject to focus on, because New York City is one of the most important surviving areas of culture actually in the United States. And it's amazing that the culture in New York City is maintained by the part of the population and a few others, scientific and so forth. Where what I know from reflections, and therefore from experience earlier and from reflections, is that actually there's been a progressive degeneration of the human aspect of New York City and its environment. You see, skyscrapers are sometimes very doubtful in their value. You're getting a lot of people doing things, and scattering things around and so forth, which don't do any good for the people of that nature.

So, what we need, of course, is a change in policy; which will have to be done in a very careful way, to recognize that there are certain things that are done in New York City which do follow a tradition of real progress, not fantasy progress, real progress. Entertainment, social processes.

For example, we used to have Classical musicians in New York City—young ones. There used to be, in the period going into World War II, you find them up at certain areas, where these students who were becoming musicians, becoming professional musicians, would be gathered. They wouldn't have much money, but they



*Classical music in New York's Central Park.*

youtube

would go in known areas, centered on Central Park; and these areas, they would settle, they would go there, and they would find out cheap or free tickets into musical events.

And they were welcomed by limitations; in other words, were the seats available for them, were the gates open for them. If they're musicians, they would say, they're musicians, training, don't have much money; all right, let's bring them in. Because they're the people who are going to be the audiences and the performers of the drama and so forth which are going to occur in that same population. And I knew a lot of people like that, who were living like that; before the war, and after the war had begun. So, we do have things; we have certain scientific institutions which are extremely important. Some of our best educational institutions which are extremely important. The basic educational system of the New York system has to be maintained at its best level; but an up-to-date level as well.

So, these are the kinds of things which should be taken into account. Obviously, what we build up in New York is, we build up a heavy weight of skyscrapers and things, which is, and the same thing happened in Germany; in certain parts of Germany, the same thing. Absolutely crazy skyscraper business, with absolutely no reason to exist there; because it's all this Wall Street kind of thing, or things related to Wall Street kinds of things which are producing most of these things. When we have a couple of skyscrapers in Manhattan, when I first lived there, these were unique; you were really impressed by these few places. But then we come down

today, and you think, where's all this junk coming from. Why are the skyscrapers so high? It takes a week to get up and down the elevators; I don't know, it's silly.

But the point is, we do need a general social reform of the United States and other nations—like European nations—we do need a social process which makes sense for mankind, and the people who have to live in this process; we have to make it practical for them in a sense. How much are they going to waste their time chasing around for this or that, or this or that? As opposed to how much times they can concentrate on developing their own mental powers, and make their inventions and so forth—their arts, creation.

### Freedom Through Beauty

**Q:** Hi, Lyn. It's D—. I wanted to bring up that right before we saw you, we had a beautiful demonstration from Jessica, on how to breathe when you're singing. And some people were stunned by that. Diane then picked up the ball there, and she had people singing solfège. And we actually did solfège for the very beginning of Schubert's Ninth Symphony; and we did it, one section was the oboes, another did the horns, and another section did the violins. This was beautiful! And but I heard some people say, "Well, what does this have to do with politics?" And it made me think of Friedrich Schiller, who said that the only path to true political freedom is through beauty. And I wanted you to comment on this idea, of why we need beauty. I think what Daniel did on Monday with Hillary Clinton, that to me was beautiful. [laughter] But I'd like you to respond.

**LaRouche:** Well, the question is, how to we develop the minds of our citizens? How do we develop the minds in terms of these kinds of technologies that we use for those purposes? How do we organize as a society so that the creative powers of the individual human beings are brought into a more efficient relationship to



*A portrait of German conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler by Emil Orlik. Furtwängler said of his artistic approach:*

*"I am told that the more you rehearse, the better you play. This is wrong. We often try to reduce the unforeseen to a controllable level, to prevent a sudden impulse that escapes our ability to control, yet also responds to an obscure desire. Let's allow improvisation to have its place and play its role. I think that the true interpreter is the one who improvises. We have mechanized the art of conducting to an awful degree, in the quest of perfection rather than of dream [...]*

*"Some of Michelangelo's sculptures are perfect, others are just outlined and the latter ones move me more than the first perfect ones because here I find the essence of desire, of the waking dream. That's what really moves me: fixing without freezing in cement, allowing chance its opportunity."*

themselves? I mean, like impossible journeys, impossible work which is not relevant to the function at all—not relevant to man's function. We want things that will work. We want educational institutions, we want medical care, health care; we want these things which go with a social process. And you put into it, after you've defined the social process, now you put in some of the gimmicks in there, which have to go to make the social process work and prosper, and develop. And that's what you essentially need.

You also need some good entertainment; but it has to be healthy entertainment. It has to be things that make people happy. When people get sick, they do sick things and so forth. But things that really important; inspire people! Inspire them to discover in themselves a desire to do something which they look at and say, "I'm glad I did that." And that's—sometimes people educate themselves. And that's all part of the process; you want that kind of process. Even gossiping among neighbors is often sometimes very useful, because they will bring up things with other neighbors, relatives and so forth; and it actually tends to be a creative process.

In New York City, there really used to be a potential for that; and this has become diminished because of the pure mechanics of the thing, of the process, which have ruined it to some degree. But New York City is actually one of the most advanced places culturally in the United States still today, even today.

**Speed:** OK, so we've come to the end again, Lyn.

And I'd like you to, in concluding remarks, if you would, evaluate. You've now done four of these things; and we're going to be doing a few more. Where do you evaluate we are, where do you want us to go in the next coming week?

**LaRouche:** What you want to do is, you want to teach this things as an educational process, which is funny in one sense, but not otherwise. The point is, if you bring people together to work together on sharing talents, sharing experience, and applying that efficiently to, so that mankind knows what they have to do . . . See, most people in most parts of the United States, don't know why they're living; they really don't. They have entertainment. Look at our young people, you know, 20-25 years of age or so, or even 30; how much do they know? How much do intelligence do they really represent? What do they do? What does it do for mankind? What, isn't it like a drug addiction, habit? Isn't most of it of that nature? Isn't it the popular opinion, the popular game that you play, and dump the next season?

No, the problem is, we don't have an orientation for the self-education, and education in general, of our people. We don't have a science-driver perspective; which was always the thing that made us successful when we were making ourselves successful. We have to go back to the same thing; we have to go back to those principles. Rediscover them! Become human again, really human.

That's what the problem is. And you can't explain all this in one breath, or even a few breaths. You have to create a community within the community. Where you create a community; you have a community, but you have within the community, you have another community which is emerging. That other community, which may temporarily be smaller, is nonetheless the source of inspiration, cultural inspiration, for the development and enriching of the whole population. And New York City can become that, readily again; it just takes a little stun and a little leverage to make it happen. [applause]

**Speed:** So, Lyn, I want to thank you on behalf of everybody here for what you've done today. I think you've really moved people to think about themselves in a completely different way. They may be shocked by it, but I think they're probably going to accept your challenge to act in a human fashion. Thank you again for everybody here. [applause]