

# THE HAMILTONIAN

## Appeal to the UN General Assembly: A New Paradigm for the Common Aims of Mankind!

BY HELGA ZEPP-LAROCHE

It is crucial that the General Assembly of the United Nations now convening in New York, build on the progress that the G20 Summit has achieved under China's leadership. The course has been set toward a new financial architecture, and the chance is greater than ever that all nations can participate in the building of the New Silk Road on the basis of win-win cooperation, and that the productivity of the world economy will rise on the basis of innovation, while poverty and the consequences of war are overcome. The main problem, however, is that the West continues to cling to the status quo of a uni-polar world and the neo-liberal financial system, although both of those objectives have long been unachievable. The rise of Asia signifies that one nation cannot set the rules, but that solutions must be found through dialogue and negotiation. The neo-liberal system is in the throes of an existential crisis.

The first twin of globalization—the policy of regime-change and alleged humanitarian interventions—has cost the lives of millions of people, brought untold suffering to millions more, destroyed entire regions, created the breeding grounds for the spread of terrorism, and set off huge waves of refugees. The wars against Iraq and Afghanistan alone, according to the study of Professor Neta Crawford of Brown University, have cost five trillion dollars—and for what result?

The second twin of globalization—the system of maximum profit for the TBTF banks, which are supposedly “too big to be allowed to fail”—has led to an unbearable gap between rich and poor. And if certain banks have to pay the full sum of their fines for criminal methods, they must declare bankruptcy because their capital base is insufficient. Hence, a new meltdown threatens, with even more catastrophic consequences than the

collapse of Lehman Brothers in 2008, now that central bank instruments are exhausted and no longer effective.

In that context, two reports released in Great Britain offer an extraordinary opportunity to re-assess and correct the current policy. After the Chilcot Report, which laid the blame on Tony Blair for the illegal Iraq war which was built on lies, a commission of the British Parliament has levelled no less scathing charges against former Prime Minister David Cameron for the war in Libya, which was carried out on “erroneous assumptions” and led to “political and economic collapse, inter-militia and inter-tribal warfare, humanitarian and migrant crises, widespread human rights violations, the spread of Gaddafi regime weapons across the region and the growth of ISIL in North Africa.”

On the role of the United States, the report states that “The United States was instrumental in extending the terms of Resolution 1973 beyond the imposition of a no-fly zone to include the authorisation of ‘all necessary measures’ to protect civilians. In practice, this led to the imposition of a ‘no-drive zone’ and the assumed authority to attack the entire Libyan Government command and communications network.”

That same overall review of the current policy should, of course, include the implications of the 28 pages of the official Joint Congressional Inquiry Report, which deals with the circumstances of the attacks of September 11, 2001, as well as the JASTA bill, which necessitate a completely new investigation.

In light of the horrendous suffering this failed policy has caused: the millions of dead and injured; the traumatized children and soldiers (including in the nations waging war); the destruction of cities, villages, infrastructure and irreplaceable cultural wealth; it is not only appropriate, but a moral obligation for the countries that took part in these wars in the different “coalitions of the willing,” to examine the political process in their parliaments and to fully participate in the reconstruction of the regions that have been devastated. This will not bring the dead back to life, but the admission of guilt and a genuine change of policy towards development would give the people living there today hope for a future.

The status quo cannot be maintained. As a result of both twins of globalization, there has been an enormous loss of trust among the population in the trans-Atlantic world. Right-wing populist and right-extremist parties are massively gaining strength; the conditions of the 1930s threaten to reappear in a new form; the European Union is crumbling; and the refugee crisis will not be solved by securing the external EU borders, but only relocated and removed from the news. The U.S. economy is collapsing, while the society is more than ever torn and overtaken by violence. Either this process will lead to an escalation of the confrontation with Russia and China, and to the extermination of mankind in a great war, or the leading politicians in the West will have the moral integrity to correct the errors of the past.

### The Solution

To come back to the positive proposition in the beginning of this appeal, the course has been set toward a way out of this crisis of civilization since the G20 summit. Not only has China presented a new level of cooperation based not on geopolitics, but rather on a policy in the mutual interest of all, it has also pledged to industrialize Africa and other low-income countries, an approach that could both solve the refugee crisis and eliminate the ter-



rorist environment. Clearly, the extension of the New Silk Road to the Middle East and Africa both requires and will bring about growth rates of 7 to 10%.

And just as promptly, the Club of Rome stepped in with a new report under the cynical title in the German translation of “One Percent Is Enough,” which would lead in consequence to population reduction, a fascist policy for which the Club of Rome is infamous. The UN recently stressed that Africa needs a growth rate of at least 7-8%. When one of the authors of the Club of Rome report, the Norwegian Jorgen Randers, comes out with the absurd statement, “My daughter is the most dangerous animal in the world,” because she consumes 30 times more energy than a girl in a developing country, it serves to show on what image of man the Club of Rome bases its argument, i.e. on a bestial one.

But man, in contrast to all other creatures, is able to use his creative potential to continually discover new insights into the laws of the universe; this is called scientific progress. The unlimited process of perfecting the human mind has a correspondence in the laws of the physical universe, which develops to ever higher energy-flux densities. We are not in a closed system on the Earth—as the Club of Rome and similar organizations claim—rather, our planet is an integral part of the Solar System, the galaxy and the universe, about which space research is discovering more and more. This research yields many advantages for Earth itself, and it is therefore fantastic that China announced at the G20 summit, that it would share with developing countries the most advanced research results for their space and lunar exploration projects.

Mankind has arrived at a crossroads. If we continue to walk the well-trodden paths with a policy of “more of the same,” the world threatens to come apart. If, on the contrary, we can agree on the common aims of mankind—an economic and financial order that serves the well-being of all mankind, and which makes possible a decent life for every person on this Earth; the securing of raw materials and energy through higher technologies such as thermonuclear fusion; the exploration of space to safeguard our planet and a renaissance of classical cultures—then we will be able to usher in a new, better era in the history of our species.

The General Assembly of the United Nations is the fitting place, where the new paradigm of our one mankind, based on that which comes before all the differences among nations, must be established and celebrated.

## OBAMA'S DOOMSDAY: First JASTA, Next Glass-Steagall

BY MICHAEL STEGER AND KESHA ROGERS

“But he hasn't got anything on!” the whole town cried out at last.

The Emperor shivered, for he suspected they were right. But he thought, “This procession has got to go on.” So he walked more proudly than ever, as his noblemen held high the train that wasn't there at all!

September 21—Obama is nearing his own doomsday. Since the beginning of September, the international community has shamed him, exposed him as a fraud, and even called him a son-of-a-whore. Since the 70th anniversary meeting of the U.N. General Assembly in September, 2015—and with special emphasis on Putin's near-miracle intervention against Obama-backed ISIS forces in Syria—China and Russia have taken the mantle of international leadership. In so doing, they have committed their shared efforts to international law, ending terrorism and the corresponding international drug trade and financial sponsors, and eradicating poverty through broadscale, long-term development.

After nearly eight years of criminal fraud, economic malfeasance, war crimes, and extrajudicial murders, it is now time for the U.S. to reject the most failed and murderous President to sit in the Oval Office. As this is written, the families of the victims of the 9/11 terrorist attacks remain persistent in their efforts on Capitol Hill to override Obama's threatened veto of the JASTA bill (Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act). The Senators, with a sudden sign of life, are now describing the override vote as a fait accompli. How unthinkable, that the U.S. would tolerate a president who sides with Anglo-Saudi financial sponsors of the 9/11 attacks against the very families who lost their husbands and wives, mothers and fathers, and sons and daughters on that day fifteen years ago.

This week the Congress, in hearings on the systemic fraud of Wells Fargo (which implicitly includes all other Wall Street banks), called for criminal indictments of Wall Street executives for the first time since the 2008 crisis, when, under Obama, the U.S. provided major bailouts and golden parachutes to the most criminal institutions and individuals involved.

Now on the verge of a dangerous breakdown of diplomatic efforts between the U.S. and Russia over Syria, entirely due to the U.S. bombing of Syrian Army soldiers (a gross violation of international law), and the destruction, most likely by U.S. backed-terrorists, of an U.N. aid convoy—actions taken by a desperate Obama, who, facing international and national ridicule, looks to drive the world into nuclear war in retaliation for his own abject failings—we are reminded of the final actions of an isolated Adolf Hitler.



Obama prepares himself for another disaster.

Now is the time to end Obama's tragic Presidency. With Obama out, or similarly relegated, we have the power to create a New Presidency independent of both of the currently failed candidates, whom most Americans already greatly abhor. Such a moment cannot be lost.

Free of Obama's insanity, we can implement LaRouche's FDR-inspired Four New Laws, and nothing short of a 1933 Ferdinand Pecora-style investigation will suffice. The Wall Street criminal bankers must be jailed and the big banks must be broken up with Glass-Steagall. Justice for the 9/11 families and for the nation as a whole means bankrupting the London-based terror apparatus.

As Mr. LaRouche recently stated, if Glass-Steagall is not enacted, many more people will join those who have already died as a result of the collapsing economy.

These steps, which will restore the necessary confidence in the powers of government, should be followed with the restoration of a Hamiltonian National Banking System, the definition of a federal credit policy focused on broadscale industrial development and infrastructure nationally, and the establishment of a crash program for fusion energy development and international cooperation on space exploration.

There is simply no need for an Emperor, or a British Queen, any longer.

1. From Hans Christen Andersen's short story “The Emperor's New Clothes” as translated into English by Jean Hersholt.

### Contact Us!

LaRouche  
Manhattan Project  
activities line:  
551-237-5290



Video Tour: The New Silk Road  
Becomes the World Land-Bridge  
[lpac.co/wlb-tour](http://lpac.co/wlb-tour)

BY ALICIA CERRETANI

On Tuesday, September 20, family members of victims of the September 11, 2001 attacks descended on the nation's capitol to protest President Obama's promised veto of the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act (JASTA). The bill—passed unanimously in both houses of Congress before arriving on Obama's desk—would hold Saudi Arabia accountable for its role in the 9/11 attacks by allowing victims' families to sue.

Beginning with a rally in front of the White House where members of the press interviewed the 9/11 families and supporters of JASTA as they chanted "President Obama, you can't hide, the Congress plans to override!" and held signs with pictures of Obama with Saudi King Salman which



Families of 9/11 victims rally outside the White House, confronting a president who is clearly defending the role of the Saudis in the murder of 2,977 people on American soil on 9/11/2001.

read "Don't choose them over U.S." and "9/11 Families and Survivors Waiting for Justice."

President Obama has promised to veto the measure for months; however, when the bill arrived on his desk almost 15 years to the day after the September 11 attacks, the White House, along with top lobbying firms hired by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, turned up the heat on Capitol Hill and immediately began targeting leading members of the U.S. Senate to help block an override.

Once a bill is sent to the White House, the President has 10 days to veto it or it goes into law. As the morning of the protests, the White House plan appeared to be to wait out the clock and veto the bill at the last moment so that the Congress would not be in session to override his veto. But over the course of Tuesday afternoon the news quickly spread that the Congress would be staying in session past the 10-day deadline and into the following week. And while a variety of reasons were given for their delayed departure, the Capitol Hill daily *The Hill* ran as its leading story, "McCconnell: Senate will delay vacation to override Obama veto," sending a clear message to Obama.

The following morning, in an unmistakable defense of the Anglo-Saudi global terror network over the American people, President Obama reiterated his promise to veto the bill, and continues to reiterate the false claim that JASTA would undermine the sovereign immunity laws which protect U.S. diplomats abroad—claims which 9/11 widow Terry Strada and Connecticut Senator Richard Blumenthal took head-on during a press conference on Capitol Hill following the rally at the White House.

Terry Strada stated: "JASTA has nothing to do with whether a private citizen or even a private company can be sued for alleged wrongdoing. JASTA deals with immunity of foreign states. So the White House's press comments that enacting JASTA will threaten suits against the U.S., which Mr. Earnest emphasized as a risk of JASTA, are categorically untrue. I am sure the White House knows that, too."

"And more importantly, our military is not at risk for being sued if JASTA is enacted. The narrow text of JASTA, like our legal history, specifically distinguishes between acts of war and acts of terrorism. The text of the bill, for anyone who cares to read it—and it is surprisingly short—specifically excludes acts of war. I am sure the White House knows that, too."

"JASTA requires that the terrorist attack at issue must have been done by a terror organization formally designated under U.S. law. To equate what we do to protect ourselves from terrorism with what others do in support of terrorism completely misreads the bill and discourages U.S. policy."

Sen. Blumenthal (D-CT) affirmed: "If the Saudi government is innocent, it has nothing to fear from a day in court. If it is culpable, it should be held accountable. This legislation makes no pre-judgment, it reaches no verdict. It simply says that the Saudi government, or its agents or its operative, or any other foreign actor, has to be in court to defend itself."

July 15, 2016 saw the release of the now-famous 28 pages, which show that individuals in the Saudi government were involved in supporting the 9/11 hijackers, specifically the two that lived in San Diego in the period leading up to the attacks. The 28 pages are just the tip of the iceberg of the hundreds of thousands of still-classified pages detailing what the FBI knew about Saudi involvement in orchestrating the attacks. It is this classified status which allows the Saudi Monarchy to claim their innocence to this day.

Why would the Saudi government spend hundreds of thousands of dollars lobbying the U.S. Congress not to pass JASTA, if they were innocent? Why does Obama go to such lengths to defend the



Terry Strada, a 9/11 widow, has fought for years to declassify the suppressed 28 pages of the Joint Congressional Report, and for JASTA.

Saudis, the world's leading exporter of terrorism, if he does not support the spread of terrorism, as in Syria?

The truth must be told about the Anglo-Saudi global terror machine. The passage of JASTA is not only critical for shutting down the Obama-backed Saudi terror regime, it demonstrates what a small but powerful group of ordinary citizens can do in the name of justice.



Senator Richard Blumenthal (D-CT) speaks alongside 9/11 family members at a press conference at the US Capitol building in support of the passage of JASTA, explicitly disagreeing with Obama.

## Behind the Notes

This interview with John Sigerson, Musical Director of the Schiller Institute and Conductor for the 9/11 Living Memorial performances of Mozart's Requiem held throughout the NYC area, was conducted on September 20, 2016.

Q: How did your approach to directing and balancing the orchestra and chorus in the Requiem differ from that which we often hear as the approach to Mozart's work at location such as the "Mostly Mozart" performed at Lincoln Center?

A: Well, it's been many years since I've listened to Mostly Mozart at Lincoln Center, so I don't want to say anything about that particular ensemble today. But I will say that ever since the 1980s, I've noticed a marked shift in the attitude of many professional string players in how they believe they are expected to play works of Mozart and other composers of that era. Instead of the rich, passionate bow-strokes typified by Lyndon LaRouche's friend Norbert Brainin, who led the Amadeus Quartet for so many years, string players began to believe what was required of them for Mozart, was shorter bow-strokes and very little vibrato, a practice which tends to destroy the beautiful legato line which is the hallmark of great *bel canto* singing.

At the same time, what I can fairly describe as a false dichotomy developed between "instrumental" and "vocal" performance. In his written works, Lyndon LaRouche has often inveighed against the absurdity of this dichotomy, and has rightly insisted that the fount of all Classical performance is the well-trained *bel canto* singing voice. What he said resonated with me personally, too, because in my student time at Juilliard, I was fortunate enough to study with the great contrabass soloist Gary Karr, who insisted that even on that seemingly grumbly instrument, one must sing passionately and expressively, and not just saw away at the notes.

This kind of dichotomy goes even further back to the conflict between Wilhelm Furtwängler and Arturo Toscanini regarding the relationship of the musician to the musical score. Whereas Toscanini insisted that his purpose was to interpret as exactly as possible what is in the written score, Furtwängler countered that the performer must always strive to recreate the work in such a way that listeners are drawn into the mind of its creator, and that therefore the performance must focus not so much on the notes themselves, as what is "behind the notes." And of course, I'm on Furtwängler's side on that.

Q: How did the Sunday performance, embedded in the Catholic liturgy, differ from the others?

A: What we planned jointly with the Co-Cathedral of St. Joseph in Brooklyn on Sunday, Sept. 11

was in fact a unique experiment integrating the Mozart Requiem with a Sunday Catholic Mass. The Requiem Mass service is generally never performed on Sunday, and so in the course of a number of meetings with Msgr. Kieran Harrington, the Parish Rector of the Cathedral, we fashioned a sequence which was both congenial to the performance requirements of our chorus and orchestra, while at the same time adhering to the liturgical requirements.

One question that immediately came up in those discussions, was the Requiem's lack of a "Gloria" section as required by the liturgy. This I solved by inserting a "Gloria" section from one of Mozart's earlier masses, namely his *Missa Brevis in D-minor*, which is in the same key and mode as the Requiem.

And it came as a nice, not so surprising surprise, that at the very end of this little "Gloria," Mozart inserts a little proto-fugal theme which foreshadows the Requiem's main "Kyrie eleison" fugal subject—which, in turn, harkens back to J.S. Bach's and Handel's magnificent work with this same theme.

Q: How did the C=256 tuning change the transparency exhibited in the performances?

A: Just to be clear: We performed at the Verdi tuning of A=432 Hz, which is slightly higher than the A=430.5 Hz required for setting Middle C at exactly 256 Hz. Both of these slightly different tunings work fine with the vocal registration that Verdi was concerned about, however I have tended to stick with A=432 Hz because it's marginally easier to get an orchestra with modern instruments to play at that pitch. For example, in our performance the clarinets were right at their limit, and I doubt they could have played in tune even one cycle lower.

As far as transparency is concerned, we are still at the very start of being able to construct an orchestra that can play really well and easily on modern instruments (i.e., not "period" instruments) at the Verdi tuning. We still have a great number of technological problems to solve in this regard, and until they are solved, everything is quite experimental.

But as for the chorus, there is definitely greater transparency, not only because the vocal registration works (even though many singers in the chorus are only half aware of where their registers sit), but because there is a certain ease or rightness which sets in once singers become accustomed to singing at this tuning. And this ease of delivery results in greater transparency—and a lot more fun!

Q: Is there, in fact, any appreciable difference, which is important, between the first sections of the Requiem, and those composed by Süssmayr after Mozart's death?

A: For anyone who has seriously studied this work, there is a definite difference between the genius shown in the sections by Mozart, and the respectfully workmanlike completions by Süssmayr. For me personally, the difference becomes most palpable in that indescribable moment where Mozart, near death, breaks off after the first bars of the "Lacrymosa," which had to be completed by Süssmayr, based only on Mozart's verbal indications.

Another example is the "Benedictus." As beautiful as Süssmayr's composition of this section is, I can't help thinking that had Mozart been able to compose it, it would have had something much more profound, perhaps foreshadowing the incredible "Benedictus" section of Beethoven's *Missa Solemnis*.

Q: There was a notable difference in the attack delivered at the very beginning of the Requiem performances, and there was also a significant difference in how you conducted and how the chorus sang sections such as the Lacrymosa section. Why was that?

A: The opening back-and-forth in the strings has to evoke the deliberately slow, solemn, somewhat hesitant steps as one enters the cathedral to participate in the Requiem. Both the tempo and the slightly lengthened bow-strokes must reflect that. I almost succeeded in getting this, but lack of rehearsal time prevented me from getting exactly what I wanted.



John Sigerson demonstrating the science of the Verdi tuning at a Schiller Institute conference in NYC, January 26, 2013. He illustrated his argument by having the chorus perform the chorus "Va Pensiero" from Verdi's opera Nabucco, at the A=432 Hz Verdi tuning, and then at the popular A=440 Hz tuning.