

---

## II. The Secret of Human Creativity

---

# The Remedy for the Evil of Obama

*The following edited excerpts are taken from the weekly LaRouche PAC National [Fireside Chat of Sept. 15, 2016](#). The guest speaker was Dennis Speed, a leader of both the LaRouche PAC and the Manhattan Project.*

**Bill Roberts:** Everyone should know that the JASTA bill passed unanimously out of the House last week, after earlier passing the Senate unanimously. Of course, this is something that 9/11 widow Terry Strada and many Congressmen have fought for over years, to have justice for the victims of 9/11, and their families and loved ones, by bringing the Saudi Kingdom to justice for their role in 9/11. As far as we know, Obama is still threatening to veto this, and we shouldn't be surprised if he tries some trick to push this back and defeat it. The only question should be: why have the American people tolerated this man, who is a murderer, and has protected the greatest mass murder of Americans in the history of the United States.

So, many of you have participated over the last weekend in the living memorial that was organized in New York City. Dennis may have more to say about this, but this was organized to address this very question, of the cowardice in the American population, the capitulation to fear and evil, to allow people to break from that and make them conscious of how they've been behaving, and to establish a higher standard within them to recognize why they were allowing such behavior. I'm going to leave it at that, and ask if Dennis would like to say something at this point, or go directly to questions.

**Dennis Speed:** I want to say something about the change that has occurred as a result of the last week. Lyndon LaRouche is the most important living thinker

of our time. Of course, all great thinkers never die, but Lyn happens to be here with us in the flesh and is able to inspire people to forms of creativity they did not know were possible. This is important to understand, and it is important to think about.

Now, there's one particular matter I'd like to bring to people's attention. From at least 1973, and actually before that time, LaRouche expressed, in various written forms, his love of and appreciation for the ideas of Percy Shelley's *A Defence of Poetry*, and I'd like to refer at the beginning of our discussion, to the first paragraph of that writing by Percy Shelley. Often we refer to it, and we talk about the idea of man having profound and impassioned conceptions respecting man and nature—conceptions that at certain periods of time are able to be received and imparted at an extraordinary rate. In other words, things that people could not learn for decades, they can literally learn in days or weeks. But the thing that distinguishes Lyn, and what he's done, is that he's dedicated his life to the idea of providing the means by which the individual can focus on the idea of creativity, that which distinguishes man from beast, and can access directly his individual or her individual creativity and *change the world*.

Now, this isn't done by some act of individual, arbitrary will. It isn't done in the ways that people normally think *at all*, and I think Lyn is the best one to express the fact that his notion of human identity is not at all the same idea as that which most people have of what is human. The human identity is not biological. What Einstein represents as a thinker, and I think in a different way what Shelley represented as a thinker, is what Lyn often refers to.



*Percy B. Shelley*

And I only wanted to refer to one element of what Shelley is talking about. He's speaking here about the difference between reason and imagination. And he says:

According to one mode of regarding those two classes of mental action which are called reason and imagination, the former may be considered as mind contemplating the relations borne by one thought to another, however produced; and the latter, as mind acting upon those thoughts so as to color them with its own light, and composing from them, as from elements, other thoughts, each containing within itself the principle of its own integrity.

That is, imagination is a compositional process of the highest order. When we speak about music, for example, this is the concept that the Mozart *Requiem* and the *Requiem* performances that John Sigeron conducted, I think, attempted to convey. That we are capable of inventing something new, and that musical composition is a case of that, that the work—the *Requiem* in this particular case, of Mozart—or the works of Bach, or others, invent something never before seen in the Universe.

They are not recombinations of earlier thoughts. They are not recombinations of earlier physical principles. It's an introduction as a *completely new principle, using the imagination*. And when that is done, the thing that is done, by introducing *this* kind of imaginative, creative principle, cannot die. It is immortal. And it is the way in which mankind accesses the principle of immortality which characterizes the Universe itself and the being of the Universe or the Composer of the Universe.

Now, I think what's important about stating that, and that's the best I can state it;—Lyn would have I think a better conception of that,—but the reason for saying this is that it is from *this* standpoint that the only efficient method of strategy comes. A discussion about anything lower than that is actually not human, and that matters such as issues, the kind of issues that we tend to be plagued by in the so-called political campaigns *are not human*. Many of the statements of the kinds of things that people talk about, however validating they seem to be in themselves, *are not human statements*.

If we start talking about things like police brutality, for example, or the way that most people discuss poverty, for example, or the way that most people discuss other so-called human needs, it is not a *human way* of discussing it. You're discussing these things *devoid* of

the imaginative or creative principle, which can be brought to bear as a strategic idea.

Now, what the Chinese have been doing, what Vladimir Putin has been doing, *these ways* of approaching the idea of strategy, which are congruent with the way in which LaRouche has approached strategy his entire life, *this* gives us a *human* economics, a *human* politics. This is to be contrasted with what we presently have coming from Obama, Hillary Clinton, Donald Trump, and much of what we see through the rest of the world as a whole.

So the intent of what we did with our musical performances was to raise the standard in the United States, raise, if you will, the guidon of reason of humanity, and so, these were not musical performances. This was a form of creative intervention, which was intended to allow, or to set the stage for further development or advancement of the outlook that was expressed, for example, by Vladimir Putin last year at the United Nations, or at the G-20 Summit that the Chinese just hosted at Hangzhou. This is what we're doing. This is our approach. This is the way we have, if you will, attempted to reorient political life in the United States. And it's the beginning of a set of actions that we will be taking in the future.

So I just wanted to say that, and now we should open up and go to any questions or any statements that people have. And we'll do our best to answer the questions.

## What is the Manhattan Project?

**Question:** Hi, this A—, here in New York. What I wanted to raise to you, Dennis, is running parallel to the building for the audience for the past two weeks or so, where we know that upwards of easily 10,000 leaflets were distributed in New York, with a distribution of the broadsheet, which had also picked up in its massive distribution. So here are two seemingly on one hand parallel operations taking place, yet we have this tremendous turnout and effect in New York.

Can you talk with us about how these two elements are really the same thing, and as well as, where do we go now? With the UN in town, with all the overview that was just provided us, what's our next move forward, lest we rest on what we accomplished this weekend?

**Speed:** Well, let me just say this. The first thing to remember is that the process that's under way in New York is the Manhattan Project. Lyndon LaRouche created this in the fall of 2014. He saw the initiative and saw the potential, and urged us to work with him, and in the first phases of that work, much of it was not *ignoring* what he said, making sure that you would go back



Library of Congress

*Hamilton's home—Grange—in upper Manhattan, was completed two years before he was murdered.*

to the drawing board. You thought you were doing the right thing, you would come back, he would give different advice about it, and what happened with that, as we began to do that, it became rather natural for him, for LaRouche directly, to initiate a process of dialogue with a group of people in New York.

Now, this was his way of resurrecting Alexander Hamilton's idea of the Presidency of the United States. He recognized that it was necessary to have a Presidential orientation and that there was no President available. And that Obama has to be removed from office, but that the American people had largely, through a failure of nerve and other problems, walked away from this task.

So, Lyn created the dialogue process. The dialogue process led in various ways, for various people to work with LaRouche, and then the various things that happened, whether that be the broadsheet or other matters, were the natural capabilities that became available.

Now, I don't want to be too sequential, because in one sense that's too formal. The truth of the matter is, that we're in a situation where the United States needs a future. LaRouche has provided the conception of the United States's future for decades, but, specifically, and in the context of the Obama Presidency, it became urgently necessary that the fact that Obama must not be President of the United States *a single day more*, must be emphasized, and *re-emphasized*. Despite the fact that people, out of despair or cowardice would believe the opposite.

So if you look at what's now just happened: You've had in July the 28 pages being released; you had the Sept. 9th passage of JASTA, the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act; and now you have had many

other things that have begun to happen. And now, of course, the prospect or the possibility of Obama's impeachment is being brought to us by Obama himself.

Now the important thing here is to recognize that what LaRouche was saying was possible, and people believed to be *impossible*, from basically April of 2009, now becomes manifest in its own way, as being the natural course of things! So how come he knew this, when other people didn't know it? This is what we mean by *human* politics, or the human principle of creativity.

So I would just put it that way, and the issue is not falling back, the issue is different. The issue is people should simply recognize that this had been something that LaRouche said we're going to do, said could be done, and we're now sitting there with the evidence, if you want to put it that way, of the truth of that principle, and it's just a matter of activating other American citizens to take advantage of that fact. That's what I would say.

**Question:** Hi Dennis, this is R— out in Oregon. I'm trying to think about all of this while you're giving the briefing. I wonder, I'm just musing to myself, is Obama in check or checkmate? Because if he signed JASTA, he's admitting that he's covered up Saudi complicity for the last eight years. And if he refuses to sign, he's standing down and thumbing his nose at the entire delegation of the Congress of the United States assembled. And neither one of those looks like a promising option for him.

But could you reiterate perhaps, what you opened with, and maybe say something else about Shelley and the creative principle in this situation?

**Speed:** Well let's just get the thing with Obama straight. Remember that Obama is never checked, because Obama is not deploying as a human being. Obama is deploying as the agent of the British Empire. Now, what has happened is that we have created a certain kind of trap, and since he acts from a bestial standpoint—he has a bestial identity—he behaves like a beast. So he's in, in that sense, a position to be taken down, but that's not going to happen unless the American people act. For example, you can not act through the electoral process presently. You can do things, you can address the issue of Obama through the electoral process, in some respects. Not through Trump or through Hillary, but through the process that we're conducting. So let's take, for example, the issue of JASTA or some of these other things. It's not that these issues in themselves bring Obama down. It's simply that his



EIRNW/Stuart Lewis

*Violinist Norbert Brainin, a founder of the Amadeus Quartet.*



EIRNS/Philip Ulanowsky

*Manhattan Project scientist Dr. Robert Moon leads a science class with young students in July 1986.*



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

*Lyndon LaRouche greets Marie Madeleine Fourcade, a leader in the World War II French resistance networks, at the founding conference of the U.S. affiliate of the Schiller Institute on July 3, 1984.*

*nature* is revealed. The nature of the British operation that spawned him, controls him, and deploys him. That's what has happened.

So Obama is not going to give in. Obama is not going to somehow relent. Obama's not going to somehow, say to us, "Oh yeah, you're right. I've got to act like a human being." That isn't going to happen. But what is true is that we've done our job and gotten the country to a certain point, and . . .

Let's just be straightforward: Many of the people who have often been on the phone calls, are no longer really on these phone calls in the same way, because they were either angry, or frustrated by the idea that, when they would ask us to endorse Donald Trump, for example, or other such things, we would say "no." We would say, "No, because he isn't human." And then they would get mad, because "Well, you say I'm not



EIRNS

*Guyana Foreign Affairs Minister and Justice Minister, Fred Wills, addressing the UN General Assembly on Sept. 8, 1976. He said that the time had come for a debt moratorium for the developing sector.*



EIRNS

*Scientist and philosopher Pobisk G. Kuznetsov, left, with Lyndon LaRouche, in Russia, April 1994.*



voting for a human being, that kind of insults me.” Well, but the problem involved is that *Donald Trump doesn’t really exist*, just like Obama doesn’t really exist. You’re not dealing with anything human. It doesn’t mean that Trump might not say something correct at some point. Or someone else may say it. But the issue of *Obama* is *the British Imperial system* and the destruction of what that represents: It’s not human.

Now, what Shelley represented and why Lyn emphasized this very, very early—and he’s always emphasized this. If you look at the people Lyn has worked with in politics, and in other fields, they’re always people who distinguish themselves in whatever field as being *creative, imaginative minds*. And so whether we’re talking about the violinist Norbert Brainin, the scientist Robert Moon, or we’re talking about the French Resistance fighter Marie-Madeleine Fourcade, or we’re talking about Hulan Jack, the former Borough President of Manhattan, or Fred Wills, the former Foreign Minister of Guyana,—there are many different people we could cite; the economists, like Taras Muranivsky in Russia; or scientist Pobisk Kuznetsov from Russia; whoever it is that LaRouche has been close to, has distinguished themselves as a fundamentally creative mind, that stand above the practices and actions of many other people in their fields.

What’s the issue? If you want a President of the United States, a Hamiltonian President of the United States, a President like a Franklin Roosevelt, it’s got to be that you activate the principle of creativity, and you lead the American people from that standpoint. This doesn’t mean you’re necessarily popular. But it means you’re correct, you’re right, and people recognize that, and they’ll follow that.

So the issue of Obama—no Obama’s not in check. That’s obvious: He’s still there. If Obama were in check, he wouldn’t be in office. So, no, he’s not in check. The point of the thing is that if the American people are willing to dispose of the vampire-like Barack Obama, who is deployed on behalf of a principle of evil, then he can be removed from office. But if you’re terrified of the vampire, and you refuse to take the necessary measures, which people all know about, of how you get rid of vampires, then he will continue to do what *his nature* causes him to do. So this is the important thing to understand: It’s *his nature* for Barack Obama to do what he’s doing. You are not going to change that, because he has no inclination to act in a human

fashion.

So he’s not in check! And every day that goes by that he is still in the Presidency, the entire world is threatened. What happened with Cameron, indicates what *could* happen with Obama, at any moment, were the American people mobilized behind what Lyn is saying. So I think that’s the important thing to understand. And you *cannot do* that, by merely attempting to quote/unquote “vote for the lesser of two evils,” be that Trump or Hillary,— and there is where the cowardice of a lot of people, including even people in our own networks, continues to be manifest. We tried to address that with the concerts, and I think we did the best we could.



cc/Elizabeth Cromwell

*President Obama’s policies have been purveyors of cultural despair.*

## What is Creativity?

**Question:** Hello, this is L— from Michigan. I’d say it’s a pretty big story, David Cameron resigning or getting impeached in the British Parliament or whatever, and I didn’t read it anywhere else, except reading it on LaRouche PAC site. How did that happen, how did they come to that conclusion? And what type of evidence is compiled, or can be compiled against Obama, and how’s it going to get to all the people, because we’re not going to be hearing it on the media or the news or radio or anything like that. Where’s the evidence compiled? You know, credible evidence compiled for the impeachment? I know that LaRouche PAC has quite a bit of evidence, but it doesn’t seem like it’s official. Who’s going to compile the evidence and bring this, and get

the people to understand that this is serious stuff? That these are impeachable crimes? That this is treason being committed by our elected officials?

**Speed:** The evidence for Barack Obama's impeachment is his existence. Now this is not a problem, and despair is not necessary. *We don't have to compile anything!* Let me explain why that's true: First of all, Terry Strada and the families of 9/11 have placed, through various assistance that we and others gave,—Walter Jones, Senator Graham, many other people,—we placed the matter of 9/11, and therefore Benghazi and many other crimes committed after 9/11, squarely in front of the American people. And for example, in the same way that once the Congress decided that it would tell Obama that it would no longer *appeal* to him to get the 28 pages, but they would simply take the prerogative of congressional action on behalf of the American people, and if necessary read the contents or express the content, on the floor of the Congress *without* Barack Obama, at *that* point the 28 pages got released!

Now, it wasn't quite so simple as I just said, but in other words, whereas for years, the supposed assumption was “well, we've got to somehow appeal to the

President, and if the President deigns to do it, maybe we'll get the pages from him.” But that wasn't the case. It was *cowardice* that was stopping the pages from being released, and a procedure was not required—what was required was to have the courage, and then the procedure, shall we say, would suddenly appear.

So this issue of “we have to compile the evidence as to why Obama has to be impeached”—No we don't! Everybody in America knows that Obama should be impeached. But they don't have the *guts* to do it. And that's why people keep running behind one or the other of these candidates and saying, “that's my responsibility as an American, I've got to vote; I'll vote for the lesser of two evils.” But that's cowardice: Because the truth of the matter, first of all, is neither of those candidates may even *exist* on Election Day to be voted for! We don't know whether Hillary Clinton is going to get through this. We don't know whether Donald Trump will get through this. That's the truth! But one thing we *do* know, is that Barack Obama is still there!

So the issue for us is that we're in a position, right now, to remove Barack Obama. We don't have to do *anything* other than *insist that it must be done*, and we do that by two means: One, take things we've already developed in advance—take what we're doing, for example, on Glass-Steagall. That's in front of both Houses of Congress right now. We have, of course, JASTA. And it's been made clear, if he tries to go to a veto of that, well, does that show the American people? If the *entire Congress* has stated that those Saudis or others should be, in fact, held accountable; if Obama tries to stand up against *that* unanimous will of the American people, how can anyone deny, or doubt, that he clearly stands on the side of the *treason* against the United States?

So there's no *need* for us to do the various things that people are claiming they need to do! No! What is needed is, the courage to act in the way LaRouche has insisted ever since April of 2009, and *insist* that he be removed from office.

**Question:** Hello, Dennis, this is C— from California. My question is the nature of evil and also that the cowardice that you're talking about, is that the empire—people just are not born evil. They are made evil. One of the ways that it's done is to come through the cultural environment, but also through television and the whole culture we have, people—literally what they *see* is not

**EIR Special Report**

# Obama's War on America: 9/11 Two

## The Real Story Behind Benghazi

**EIR Special Report**

NEW UPDATED EDITION

Obama's War on America: 9/11 Two



February 2013

Price **\$100** (Paperback or PDF. For paper, add shipping and handling; Va. residents add 5% sales tax)  
Order from **EIR News Service** 1-800-278-3135  
Or online: **store.larouchepub.com**

a world that they think that they can deal with, and then they take various avoidances—as you say, cowardice. But it's not that the individual person, it's not an individual thing. It's actually a psychological manipulation. And people don't remember Trist and these guys; the guy coming out of World War I, that they devoted a science of controlling, let us say, the visual—when I say the visual I mean, what people see; they don't *see* the future. They can only see what's there. Can you comment on that?

**Speed:** OK. Well, yes, there is something called the Tavistock Institute for Human Relations, and yes, they're the brain-washing process. But the way Lyn talked about this, and had us illustrate it, now maybe twenty-two years ago, was in a thing called "The Palmerston Zoo." We gave a panel at one of the conferences, a group of us. And we tried to described how Lord Palmerston had designed—using ideological studies—the way in which the various elements of humanity in various areas of the world were self-controlled by ideology, by poisonous ideology which people refused to liberate themselves from.

One of the reasons why Lyndon LaRouche has often emphasized the figure of Moses Mendelssohn in the case of Germany, is that Moses Mendelssohn,—of course very poor, and Jewish, and limited in various ways,—he was from the ghetto—assimilated the highest levels of culture, of German culture, but also of other cultures, and became the exemplar, together with Lessing in their joint work with others like Kästner, and others, of what would become the actual modern, European Classical music tradition. It was through the work of Mendelssohn and Lessing, and Kästner and others that Bach, for example, was preserved, creating the essential ability to get to Mozart the knowledge of Bach. The knowledge and the rebirth of the focus on Bach, which came through the Mendelssohn family itself, and Felix Mendelssohn in particular, through his 1829 resurrection of the *St. Matthew Passion*.

Now, I'm citing that merely before I'm about to then



oil portrait (1771) by Anton Graff, University of Leipzig collection  
*Moses Mendelssohn (1729-1786) played an exemplary role in creating the modern European Classical music tradition.*

hit you with the other element, which is,— yeah, people are not born evil. But here's the problem: Everyone has a responsibility, individually, as to whether or not they *accept* being evil! And so, yeah, you may not be born that way, but to *simply* claim that people are manipulated into being evil—No. No! That's the whole issue, actually, of the nature of evil in the world.

The individual free will,— and this is true for Barack Obama just as it's true for everybody else,— allows you to make a choice as to whether or not that becomes your identity. In the case of Barack Obama you're dealing with something which may not be pure evil, but it is

*impure* evil. It's like saying, "well, Dracula is not born evil." Well,— but Dracula is a vampire, he's undead! So, Barack Obama—we're talking about the living dead, the undead! So, yes, you're correct that he was perhaps not born evil, but he's something which is unborn.

We're not talking about the simple question of his mother, and the things we said before; that was also highly unfortunate. And yes, people get very nervous when you say these kinds of things, for other reasons which I don't find valid around Barack Obama. But I think what's important, is to recognize that we wouldn't be concerned about him if he didn't hold office, that is, any office, ever, if he had not held office.

But he did. And so, we have to recognize that the problem of *one day more* of the existence of the so-called Presidency of Barack Obama, is one day more that the human race is held hostage to evil!

So, the real point is, that there's a moral obligation on the part of the rest of us, *to stand against that, in a completely and utterly uncompromising way.* That's the issue. Not the fact that the British or others are capable of manipulating that evil against human beings. Our point has to be: We reject the conception that human creativity on the part of each and every one of us does not carry an *obligation* to fight against evil. And for many people that's their first access to creativity, to say: I will fight against evil, and I will figure out how to defeat it.