
II. What Is Dedication?

LAROCHE PAC FIRESIDE CHAT WITH MICHAEL STEGER

Resolving Upward

This is an edited transcript of LaRouche PAC's weekly call-in show, June 23, with host Dave Christie of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee from Seattle, and guest Michael G. Steger of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee from San Francisco. Video of the entire broadcast is available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jqHr0e9Ogoc>

Dave Christie: Good evening. This is Dave Christie with the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee. I'll be the moderator for tonight's Thursday Fireside Chat, June 23, 2016. We have the honor of being joined by Michael Steger, from the LaRouche PAC policy committee and former candidate for U.S. Congress, having the fun to run against Nancy Pelosi.

Anyway, this is an historic moment, and I think without further ado, I'll just turn things over to Michael, to see if he has some initial comments, and then we'll open it up for a question & answer period.

Michael Steger: Hi Dave. I don't think there's a lot I need to say in the introduction because I think we can get to most of it in the questions and answers. But there's definitely a confluence of circumstances taking place that indicates that we are at the potential point to create—on a global scale—a new economic system. The collapse of the trans-Atlantic region is at a disinte-

gration point. We see it in Europe, we see in the Presidential election in the United States, and the economic disparity. You also see it in the collapse of even major countries in South America.

At the same time, you see such a coordinated juncture of developments in Eurasia, and I think that probably is best highlighted not only in the Shanghai Cooperation Organization summit that's ongoing with most nations of Eurasia participating, but also in the upcoming summit between Putin and President Xi Jinping of China this coming weekend, at which the deep-space exploration capability that Russia and China are coordinating, along with other nations like India, is on the top of the list. And this really does indicate that there's a potential, if there's a creative orientation to create a new global economic system and avert the disaster of a nuclear war.

So I think in that context, we should just open it up for questions and have some fun.

Christie: And while we're waiting for people to get on, given the situation internationally around the war danger that Mr. LaRouche has been one of the first to highlight the nature of, and given what Lyn [Lyndon LaRouche] has pointed out in terms of the push by the British Empire towards war,— going back as far as 2011



U.S. Air Force/Senior Airman Kenny Holston

One of the fleet of U.S. Air Force stealth bomber aircraft returning to Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri from a bombing mission at the beginning of the war against Libya.



CC/Stephan Roehl

Dr. Frank-Walter Steinmeier, SPD party leader and German Foreign Minister.



kremlin.ru

Sigmar Gabriel, Minister of Economic Affairs and Energy.

with the death of Muammar Qaddafi, he knew that the war drive was resulting from what's developing here around the push toward the new paradigm as its developing.

Michael, do you have anything more to say about the nature of the war danger?



CC/Mueller

Wolfgang Ischinger at the 50th Munich Security Conference in Munich in 2014.

The Extraterrestrial Imperative

Steger: Yes, Helga had mentioned this last week, regarding the acknowledgment of the war danger in Europe, which was significant, and this was then followed by German Foreign Minister Steinmeier's call for a change in orientation towards Russia and the sanctions. You also have the vice chancellor of Germany Sigmar Gabriel meeting with Russian President Putin next week. And there's a couple of other people—Wolfgang Ischinger who runs the Munich Security Conference supported Steinmeier, and a German diplomat to Russia, Gernot Erler—who also have endorsed Steinmeier. So there's a real political institutional fight inside Germany and inside Europe regarding the questions of war and the war danger.

The same thing is being seen in the United States: You obviously have vocal people regarding the war danger, such as

Stephen Cohen. But we've even seen people like Gov. Jerry Brown, who's wrong on practically everything, but seems to be right on the dangers of nuclear war at this point.

And I would say that's even preceded by a recognition in the population. This is what underlies the revolt you see happening in the trans-Atlantic, by the population. They recognize that this system is collapsing, and its ultimate act will be nuclear war and annihilation. As the late space pioneer Krafft Ehrlicke said, unless we leave the confines of planet Earth,—given the level of industry, the level of development taking place in the 20th Century, the *only* way that mankind can find a perpetual state of collaboration and development is to leave the confines of Earth. He said: I find it an abysmal condition that mankind will be stuck on the planet with the potential to annihilate itself. And that the only way to overcome that challenge is really to go to

an extraterrestrial development program.

And that's why it's so significant that what Russia and China are embarking upon is not simply challeng-



Kremlin.ru

Russian President Vladimir Putin and Xi Jinping, President of the People's Republic of China reviewing an Honor Guard before they held talks in Beijing, June 25, 2016.

ing the war policies of the West, not simply taking up the questions of economic development, not simply developing the financial institutions like the New Development Bank and the AIIB which can replace this trans-Atlantic system, but they've actually indicated the philosophical and scientific conceptions of mankind that can secure a higher system.

And that's what I think is essential today, and this is what Mr. LaRouche has emphasized in discussions over the last couple of weeks, and especially this week, given what's developing so rapidly. So there's more to say, but perhaps there's some questions.

Question: Hello, this A— here in New York, with what may be a little bit of an update. In terms of what we're doing here in New York, specifically with the concert this Sunday that will be the beginning of a celebration of a longtime board member of the Schiller Institute, and teacher, and as I understand it—I never knew her—a genius musically: Sylvia Olden Lee.

I've been talking with people, and when you go through the strategic overview, of the threat of annihilation, and the necessary removal of Obama—all of these things—the population in my view has been really stymied and dismayed. So it becomes more clear to me each day that the flank of the beauty of music, and the ideas embedded in the works of these geniuses, become really essential for people to break their own mental bonds of slavery. So we're in a buildup now toward, to have within a year, a chorus of 1500 people, and I think this is the most significant event we're going to have so far, in terms of effect, and the depth and range of the program—the German language will be sung, Italian, the music of Handel, and Negro Spirituals. So this is a very broad program.

And I'm having fun because I'm trying to focus people on that idea of breaking through their own mental slavery, so that given things like Orlando, things like the requirement to remove Obama,— they can recognize within themselves what Lincoln called, “the better [a]ngels of our nature.” But they're so burdened,



Sylvia Olden Lee at a Feb. 18-21, 1994 Schiller Institute conference music panel.

EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

they're so bombarded that they are helpless and hopeless without doing this. And personally, from contacts that I've had before, I think, feel, and hope that this will be reflected in the attendance of people that I've talked to. Because I think I've moved them a little bit, oftentimes by using someone who has recently joined the chorus, who had first gone to the conference, attended a concert and now is a member of the chorus and having a great time doing it.

So I think the work is crucial, so that people can actually discuss everything that Dave and Mike are discussing, because I

don't think people can succeed without engaging in this process.

So I wanted to raise that, and then let you elaborate on it as you see fit.

The Trans-Atlantic in Collapse

Steger: I would only add probably one thing, since I think your report stands on its own: probably one of the grossest misunderstandings we have in our society today, is the failure to understand that the natural state of the human mind is genius. That's actually the natural orientation of the human mind. As Norbert Brainin, the great musician, once said of his quartet's collaboration, “we have to resolve upward,” and that the natural tendency of the mind, under optimistic circumstances, under the sense of mankind's potential for development, is to resolve upward, to resolve towards the characteristic of genius. And it really is the music work that we have concentrated on in New York, with the many choruses, with the sense of what we're inspiring within the population there, which calls us to resolve upwards, towards that quality of genius which is natural to the human species.

And it's been this artificial state of cynicism that's been imposed on people, that is really undermining what's possible today for the human species. And this is what we have to eradicate. The source of that is Obama. The key source of that cynicism, the key source of that frustration and rage, is Obama, and he has to be dismissed, flushed out of the political process. What we



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Violinist Norbert Brainin and pianist Günter Ludwig rehearsing for a concert dedicated to Lyndon LaRouche on Dec. 2, 1988 in Washington, D.C.

really have to do is inspire people towards something far greater than what they see is possible under the current system.

And by means of what we're doing in New York, what Kesha Rogers is doing in Houston with the space program, what we have in terms of a potential orientation towards the Pacific, this organization is really orienting the population, as best we can—we're not large; we're fairly small. But we're making clear demonstrations of what the potential of the United States is, as a nation. And that's absolutely essential, because we have to pull together a functioning government at this point. You've got to bring in a Presidency which can function. Clearly the collaborative potential with the rest of the world is increasing, and that's what we have to take advantage of.

But I think your report stands, as a significant demonstration of what we're doing.

Question: Hello, this is W—B— in Denver, and I've learned just a few hours ago that there's a plan to form a European Union army. I don't know if the LaRouche movement is aware of this yet, but this of course is very dangerous, and of course has made the war-mongers very postal [violently crazy].

But I was wondering, if there are any plans the LaRouche movement has in Western Europe

with regard to this outrageous scheme?

Steger: I think, as we see right now with the vote in Great Britain, that Western Europe is collapsing. There is an increasing pressure on the entire Atlantic Alliance, the NATO-European Union, Wall Street-London axis. This is bankrupt. Probably the best indication of this is the recent trip by Xi Jinping to Poland, even though Poland represents this kind of somewhat insane, Eastern European faction, which is getting used by this NATO program. I mean, they just placed 60,000 troops in this Baltic/Poland region, for NATO military exercises. They're beginning to bring missile defense system which are provoking us towards a greater threat

of nuclear war.

But there is no capability of holding this thing together. Mr. LaRouche said in July of 2007, and this is a quote, "There is no option of a non-collapse. This system is gone." And that was regarding what was then the subprime mortgage bubble at the time. But at this point, as he said last week, this is not just a collapse of a financial system, this the collapse of an entire system, of a *whole* system.

And you see it: You see it in the general cultural



from U.S. Army video/Staff Sgt. Ricardo Hernandez Arocho

U.S. soldiers conduct a continuous fire Live Fire Exercise near Tapa, Estonia, June 20, 2016.

breakdown; you see it in Germany, you see it with the migrant crisis; you see it with the general cowardice within the political leadership. You see it in the question of the sanctions against Russia. You see that these nations of Europe cannot exist outside the New Silk Road paradigm of Russia, China, and India. They *have* to participate; their livelihood, their participation in the human species' development depends upon their moving in this direction. And their populations are facing this kind of trans-Atlantic breakdown.

Einstein's Revolution

There was a poll that came out in the United States: 81% of the American population faced difficulty paying for housing in the last five years. That should be basic! But housing prices like in the San Francisco Bay Area where I am, are over 50% of most people's income! So it's not surprising you would have problems in rent at some times, or paying your mortgage.

So, given the level of breakdown in the United States and in Western Europe, these countries are not capable of doing this; these are pipedreams! This idea of a European army or a European resurgence, a major NATO deployment along the borders of Russia—they are tripwires; all they have is bluff. But the bluff is of nuclear war.

So the question then, is, in that context, how do we resolve it? If the trans-Atlantic region is breaking down, if it's done, if it's collapsing. There's no way it can't collapse. Look at this Presidential election: both candidates are despised by a majority of the population. You've got a breakdown in the United States. Think of the irony of what Obama calls "an economic recovery": increasing death rates, largely premised on the fact that people in their middle ages, forties and fifties—mostly white men, but predominantly white women leading the increased death rates. For the first time in decades, we have increasing rates of death. This coincides with a tripling of fatal overdoses of drugs, over just six years ago! That's within Obama's Administration, you have a tripling of people of drug overdoses in the United States. And then, just this year, you have nearly for every day of the year so far, we've had some level of mass murder.



Creative Commons

Albert Einstein playing the violin.

That expresses a psychological breakdown, a cultural breakdown, far beyond just finances, the stock bubble, unemployment, and wages. This is the kind of a breakdown of a culture itself. And Obama calls that "the greatest economic recovery ever"! That's Satanic; that's not just stupidity,— that's real evil! And that's what we've got to remove.

Now, what Lyn's been raising recently, and he emphasized it today with the Policy Committee and other associates, is, you can't "describe your way into a new system." We're not talking about changing a few parts of the current economic, or political, or cultural system. To establish a culture which has true viability, long-term into the future, is not changing a few parts. It's conceiving, in a more profound and insightful way, the Universe itself, and mankind's role in it; fundamentally different than what the current society perceives.

Now, the best demonstration of this in recent contemporary history is Albert Einstein's complete revolution of science. To a large degree, Einstein's work is misunderstood,— predominantly by scientists. They don't grasp the true nature of what Einstein established. And this is clear because even during the course of Einstein's lifetime, his basic conceptions of the Universe were totally disregarded by the entire scientific establishment. He was attacked. He was personally attacked

and isolated. And yet, what he demonstrated is still being verified today,— we’ve seen this recent demonstration of gravitational waves.

Einstein had an insight into the Universe that was fundamentally different. Where did that come from? Did Einstein come up with a mathematical equation which demonstrated what the new Universe would be like? No! That wasn’t the way Einstein thought! Einstein approached his work absolutely differently. He approached it from the standpoint of how must the Universe function? The Universe must function in a more beautiful and rational way than I am currently understanding it. Because he recognized there were certain paradoxes,— that the current framework of culture did not grasp the Universe in a sufficient way to resolve the paradoxes, to resolve the contradictions. Because is it true that mankind can’t advance? No! It’s not true,— mankind can perpetually advance. So what’s the conception of the Universe we have to go to? And Einstein developed this. And what he admits, self-consciously, is that his greatest influence at times of greatest difficulty and challenge, would be the conceptions of Mozart—the conceptions of composition that you find in Mozart’s work. That that governed him!

Now, how does that work? It’s much like what A— was demonstrating with the Manhattan Project and what we’re doing there with the choruses and the concert this Sunday. People in the New York area, we’re having a [concert this Sunday](#) on the Upper West Side that you should definitely attend. Not because it’s a form of “entertainment.” But it provides a demonstration, of a conception of a Universe which must govern a new economic system.

The Mission at Hand

And that’s where the emphasis has to be. Because this other stuff is bluff and bluster. But that’s not necessarily,— just because it’s bluff and bluster doesn’t mean we’re saved. We’re only saved if we have the courage and the creative insight to create and act upon a new and higher system. And that can only *ever* be created by the human mind. And that’s really the political responsibility, that’s the political fight today.

And don’t count on members of Congress. They can barely get off the ground, literally. There’s got to be a higher fight from a certain minority of the population who recognize that we’re going to go to a higher system, and the most important factor is that you have people like Vladimir Putin who recognize what’s taking place.

Putin, more than any other leadership on the planet today, recognizes that the enemy is not Western Europe, it’s not the United States; it *is* the British Empire. It is a system of thought, a system of culture.

Now, how do we know that? Look at Putin’s intervention into Syria. Look at over the course of the last nine months, the dramatic, fundamental changes on the planet that have been made by that intervention. And what was probably most indicative, was the concert in Palmyra. People just couldn’t even comprehend it. They had helicopter escorts of Western media into this ancient, ancient amphitheater, and they held a Classical concert, and gave them a chance to see what they’d been fighting for,— a sense of real civilization. And the Western media couldn’t comprehend it; they couldn’t fathom what was taking place. And yet, that concert continues to resonate. The Prime Minister of Italy Renzi couldn’t but help to make mention of it at the St. Petersburg economic forum.

It resonates with people, because it captures a sense of what we’re actually out to accomplish as a human species, that there’s a *different* conception. And that’s why what Putin is doing is essential. And to the extent we operate in collaboration with that kind of creative genius, we can pull off the biggest revolution in human history. But if we don’t operate this way, it’ll be *our fault*. We will have failed to take the responsibility we should have.

And that should be the tension that we all have in our guts today; not just to identify the problem, but do we have the courage to go towards the solution, the optimism, the willingness to fight for something that’s never been created before. And I think that’s really the mission at hand.

Question: Thank’s for the update. Mike, I don’t want to go too far off-track. I had an organizing question for you, though, and just answer it how you feel it’s fit. I keep going back to organizing around the solution: Everything I talk about, I have to remind myself not to nerd out on it, but to go towards the solution, not to get stuck in all these details, but keep it around joining the BRICS, going to the Moon, getting cold fusion, that’ll solve our water problems, it’ll solve a lot of job problems. And I’ve seen good results with it here and there, but I’m not sure how I can expand further on it. But areas I’ve seen good results with it on, are people who intend well, but maybe haven’t had the rigor of actually doing all this—libertarians, people who are into crypto-



Margaret Greenspan

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

currency, network computer engineers who feel that human creativity can be synthesized and therefore all the jobs can be automated and that's going to be a big problem, and we're going to be out of jobs—but keep pushing that humanity has to expand its consciousness and its creativity and get out of this planet, and therefore we will always have jobs. I've found a lot better results with that, than just spitting out facts, facts, facts, facts, facts.

And I love listening to Jeff, I absolutely love it. I love listening to all this stuff, but sometimes, for me, I feel that it distracts me from the solution. In my mind, sometimes it's not directly tied to the solution.

So I don't know how you can maybe help make that more clear for me. Or help us organize better around that. Or if you have a different idea. Thanks.

'How,' not 'What' You Think

Steger: I think I understand the question, of some of the facts versus a sense of the solution, but I think you answered the question. And I think you captured what's essential. I mean, there's nothing you're "supposed" to talk about. There is no formula you're supposed to abide by that's the right thing to do.

What you have to do is have—you know, Lyn has this funny reference to this German movie, "Das Spukschloss im Spessart." [The Haunted Castle in the Spessart], which is about a bunch of ghosts who come back to do their penance because they were criminals in the past. But it was done at the time when Germany was coming to terms with what the Nazi era was, and it's a comedy. And it's very light; it's meant to reawaken peo-

ple's sense that they don't have to live in the crimes of the past. That you have to live in the potential of the future. And there's a song that Lyn often references, whose refrain is "*Die Hauptsache ist der Effekt, tschike tschike tschike tschik*" [The most important thing is the effect]. And its essence is that the main point is the effect that you have. What are you creating in the other person's mind? *That's* what you fight for. If you follow some rule, of saying, I've got to make sure they know these certain facts,—the facts may be necessary. Hopefully the facts are based on reality versus what the media's been pushing out. Sometimes truthful information is useful to at least confront people with what's happening.

But you have to be willing to engage towards a higher direction. You have to get the mind moving. You have to move them in a direction which is consistent with where the world needs to go, and you find a dialogue from that standpoint. You find a musical dialogue in that direction. And that just has to be the ongoing commitment, and that's the difficulty. It's much easier sometimes to have a formula, talk about a few facts and information or war danger, and expect that if people don't respond, they're just cowards and it's their fault, versus the idea that you can find a way of engaging people to uplift them.

And look at Lyn's approach towards the Manhattan Project: We've launched these series of choruses; we've got one in Queens, one in Brooklyn, one in Manhattan, one in New Jersey, possibly one in the Bronx. You've got a real developing of a quality of awakening the higher identity within the population. Now, what's the direct political effect of it? Well, it's creating the poten-

That's what Einstein looked to act upon; that's what Mozart looked to act upon. Not *what* you think about the Universe; *how* you think about the Universe: To see the potential of the human mind, to see the potential of human creative insight. Because when people have that sense of capacity, then you have the ability to bring down this empire, and replace it with a true, human system.

tial of people to respond to the future! And that's the essential question. That's what we've got to accomplish.

And I think that's got to be the fight today. We do it with *urgency*, because look, we have to take this question seriously: The British Empire *is* the most evil, Satanic force on the planet. It's best expressed by the actions of Obama today. This guy has been a mass-murderer. I went through some of the facts—people know the drone references. I think up to 5,000 innocent civilians were killed by him over the last seven years. But this British Empire is Satanic.

There is a clear intent of eliminating up to 5-6 billion people from the planet. They can reduce the population by that magnitude down to approximately 1 billion people, for “governance”—to govern the population, to cull the herd. Now, this is a Satanic force. It's a historically Satanic force.

Now they are under siege. Their system is collapsing and breaking down, and not only is it collapsing and breaking down,—that was inevitable. But they have not secured the ability to bring down the entire human species. What Russia and China have done, in collaboration,—with Putin's leadership, with the developments in China now under Xi Jinping, have been remarkable. But we've got to end this tyranny. You've got to put them under siege. You have to bring down this empire. There has to be a sense of urgency. You give them a minute to breathe, and they will look to wreak havoc wherever they can.

Just look at South America: South America is now potentially on the verge of total devastation, where just a year ago, it looked like it was on the rise. Bolivia, nations that were landlocked, were looking at nuclear power, space exploration, continental rail lines. And now they're looking at a total genocide program in South America. This is the work of the British Empire, this British system. Questions of assassinations of world leaders.

Now, that's not a question of gloom and doom. It's a

question of *urgency* because their system is breaking down. So we've got to bring it down, finish it. You've got the whole connection between the British, the Saudis and Obama on 9/11: *Bring them down*.

Look what the Congress just did on gun rights! They didn't follow formality, they didn't follow procedures. They basically went and shut down the entire House of Congress! Why don't they do that on the truth of 9/11? Where is the guts to take that level of responsibility?

Become More Optimistic

So we've got to bring down this British Empire, and there's got to be an urgency to do that. But then, the way the urgency expresses itself is not simply in the descriptions of what must be done, but in the method that demonstrates *how* it can be done. That we actually act upon *how* people think, not what they think. And that really is the question of genius. That's what Einstein looked to act upon; that's what Mozart looked to act upon. Not *what* you think about the Universe; *how* you think about the Universe: To see the potential of the human mind, to see the potential of human creative insight. Because when people have that sense of capacity, then you have the ability to bring down this empire, and replace it with a true, human system. And I think that's got to be the sense.

But the *urgency* and the sense of victory at this point, has to be real in people. We've got to bring this system down, and it's more possible today than it's ever been. And I think that's got to be the driving conception.

Question: Good evening Michael and Dave, this is V— in Los Angeles. Just a simple question about the way that the British Empire functions behind the curtain so to speak: I've noticed that there are a lot of very powerful, old money foundation figures like Kissinger and George Soros and these types, who are actually still quite active, they actually travel quite a lot and go to other nations and try to maybe sabotage relationships with the BRICS and things of that sort. So my simple

question is, as an organization that's this small, and our forces spread thin, what kind of flanks can we use against a system which on its surface seems unbeatable?

Steger: Well, I would probably not agree with your premise; I don't know if you agree with your premise in a sense. I mean, the system is beatable: It's coming down. Shultz, Kissinger, and Soros are pathetically kind of hanging-on by a thread to the dying system that they've lived their lives enforcing, to some degree. But it's collapsing.

The rise of China and Russia, the development of an orientation, just the magnitude of development that we've seen now in China, but now intended for the entire area of South and Southeast Asia,— you've taken 600 million people out of poverty in China in 25 years, and you're now intending to not only replicate that within South and Southeast Asia, so that you're bringing upwards of 1.5 billion people out of poverty over the course of a 40-60 year period. You're also orienting and increasing that capacity, with a clear focus on deep-space exploration.

And this is something that—it's irrefutable that there are significant economic benefits and advancements to space exploration. That's never been denied. No one can ever make that case. They can say these are a waste of resources, which is ignorant; they're just ignorant; they don't really know. There's no competent case to make to demonstrate that space exploration has ever cost anything; it had a massive return on investment.

So why don't we do it? Well, that's exactly why you see this orientation in China, Russia, India, and the other countries involved. That is why Japan can't ignore what's taking place. Because there's something different: The system mankind must adopt, is a different conception of mankind in the Universe. And that isn't necessarily entirely clear, but the clear benefits of this orientation *are*, and unless you're dominated by a culture of cynicism, of despair, or corruption, you naturally orient in this way. The natural orientation of the



The modern city of Shanghai, China.

mind is genius.

And that's what we've got to create now within the trans-Atlantic region. You have to create that, just as Einstein did; Einstein fought the same degeneration. He saw it firsthand throughout the course of his adult life, the kind of attacks and degeneration. But Einstein never thought it was unbeatable. He recognized clearly this thing is beatable, for the very reason that it's irrational! It's based on a lower conception of the Universe. There is a guaranteed capability to beat it, if you adopt a higher conception of the Universe,— if you adopt the conception of the Universe of Einstein, then there's no way mankind can lose.

And that's what someone like Putin has a sense of. He has a sense that it's guaranteed we can win,— as long as we can prevent them from blowing up the world, there's no way their system can continue. And that's the kind of idea that the American population urgency has to gain, is that it's winnable. But you have to go out and destroy that which is the source of evil. You can't simply appreciate the fact that good things are happening. We have to make a moral shift towards what mankind can accomplish. And I think it's just a question of the optimism; the optimism on a daily basis. People ask, "well, what can I do?"

They can become more optimistic, become more creative, become more beautiful; and then you'll find the ways by which to inspire other people, to challenge the way other people think. Take a step back from the crisis and look at the potential: How do we move the

United States upward? It's not simply by knowing the problem of the last 50 years or 70 years. You have to have a higher conception outside of that. And I think that's really the challenge, and I think people on this call may have that, but do you live up to it every day? And do you challenge other people with that conception? Because simply challenging the facts or information, will oftentimes not resolve the problem. And Einstein knew that. Einstein knew you can't simply challenge people on the facts.

The Creative Challenge

There's a famous story of Einstein, when he was asked to give a presentation on his discovery for an award,— but he just broke out his violin and played a Mozart violin sonata. Because he recognized, it's not a question of me describing to you, the Universe as now I see it; but how do I provoke a quality of thinking? And this is what Putin's engaged in; this is the Palmyra concert. But he won't repeat Palmyra; he's not going to do the same thing he's done already.

And neither can we. We constantly look for the new potentials that are taking place. Now, this Brexit vote, this vote in Europe, the collapse of the European system—regardless of which way the Brexit vote goes, this European system is collapsing, the basis of NATO is collapsing; the basis for the so-called Presidential election is collapsing. Have the media agreed to its collapse? No! But I don't expect the media to do that; but from a physical standpoint this thing's done.

The question is, what are we going to replace it with? And that's I think the scientific question we have to take up, to make sure we win.

Question: Hello, my name is N— and I'm calling from Nevada. I've only been involved with the LaRouche movement for one year, and a lot of the things that I do—I read the *Executive Intelligence Review* archives to get myself up to the same page as all of you; and I've been reading a lot about the International Monetary Fund. You wrote many articles in the 1970s and 1980s, about how they go into countries, they impose structural adjustment programs, and they leave the countries in worse shape financially. People are left with less to eat, people are starving. It just seems like they're just ruining countries.

And so, I heard that this year China was accepted into the IMF and that their currency will be part of that basket of currencies from some time in September of

2016. And my question is, when I read all of these articles in the *EIR* on the IMF, it seems like such a terrible organization with what it's doing to countries, Ibero-America, and heading our way to the U.S.A. They've got this plan, they just write up all of these numbers that aren't even correct and so forth, and loan people money.

So my question is, how come China seems to be doing the AIIB and the BRICS and they want to set up something positive, yet they want to be part of the IMF? And my second question is, when are we due for our IMF loan, when people bail out of the U.S. dollar and then we're broke—is the IMF going to come into the United States? Are we just next, the country that's going to be given austerity and so forth? Does that make any sense?

That's my question.

Steger: I think it's important to know some of the history of the fight. Probably the most important aspect is that Mr. LaRouche and our organization had pinpointed the IMF as an evil institution a long time ago. But it's fairly irrelevant now; there's no relevance to it. There's no relevance to any of these institutions—they're bankrupt, they have no significance; they have no significance in Europe.

Unfortunately, South America is facing a certain political upheaval at this point, but it can be easily turned around. I mean, the genocide practices that are now being pushed in South America could be reversed very quickly; the policies in the United States could change dramatically. One of the things Einstein recognized,— and Einstein is relevant, because this practice you're referencing from the IMF, this didn't start in the 1970s, or the 1950s or 1960s. This is a British Imperial policy that was adopted with clear intent by the late 19th Century, and formulated. And there have been direct studies, case studies on Egypt in the late 19th Century. This is partly how the Monroe Doctrine of the United States was applied to defend the nations of South America in the late 19th and early 20th Century—same practices, same colonial debt slavery that you see from the IMF.

So this is the same thing that Einstein recognized, and it's a question of how do you think about transforming the entire system. And you don't change an entire system part by part. That's why China's not worried about the IMF; you don't have to worry about these things. What you have to focus on, is what's necessary to create an entirely new system.

And this is a creative challenge. People think politics and economics are mostly facts and information,

You can't define the mathematical formula of that system, before you've developed the cultural conception of that system. It has to become an idea that resonates within a population ... to bring it to bear in the minds of your population, that we're going to move upward. We're going to develop a society again. We're going to take the children born today, and over the next 25 years, we're going to develop within them a sense of creative genius, a sense of optimism, a sense of taking on the great challenges.

and do you know your facts and information?—they're not! We're talking about the actual evolutionary nature of the human species. We're not talking politics and economics as separate branches of study. These are relevant to the extent they're relevant to the human species' evolutionary development. And that evolutionary development does not take place on a step-wise basis. It's not one small step after another. Evolutionary leaps in mankind are leaps, to a higher ordering system. Einstein recognized that same characteristic, because that's how the Universe itself functions. And by intrinsic nature, if the Universe functions that way, and the mind can come to know it, then the human mind functions in a similar way.

Krafft Ehricke's Principle

This was the basis of the Italian Renaissance in the 15th Century. This was the basis of the ancient Greek Renaissance that we see with Socrates and Plato later. They captured a way of thinking. This is how mankind has made fundamental advancements in its sense of society, in its sense of humanity, and its sense of its role in the Universe. And that's the kind of quality that we now have to capture today, if we're going to create an entirely new orientation for the human species. And so, it's good. You have to know the landscape, you have to know the domain you're dealing with. You need to know this British system. But to the extent you know it, that won't be sufficient. You have to know it, because you're out to defeat it. Know your enemy, I guess, in a sense.

But we're out to create an entirely new system, independent of this enemy function, this evil practice. There are no limitations. Krafft Ehricke has a famous quote that Kesha often references, that the only limitations mankind has, are the ones that mankind places on himself. So we have no intrinsic limitations for overall growth and development. That's a different conception of the Universe than we're living in today. And we have to bring *that* kind of Universe to bear as a discovery within society!

You can't define the mathematical formula of that system, before you've developed the cultural conception of that system. It has to become an idea that resonates within a population before you can say "this is what it is, this is how we're going to measure it, this is how it's going to function." You have to bring it to bear in the minds of your population, that we're going to move upward. We're going to develop a society again. We're going to take the children born today, and over the next 25 years, we're going to develop within them a sense of creative genius, a sense of optimism, a sense of taking on the great challenges.

And that kind of commitment—and you don't have to know how we're going to do that, but you have a devotion to making the discovery and to share the discovery as it develops. And that quality of culture, that's a functioning nation, that's a functioning society. *That's* what the British Empire has been out to destroy. What the IMF system, the British system has been out to destroy is that quality of culture. They haven't just wanted to put nations into debt slavery; they wanted nations into debt slavery so they could kill the culture, so that people would not have access to this quality of development, to this quality of creative insight.

And that's what we have to generate today. So I hope that answers your question.

What is Victory?

Christie: Okay, obviously, the nature of the discussion thus far has been getting to that very idea, which is going to consistently refer to around Einstein, but clearly we're in uncharted waters, and therefore, there's no blueprint for how we proceed from here. We have a principled notion of where we've got to go. So I'm saying this is important, because people probably do have questions that they're thinking of. And I think whatever topic people have, they should just feel free to ask Mike and get a sense of clarity on the situation, or get a sense of how you might be thinking about things.

Question: Hi, it's B— in Los Angeles. I have a question on the power of the human being to be just this powerful entity of God, or the question of immortality itself. I think the question of death, which I think is the reason why people have become so susceptible to this reign of terror or whatever you want to say—it's evil—I think it's because people haven't realized the capability that we have in ourselves to be immortal, or at least to identify what that power to be a human being is.

So I think I just want to make a statement and say that, if you don't have a sense of it, I believe that people do become susceptible to becoming whatever realm of degeneracy that people may be engaged in, and I think the only way out is to learn something about oneself and this creative realm of—people reference music and poetry. But I think that people who do not engage in that obviously have not conquered the power to know what immortality is, what that sense of becoming that humanity in oneself is.

Steger: Well, take the way that—this is one way it manifests itself. You've got people in society today, who are pushed up against a wall. People are being crushed by this—it's been 15 years since the 9/11 attacks, and there's been an ongoing destruction of the country. For the first part of the G.W. Bush administration there was a housing bubble; some people had thought they had made it rich, there was a sense of maybe financial affluence. But once that blew out, you had a gross consolidation of wealth into a small percentage, and most people have been devastated ever since. There have been some pockets of increase, but in general, it's been devastated. And the terror, the horror of the ongoing perpetual war state, the constant sense of financial crisis, the constant sense of a breakdown of basic infrastructure, a breakdown of education and culture for young people, have put most people,— whether they're the young people in college today, who really have no sense at all of this, like a 19 year old who was 4 years old when 9/11 happened and grew up during this entire 15-year period, or it's the parent of that child, or the grandparent who watches both their child and grandchild suffer from consequences of either drug addiction, or cultural disorientation; so there's a real physical breakdown.

So people end up in a state of mind of desperation. And that desperation leads one to want a fundamental change, either to end it,— fine, and you hear certain people who get cynical and you hear the expression,— they don't mean it, but they say,— maybe we should

just blow it up and start over. They end up toward the cynical state of mind. Because they're just so frustrated, they don't see a way out.

And when you talk to them, they also then imagine, “OK, fine, you're saying we can solve it. OK I want to solve it, I don't want to see it go to nuclear war, I don't want to see it get any worse. We've got to do something. We've got to make it better.” But in their mind, they think of better as,— there's going to be a break point and it's going to “be better.” And then they can keep thinking the way they've been thinking. They can keep living the way they've been living.

Well, it doesn't function that way. Because our way of thinking, our way of dealing with society on a day-to-day basis, even if it's just to endure, is not sufficient, it's not compatible with a functioning society and a functioning nation. So people want a dramatic shift, where you take away all the horror and the pain; and it's not uncommon. It's similar to people in warfare. We often talk about the post-traumatic stress disorder. People come back in a state of high anxiety and shock, and rage, because of how unjust the current system, how evil the current system is, and then the actual problems, the kind of crises that they encounter. And so you just want to “make it stop.”

Now, it's not surprising that the compositions of Mozart, or of Bach, or of Beethoven, are clinically beneficial for, say, those soldiers coming back from war, as they are for a population in the state of crisis that you find the United States today. Because what you find in those compositions is a method of thinking, a conception of identity which gives one a source of strength, to actually live from day to day with a sense of optimism and of growth, a sense that “my life is going to be dedicated towards developing something.” Much like a parent, if a society is at least functioning, because a parent can't raise a child, or parents can't raise a child on their own. It's the society which raises them. It's the teachers, it's the culture, it's the entertainment, it's the historical process that they're a part of. But when you have that sense, then you make those sacrifices to develop that child—it's not easy raising a child or raising a family. But you take on the endeavor, the effort, with the sense that by the time that child is 20 or 25, you now have a person in society capable of making remarkable contributions. And you take joy and pride in the fact that the society has moved upward because of your efforts. Not because your efforts were one big relief. Your efforts were still significant work, but they capture that

Winning means an opportunity to make sacrifices that now mean something, that have an immortality to them; that the contributions that we make now have an opportunity to become immortal. That my society is not reduced into need of something mortal or beast-like; but I'm going to fight for a society that appreciates the immortal contributions that the individual can make. And that's winning.

quality of tension and optimism that you get in great culture, in great composition.

And so it has to take a different quality of hypothesis. And unfortunately the emotions are so *brutish* in people today, our cultural approach towards emotions is so brutish,— because the sense of emotions is the core of an ability to make hypotheses to deal with society, to move forward. And the insights that Mozart and Beethoven have, I would say, came because they were approaching this question from the highest scientific standpoint one could—because it's not going to be that there's one great change: Glass-Steagall comes, and then wars stop, the angels sing, and now we're moving upward and everything's fine.

It's a different sense of moving a society upward, that the sacrifices people are going to make are now going to be worth something, versus the sacrifices you make today seem to make things only worse and worse. I don't think this is comprehensive by any means, but at least what I'm attempting to get at is a kind of change of identity, of how we think about what winning means. Winning means an opportunity to make sacrifices that now mean something, that have an immortality to them; that the contributions that we make now have an opportunity to become immortal. That my society is not reduced into need of something mortal or beast-like; but I'm going to fight for a society that appreciates the immortal contributions that the individual can make. And that's winning.

And that exists, that quality of “win-win” now exists on the planet, and the question is now to make that *the* dominant human culture, and to eradicate this warlike, geopolitical beast structure that the British have been imposing for far too long. It's to bring down this beast program, to bring down Obama. That's the political act to make this happen.

But this idea of what winning looks like: it's not a one final stroke, and then it's over. There's almost like a consumer mentality to that conception of winning. There's a dark age conception of winning. We need a

Renaissance conception of winning, *how* we think about winning. And to the extent we actually struggle and deal with that idea, and play with it, and organize around it, then we create the foundations for a new society, a new nation.

LaRouche's 2011 Warning

Question: Hello, this is H— in New York. We have been using the shut down NATO petition, and I've gotten a report that this is also being used in Europe, in France, in Germany, and it might be useful. But we're also going to have this Warsaw summit taking place in Warsaw on July 8-9. So this is dangerous, this is time sensitive.

But the other thing I was thinking about, is we have these weapons systems that don't even work, like the famous trillion-dollar F-35 airplane—just a total waste—and how to get these people who are working on things like that to do something useful is a pretty big challenge, because we're reaching the limit. How many weapons systems can you have that cost a trillion dollars each? So that's my comment.

Steger: What's probably most interesting is that there's an increasing acknowledgment, as Dave mentioned. Dave and I were at a conference in Chinatown, San Francisco in November of 2011, when Lyndon LaRouche made a very clear forecast, that with the assassination and overthrow of Muammar Qaddafi in Libya, that there was no time. The British and Obama had no time to deal with a trial, like a Saddam Hussein trial for Qaddafi, so they basically assassinated him in the sewer, so they could move as quickly as possible, *because* of the timeframe, that they *had* to provoke a world war type scenario, or, they had to provoke a submission. They had to provoke Russia and China into an instability and submission under a British Imperial policy, and their next move was going to be Syria, because they had already set up the destabilization factors in Syria the year prior, so this was already happening. And then, the gun capacity, the military capacity, arms,



CC/Mikhail Evstafiev

A Russian Mi-8 helicopter shot down by Chechen rebels near the Chechen capital, Grozny, during the first Chechen War.

the terrorists, could move in and flood Syria for a major disruption.

And he said, “Look this is a drive towards nuclear war with Russia and China,” and he made a very clear and stark warning. Lyn’s been in indirect collaboration with Vladimir Putin on this idea since 1998-99, when Putin came into power and he immediately dealt with the Second Chechen War. And the First Chechen War was blown by Russia. Russia was in a complete collapse, it was shock therapy, and it was getting destroyed throughout the 1990s. And when Putin came in, he took a decisive action on the Chechen war, but he recognized, as Lyn had,— and Lyn had made very clear warnings to this network in Russia,— remember, the first place Lyn went when he came out of prison, was Russia. Putin had this orientation. And partly because of what Lyn had done with the SDI under Reagan, the SDI developments,— imagine, the SDI development was the same potential then for a fundamental change towards a global economic system as we see today; although Lyn has already made what’s now possible, possible in the 1980s.

But because of British direction of the Soviet leadership, they rejected Reagan’s offer of the SDI,

and plunged the world into a severe breakdown crisis by the late 1980s.

And so Lyn, immediately coming out of prison goes to Russia. By the late 1990s, he’s in a dialogue with the Russian leadership around the strategic dangers of a war program, that the British are going for world war, on the premise of financial breakdown, that the bankruptcy of the West is imminent. And we’ve seen it: We’ve seen a series of breakdowns, the 1997 Asian crisis; the 1998 Russian bond crisis which almost blew out the entire Wall Street-London financial system, the so-called LTCM crisis. And you saw this breakdown ongoing throughout this last 15 years.

The Courage to Go for Victory

So Lyn recognized this danger. Obviously, we saw the same terrorist attack on 9/11, but Putin recognized it. And Russia and China today are aware of the British Imperial process. They know the enemy; Putin knows the enemy. The enemy is not the United States, the enemy is not Europe, it is the British system of outlook! It is the geopolitical system, which is archaic; it’s not capable of coping with the modern developments of mankind toward space exploration. There is a statement by the head of the European Space Agency, that the day Crimea was invaded, there was a Russian, an American and a German on the International Space Station.



EIRNS/Rachel Douglas

Lyndon LaRouche addressing the memorial symposium for Pobisk Kuznetsov in Moscow, December, 2001.



youtube/Bananenrepublik1

Gen. (ret.) Harald Kujat, former chief of staff of the German Armed Forces, and former chairman of the NATO Military Committee.



U.S. Army/Visual Information Specialist Jason Johnston
Czech Republic Army Gen. Petr Pavel, chairman of the NATO Military Committee.

did in the St. Petersburg International Economic Forum just last week—that there was a U.S. backed coup in Ukraine, so what did you expect us to do? We could have worked with a pro-Europe government in Ukraine, but the United States and NATO had to push for a Nazi coup. Putin recognizes the enemy.

And you now have Germany recognizing that they have to choose which direction they are going: Are they going with this British Imperial program, the same imperial pro-

gram that governed the Hitler operation, or are they going to go with a new outlook?

And so, the whole NATO structure's got to go. The whole NATO system, it's just got to go—the European Union, it's got to go. You've got to go back to a sense of collaboration among nations towards the overall development of mankind. The informal motto of NATO has been, "to keep the Germans down, Russians out, and the Americans in." And that's been the orientation.

And it's a conception of mankind in the Universe. So we've got to be clear on what the enemy is. The enemy is not Donald Trump, the enemy is not Hillary Clinton. They're both problems; neither of them are the solution, by any means! But the solution is to *end* this

Now, the gestures by Germany—Germany's schizophrenic at this point: It's deploying soldiers on the border of Russia, at the same time that you have an increasing grouping, the former chairman of the NATO Military Committee, Gen. Harald Kujat (ret.), and former chief of staff of the German Armed Forces, who also endorsed Steinmeier's comments that the NATO military exercises on Russia's borders are uncalled for. You had Czech Gen. Petr Pavel, who now chairs the NATO Military Committee. He came out saying there's no risk of Russia invading; there's no risk. The Bulgarian Prime Minister said there's no risk of Russia invading anyone, there's no aggressive actions. What they did in Crimea was a referendum, because the United States backed a Nazi coup; and Putin has the ability to just say this publicly—as he



CC/Aymayna Hyikary

Anti-government protesters in Kiev, Ukraine, attacking police troops on Feb. 18, 2014.

British system and to replace it with a system of a functioning human species on the planet. And that's what's possible today.

The alternative is a scorched-earth policy, it's what you see in South America. It's what you see in the United States, just an increasing level of destruction of the population, which ultimately will be through nuclear annihilation.

But what we see now is that it is possible to end this system. And Lyn was very clear, he was very specific on this question, so there's a reason why I make this emphasis: That we can be governed by the fear of nuclear war, but at some point you have to be willing to have the courage to go for victory, and not simply fight a war out of fear of losing, but fight to actually win, which takes a certain sacrifice, it takes a certain commitment. And it takes a different conception, because there's a responsibility in winning, to keep winning, to keep moving upward. And that's the responsibility we've got to take today.

Christie: Yes, you were discussing the NATO question, the mantra, of "keep Germany down; Russia out; the United States in," of course that's really what the issue is, really at the heart of this whole question around the European Union. Will it be the superstate, united with NATO as part of the British Empire? And to just make it clear, that statement came from Lord Ismay, who was the first NATO Secretary General. And Ismay was the top aide to Winston Churchill. Churchill was the one who set up the whole "Iron Curtain" program. . . .

Ehricke's Conception of the Space Program

Question: Yeah, this is the anonymous R—. This is a comprehensive and really good briefing, Mike. And I'm reminded by what you just reiterated of the old canard, that the Chinese character for "crisis" is also the character for "opportunity." And I know you must be familiar with that.

The reason I'm reminded of that is because, with all this thing going on, I've had occasion to read up on Krafft Ehricke; and I found a two-volume set by him on space flight from 1960. While I was going through that, I'm learning an awful lot about just how scientifically astute this gentleman really was. I thought he was



General Dynamics Astronautics

One of 20 components of a space station, Outpost, proposed here by Krafft Ehricke in 1958.

maybe a lightweight philosopher that had caught Helga's fancy or something like that. But he's truly a magnificent thinker.

And one of the things I learned is that the space program owes its origination in some degree to an oversight clause in the Versailles Treaty from 1919, where the Allies failed to restrict the German army from the development of rocketry weapons. And so there's all sorts of creative thinking that's plunged forward to make the space program reality, in a certain sense. This great, magnificent enterprise of humankind comes out of this pathetic crisis of World War I and the even more pathetic Treaty of Versailles.

So crisis can be an opportunity; and this crisis, too, could be an opportunity. And in that sense I'd like to ask you a little bit more about Krafft Ehricke's concept of mankind in space. I don't know if you need to do it in this call, but maybe somebody could write a little note on it somewhere: Krafft Ehricke versus the conception we're getting from Jeff Bezos and Elon Musk for recycling rockets and catching them on barges and making sure they land perfectly. And I think the latest story that came out was the Cape Canaveral docks were going to charge Elon Musk an extra \$500 a ton to bring the reusable rockets back!

But could you talk about that, or think about that?

And another question I had is, did Ehricke ever have a correspondence with Einstein, or did Einstein ever acknowledge Ehricke in such a way that the two

... For Krafft Ehricke this was a leading conception: That the technology is not the question. Whether technology is good or bad, is irrelevant. The advancements in technology are critical; but the key is in the culture by which we use them; it's the cultural identification of mankind and the human species.

of those geniuses could help catalyze interest in Ehricke's vision of man's role in outer space? Because I say endorsing Ehricke would be a great thing. So that's all I've got.

Steger: What stands out with Krafft Ehricke, and some of the specific questions,— I don't know,— but I think beyond the specific question which sometimes can get an validation or an indication of things, there's something broader we can know, but often even with the right facts, people still overlook it. With Krafft Ehricke what stands out is that you had a quality of creative passion and of creative identity coming out of the early 20th Century, which you see with someone like Einstein. One of the mentors for Krafft Ehricke, Hermann Oberth was a leading figure in the space exploration program. Obviously Krafft Ehricke's outlook on space exploration was of a scientific conception of the human species which is unparalleled in science today.

And you see it similarly with people like Wilhelm Furtwängler. You take Einstein and Ehricke and you see a quality of how the creative process of the human mind is itself what shapes the political and economic endeavors of the species. And it's been someone like Krafft Ehricke, with the ability to endure the Nazi occupation that he had, which destroyed his country to a large extent, to where to continue his research and work he comes to the United States. But even here in the United States, it was clear to see the quality of destruction, as Dave just referenced, in the Churchill/Truman Iron Curtain program, which was an FBI-dominated police-state in the United States. The FBI was operating practically like the SS of the Nazis. This is an internal police state which operates from a code of conduct which is evil. And it became a dominant political force in the United States responsible for the assassinations of Kennedy, of King, the targetting of LaRouche and our organization. And when Krafft Ehricke came here, he recognized that there's a certain commitment towards space exploration, but there's not a culture which is embracing it. And even before the Apollo project was fulfilled, even before we put a man on the Moon, the pro-

gram was already getting cut. And the investments are shrinking quickly.

And five years after the landing of the Moon, he gives a presentation down at El Segundo in the aerospace sector near the airport in Los Angeles. He recognizes that there's a gross misunderstanding by many people, even people who are participating in the space program, as to what this actually is: This is a necessary course of action. It is necessary. Just as Furtwängler saw Beethoven's symphonies as necessary for mankind's advancement. To Furtwängler the music was acting upon the future of human society. He conducted the piece towards the future of human society, not towards the notes.

It's the same with Krafft Ehricke's conception of the space program, as it was Einstein's conception of what scientific thought was. Scientific thought is not a discovery of something: It's the provocation of discovery in others. The discovery one makes of any significance is a discovery of the Universe which then provokes in the minds of other scientists, further discoveries. What Einstein was attacked by was a cult, a cult set up by Bertrand Russell, but a cult of mathematics which said that discoveries can no longer be made. And that's the same culture which came to dominate the space program environment.

That's What We Must Fight For

And so Krafft Ehricke took on the problem of the environmentalists. So he took on Nazis, then he took on the fascists in the FBI, who basically began to dismantle the space program after they killed Kennedy and then killed his brother Bobby, and then, he took on the environmentalist movement, which was really just one more aspect of the same kind of breakdown of this trans-Atlantic British system. And he recognized that question, and what he loved about his work with Helga and Lyn was that they recognized it, and for Krafft Ehricke this was a leading conception: That the technology is not the question. Whether technology is good or bad, is irrelevant. The advancements in technology are critical; but the key

is in the culture by which we use them; it's the cultural identification of mankind and the human species.

And that's not something that you can provoke within a society by a description. Deductions will fail. You can't deduce in the minds of a people, or through education, you can't deduce in the minds of young people what the proper orientation of human identity is. You can't conclude it by logical argument. You can't define it by some formula that this is what human existence is. Because it doesn't exist that way!

Once you define it that way, you kill human identity! And this was why Krafft Ehrlicke loved what we were doing as a political movement. And if only he had lived, if only he hadn't been plagued by some of these illnesses. He was dedicating himself to this direction. And there was that same passion he had to oppose the Nazis, to oppose the FBI, to oppose the green agenda, that he recognized in what we were providing as a means, a social movement by which you could overcome these problems, because you needed a movement to provoke a sense of discovery, and not just *a* discovery, but the *method* of discovery: The means by which discovery is made or the domain from which discovery is made.

And that really is what we have to fight for. That's the kind of culture that Einstein and Krafft Ehrlicke fought for, and that really is what the new system of human economic value has to be: the potential to provoke further discovery in the future, to provoke others to take on the great challenges. That's not a "fact"; that's not a discovery, or it's certainly not any kind of equation of something.

So that's what Krafft Ehrlicke and Einstein shared, and this is very clear, and this is what Lyn captures today. That's why Lyn's such a dominant political force on the planet, today, because of this quality. Why? Because it's a higher quality of thinking. It's more rational. It's more beautiful, for Einstein as for John Keats, the poet: Beauty is an indication of truth in the Universe. And that's what Lyn recognizes. He recognizes that we have more power in the Universe today if we attain this quality of thinking, if we dedicate ourselves to this quality of thinking. And that's what gives us the basis, but it's also the basis by which we can establish a new system. They're the means and the end.

And I think that kind of conception is what has governed all geniuses throughout human history, that quality, that sense of understanding. And what we don't want to do, is resolve down. Resolved? Yes, okay, that's true, but we have to resolve to something lower, something

more comprehensible, something more that people will understand. Well that's just pessimistic! People won't understand their own creative potential? Why wouldn't they? Why wouldn't they love it? Isn't it a sense of freedom? Isn't it a sense of awe about the mind's ability to penetrate the way the Universe functions?

I think people are capable and want to. This is an intrinsic desire within every individual to grasp that sense of creative genius. But there also has to be a dedication, a quality of leadership to provoke it and that's what's absolutely essential today.

Enjoy This Moment

Question: This is T— from Virginia. Thanks again Mike for going through everything, the current situation with culture and how that's a necessity, because it pertains to my question. When I'm talking to people about all these great solutions attributed to Mr. LaRouche, the Silk Road, the new paradigm, BRICS, the space program, all these things look good on paper. The people agree, but you know, they're not going to fight and they support and they do everything contrary to what they say they agree with.

So of course, when you're speaking of the culture, and how it's taking precedence and it's shaped these types of responses, I get why people simply agree and do nothing. The culture now is really repulsive, and on top of that, you can barely even recognize how bad things are with the drugs.

For me personally, the Classical music is what works for me; and had I not picked up playing the flute again two years ago, I probably wouldn't be on this call! And you just mentioned how Mr. LaRouche always points out Classical music as being a necessity to move people forward, to move them into the Hamiltonian system, and aligning the BRICS and all these great things. My question is, how can I approach people with the idea of embracing Classical music and Classical culture without them interpreting it as just another one of these great things that my movement does, and they'll just simply agree to it?

Steger: Well, there's no timeframe. You're dealing with a physical process. There's an intrinsic time, but with each person that's going to be somewhat different, so you can't predefine it. You can't predefine: this person hasn't made it so I guess they won't. You don't know. So the question is, do you just enjoy the provocation and the delight in the discussion of these ideas? And that's like you said: in participating in a musical



Xinhua/Liu Weibing

Chinese President Xi Jinping (standing) addresses the welcome banquet held by Polish President Andrzej Duda (third from right, rear) in Warsaw Poland, on June 20, 2016.

process, it keeps your mind alive and elevated, that you're resolving upwards. And that really is the endeavor.

You know, when Lyn gets these kinds of questions, his answer is, well, look what I'm doing. And you have to: He's 93 years old, his movement has been torn to pieces,— you can imagine, our organization was taken over by an ideology and FBI kind of operation when Lyn was in prison.

So they put him in prison, unjustly for five years, at the time the entire system was coming down. He's the only economist on the block so to speak, to forecast the end of the Soviet system and the fall of the Berlin Wall. Helga—everyone, all of the leadership of the organization as they describe it, were shocked when Lyn said, the Berlin Wall is coming down.

It's ironic that the President of China said "We should make Poland the example for all of Europe," recently on his trip to Poland just the end of last week. They're developing a whole port and transit logistics system in Poland, and integrating Poland to be a key pathway of the main rail corridor from China, from Chongqing in central China to Duisburg, the main inland port on the Rhine, in Germany. But [Lyndon had said the same thing](#): He said give me Poland; let Poland be an example of a collaborative effort towards development between both the former Comecon system [Soviet-Eastern European

economic bloc] and Western Europe, and let Poland be an example of where Europe can go.

Now, Lyn was put in prison at that point. He was *in prison* when the Wall came down!

And so, the FBI largely took over the organization. And they ran all kinds of disruptions. What was the main attack they had? The main attack on the organization was to lose the joy of provoking the process of creative discovery. Turn it into something analytical. Turn it into something where we can do this, and this, and this, and then somehow we'll get the political break we need. You reduce it to some kind of mathematical equation; you reduce it to some kind of analytical tactics. You lose the actual process. You reduce it to the constant crisis in money, because

you're facing an economic breakdown.

Versus recognizing you've got to provoke a quality of creative discovery in others, and there has to be a sense of joy in that fight. You're dealing with a breakdown of the entire British Empire, British System. This is not the breakdown of a housing bubble. As Lyn has compared it before, this is like the breakdown of the Roman Empire, when following that collapse, there ensued a Dark Age for hundreds of years.

Our efforts are to avoid a Dark Age that could potentially threaten to consume mankind with a Dark Age for hundreds of years, if not a kind of Apocalyptic Dark Age of nuclear annihilation.

To really enjoy, that's the question. We're not trying to stop losing. You have to look for the conception of victory. [Nicholas of] Cusa has this conception of the "not-other." Because it's not other than not-other; it is that which is good. You have to identify and develop that conception. You can't simply say, "I want to stop losing." You can't define it negatively. And you can't necessarily impose on people *when* they're going to make the discovery. Oftentimes when you do that, when we expect people to make a discovery at a certain time-frame, it only drags the process down, because we're not really enjoying, we ourselves are not participating in the creative process.

We're saying, "Look, you've got to do this," be-

cause . . . you're going to put in some arbitrary expectation on them, versus just enjoy provoking their mind and see how they respond. What you will find is that people get it, because it's not an analytical process that we're asking them to understand. It's a sense of freedom. With most people today, in this culture, with this entertainment, with this news service, with this education, with this traffic, and the kind of work that people are engaged in, or the family lives that are so broken down, the freedom of the mind is not there.

And so, I think we just have to enjoy it. As Lyn says, look at him. Look at how Lyn's operating. Enjoy this moment. We have the potential today to achieve a great victory, if we recognize the sense of urgency to crush this system, to bring down Obama, to bring down Wall Street. We're not looking for reform, we're looking for the elimination of this Wall Street/London system. We're looking to bring down Obama, to bring down this whole Presidential fraud.

Awaken This in People

People say, "How are you going to do it?" *It's happening!* It's happening because of what Putin and China and most of the human species right now is participating in. This is an undeniable advancement of the human species. It's challenging the bankruptcy of the trans-Atlantic system. As Einstein knew, when the system changes, it's the whole system. You can't change it in parts. It's the whole process.

I want to address your particular question, but I would point to that way of thinking, the way Lyn approaches it, the kind of fight Lyn's taken on—he's rebuilt his organization within the last two years, with the orientation in Manhattan, and then with Kesha's revival of the space program, with what Dave and I are doing on the West Coast regarding Russia and China and the Pacific orientation, we have reoriented,—leading with Manhattan, leading with the revival of this kind of choral principle, we have recreated,—he has recreated his organization. It took him 20 years, after coming out of prison, but he has recreated it at a critical juncture in the political process.

That's a quality of devotion. That quality of action by Lyn inspires me every day—to not worry if other people are making the discovery on the timeframe that they should be. My sense of urgency is to continue to provoke other people, whoever they might be, to make that discovery. And that's why Lyn's such a leading figure today.

Christie: We have a few people left in the queue. Do you want to take another question or two?

Steger: Yes, if there's two more, why don't we take those two questions?

Question: Hi! This is D—in Wisconsin. I unfortunately missed the first hour. I'm wondering, you guys may have already answered it, the impotent sit-in by the Congressional Democrats over that gun issue the last 24 hours?

Steger: Yeah, we touched on it and I think you just made the point. This is pathetic and they've chosen to become irrelevant. The question is, how relevant are we? They show what irrelevance looks like. I think that's pretty clear. So now, what are we going to do? How are we going to operate in this kind of unique historical moment? That's what's got to govern our sense of a process. That's what I would say.

Question: Hi! This is I—from Brooklyn. Forgive me Mike and Dave, but I just want to thank you for being spot on. My question is, to what degree and extent would you categorize the strength of the British system as the ghost? How could we de-mask the ghost? What are their strengths, especially culturally and financially? To what extent do they influence the average citizen?

You guys mentioned the ghost that Mr. Lyn was talking about, the movie ["Das Spukschloss im Spessart"—The Haunted Castle in the Spessart]. I was just using that as a metaphor in order to sort of understand how the British system affects how a citizen understands the current reality that he is in. In other words, how would you characterize the strength, institutionally, as far as poverty-wise, and culturally, as well as financially? How was the British system able to transform the political, economic, and industrial history of the American system? Was it done consciously, or was it just accepted subconsciously?

Steger: Okay. I think I get the question. This [German] movie that Lyn references, I think we posted a fairly good version of it on YouTube with [English] subtitles. There's a quality of joy that's possible within human life, and it's that which we have to unleash in the American people. People have been crushed under a society which has replaced joy, towards a banal kind of pleasure. They think of the banal pleasure as a way of escaping the torture of the current society.

The new issue of *EIR* magazine is out this week. In the back of it there is a presentation from the Saturday

... Young people brainwashed on this environmentalism, brainwashed on the obsession with recycling, this obsession of concern with the Earth. If you really are concerned, then you have to approach the challenges of space exploration, which don't require constipated worry. They require a playfulness of human creative thought ... They require real philosophical insight, a real imagination, and a lot of incredibly challenging, long, focused, concentrated work—real work, towards what we can accomplish with this imagination and potential.

[June 18] Manhattan discussion that John Sigerson provided. He references this Orlando massacre. These are 20-, 22-, 25-year-old young people. They are in some dark, kind of unlit, horrible—it's like a hell-hole. Why are they there? To escape the insanity of society? You run to something like that, to find some escape?

There's a loss of a sense of real joy. The means by which you awaken that sometimes is very playful, as this movie is that they did in Germany in the 1960s, where they really make it clear that most of West Germany is run by a bunch of British and CIA spies, who basically are no different from the Nazis [laughs], so you have to have a certain sense of humor, that what the Nazis were, wasn't something necessarily that just had a goose-step and a swastika.

You have to awaken a sense of playfulness in people. It's the same with all these young people brainwashed on this environmentalism, brainwashed on the obsession with recycling, or whatever, this obsession of concern with the Earth. If you really are concerned, then you have to approach the challenges of space exploration, which don't require constipated worry. They require a playfulness of human creative thought: How do we solve these great challenges of space exploration? They require real philosophical insight, a real imagination, and a lot of incredibly challenging, long, focused, concentrated work—real work, towards what we can accomplish with this imagination and potential.

I think we've just got to awaken that in people. Awaken a sense of *joy* of what it means to be human and participate in a society that's focused and oriented towards accomplishing such goals, and that we can say today that there exists, on this planet, that focus. You'll see it manifest this weekend. There is a focus on the planet, increasingly, towards this quality of the human species, and we should take great joy in that, and recognize with that comes a real sense of responsibility to ensure that it continues.

The best way to ensure that is to get rid of this creep Obama, to get rid of this British system, and to focus on that kind of higher conception of mankind. The sense of joy and playfulness is irreplaceable. It really is the heart and soul of Mozart and Beethoven. As intense as their compositions are, the playfulness is ever-present.

Christie: Okay. I think we're going to call it there. We have a few of our long-time allies left in the queue, but feel free to call Mike on any questions you may have. I very much appreciated the discussion so far this evening. I can only just say this: tune in to LaRouche PAC this weekend. The quality of intervention we are making this weekend is really unprecedented. The timing of where we're at is unprecedented. We know that no matter what has happened with the situation around the Brexit [vote], clearly it's doomed no matter what. But as a kind of a shock, at least at this point, with about half of the votes counted, the "Leave" campaign is up by about 500,000 votes. It's tight still. They're only up to 51.7%, but obviously the implications of this are going to be tectonic either way. The leadership to guide humanity out of this crisis is being provided by Putin this weekend over what he's doing with China, the ongoing meetings with the SCO, and what he's done since the St. Petersburg International Economic Forum, but also what Lyn and Helga are up to this weekend. People should just absolutely tune in, pay attention, especially to the webcast tomorrow, which will include input from both Helga and Lyndon LaRouche.

So, yeah, stay tuned. Mike, I don't know if you have any final thoughts here, but if you do, why don't you lay them out.

Steger: I think, people, we should have some fun and get to work. There's a lot to do!

Christie: Okay. That sounds good. Thanks for joining us this evening. Like I say, stay tuned this weekend. Bye!