

**Vi må genoplive et sandt USA.
Der har aldrig været et
større øjeblik til at udvikle
LaRouches ideer.**

**LaRouchePAC Internationale
Webcast, 4. nov., 2016; Leder**

Matthew Ogden: Jeg tror, vi helt bestemt kan sige, at vi befinder os i en meget farlig, men afgørende periode i vores historie lige nu; både nationalt og internationalt. Tiden efter valget, der finder sted næste tirsdag, vil fordre et meget fattet, klart og sobert lederskab, som kun LaRouchePAC kan yde. Jeg tror, at vi nu ser den rolle, vi har kunnet skabe; og faktum er, at, umiddelbart efter valget, må vi have en hastedebat i USA's Kongres med en omgående vedtagelse af Glass-Steagall, som det første hasteskridt. Det afgørende, første skridt i et helt økonomisk genrejsningsprogram, som må indføres i USA; og der må gribes til afgørende handling for at forhindre præsident Obama i at lancere Tredje Verdenskrig i de sidste uger af hans embedstid.

Tidligere sagde Diane [Sare] – jeg citerer kort og lader hende selv sige lidt mere; men, under en diskussion med hr. og fr. LaRouche kom et meget vigtigt punkt frem. Der er en masse såkaldt »analyse« og propaganda derude i nyhedsmedierne og andetsteds, der siger, at det amerikanske folk er mere splittet end nogensinde tidligere som nation, osv., osv. Men sandheden er, at det amerikanske folk faktisk er mere forenet end nogensinde før, omkring disse to afgørende hovedspørgsmål: den omgående vedtagelse af Glass-Steagall og nedlukning af Wall Street; og forhindring af atomkrig, at forhindre, at Obama starter Tredje Verdenskrig. Dette skyldes naturligvis

ikke mindst LaRouchePAC's vedvarende indsats i løbet af de seneste år; men hovedsagligt koncentreret i de seneste måneder med det, vi har kunnet katalysere fra vores base i New York City, i Manhattan.

Lad mig blot nævne to ting, som jeg mener, demonstrerer denne pointe meget klart. Der var en ny opinionsundersøgelse, der blev offentliggjort i begyndelsen af ugen, og som sagde, at, i nøgle-kampstaterne, må-vinde-staterne – Ohio, Michigan, North Carolina og Florida, og et par andre stater – sagde 70 % af de sandsynlige vælgere, der blev spurgt, at Glass-Steagall, med navns nævnelse, var en nødvendighed. De var tilhængere af Glass-Steagall. 68 % sagde, at de var tilhængere af at bryde Wall Street-bankerne op. Dernæst sagde en anden opinionsundersøgelse, der blev offentliggjort tidligere på ugen – foretaget af Marylands Universitet – at 2/3 af amerikanerne, inklusive 65 % af Demokraterne, ønsker mere samarbejde mellem USA og Rusland; især mht. at løse krisen i Syrien. Det taler netop om den pointe, som du, Diane, fastslog. Men hvad der fortsat er klart, er, at det afgørende program fortsat er LaRouches Fire Økonomiske Love; baseret direkte på de principper, som Alexander Hamilton brugte til at opbygge USA. Vi kan inspireres og modellere det, vi må gøre i dette land i løbet af de kommende uger og måneder, ud fra det, der finder sted med et nyt paradigme, der foregår i hele verden i andre lande, inklusive i Kina. Vi har eksempler, som Jason Ross vil gennemgå; meget solide, konkrete eksempler på, hvad man har gjort i Egypten for at bygge den nye Suezkanal, og i andre lande. Det vil Jason Ross fremlægge lidt om senere i udsendelsen; baseret på en præsentation for det Amerikanske Selskab af Civilingeniørers afdeling i New York City for et par uger siden.s

Lad os begynde diskussion herfra.

Engelsk udskrift af hele webcastet, er dagens leder fra LaRouchePAC:

WE'VE GOT TO REVIVE A TRUE UNITED STATES.
THERE'S NEVER BEEN A GREATER MOMENT
TO DEVELOP LAROUCHE'S IDEAS.

International Webcast, Nov. 4, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening; it's November 4, 2016.

My
name is Matthew Ogden; and you're joining us for our weekly
Friday evening broadcast here from larouchepac.com. I'm
joined
in the studio tonight by Jason Ross from the LaRouche PAC
Science
Team; and via video, by two members of the LaRouche PAC Policy
Committee: Diane Sare, joining us from New York City; and
Michael
Steger, joining us from San Francisco, California.

Now, I think it can be said very definitively that we
are in
an extremely dangerous but decisive period in our history
right
now; both nationally and internationally. The aftermath of
this
election coming up next Tuesday is going to require very calm,
clear, and sober leadership which only LaRouche PAC can
provide.
I think what we're seeing right now is the role that we've
been
able to leverage; and the fact is, that immediately following
this election, an emergency debate will have to take place
inside
the United States Congress with a vote scheduled promptly on
Glass-Steagall as the emergency first step. The critical
first
step in an entire recovery program that must be instituted in
the

United States; and decisive action must be taken to prevent President Obama from launching World War III in the remaining weeks that he has in office.

Now, Diane said earlier – which I just want to cite and let her say a little bit more on; but during a discussion we had with Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche, a very important point [came up]. There's a lot of so-called "analysis" and propaganda out there in the news media and elsewhere, saying that the American people are more divided than they've ever been as a nation, etc., etc. But in truth, in fact, the American people are more united than perhaps they've ever been around these two key critical issues: the immediate passage of Glass-Steagall, shutting down Wall Street; and preventing thermonuclear war, preventing Obama from starting World War III. This is obviously due in no small part to the consistent efforts of LaRouche PAC over the recent number of years; but focussed mainly over the recent number of months with what we've been able to catalyze from our base in New York City, in Manhattan.

Let me just cite two quick things that I think demonstrate this point very clearly. There was a new poll that came out at the beginning of this week that said that in the key battleground states, the must-win states – Ohio, Michigan, North Carolina, Florida, a couple of other states – 70% of the likely voters polled said that Glass-Steagall by name was a necessity. They were in support of Glass-Steagall. 68% said that they were in

support of breaking up the Wall Street banks. Then another poll that came out earlier this week – this one done by the University of Maryland – said that 2/3 of Americans, including 65% of Democrats, want more cooperation between the United States and Russia; particularly having to do with resolving the crisis in Syria. So, I think that speaks exactly to the point that Diane, you were making. But what remains clear, is the critical program remains LaRouche's Four Economic Laws; based directly on the principles that Alexander Hamilton used to build the United States. We can be inspired and model what we have to do in this country over the coming weeks and months off of what is happening with a new paradigm happening around the world in other countries, including China. We have examples that Jason Ross is going to go through; very solid, concrete examples of what's been done in Egypt to build the new Suez Canal, and others. So, Jason will present some of that a little bit later in the show; based off of a presentation that he made to the American Society of Civil Engineers chapter in New York City a couple of weeks back.

But let me just leave it at that; and I think we can start the discussion from there.

DIANE SARE: Well, I was – as often I am – was inspired by

the local morning news; which both the local New Jersey paper I get and the {New York Times} had these articles as Matt said about how divided the population was. The truth of the matter is, the population is not divided. People are divided over which candidate they hate more; and people have enormous hatred for Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump. In that regard, I just have to say that Hillary Clinton – who is the continuation of the Bush/Obama legacy and is a total stooge of the British Empire, George Soros, and everything that represents – and is putting us on a trajectory for war with Russia; she absolutely has to be stopped. And Obama absolutely has to be thrown out of the White House; and if that could have happened yesterday, that would have been excellent. And we do have the Congress coming in the week after the election. But it's not as if the American people don't realize that their standard of living has completely collapsed, particularly in the last 15 years. There is enormous rage at Wall Street; where I think there was another poll where something over 90% or 94% said that Wall Street bankers should be put in jail. So, the American people are very unified that they think that the people who actually destroyed the US economy, which is not – as we're so often told by the Wall Street bankers and billionaires, just as in the time preceding Franklin Roosevelt – that the people who caused the depression were all those unemployed working class people. The people who caused this

are

the people who run these financial institutions – like the CEO of Wells Fargo, like George Soros; like the people who were behind the assassination of Herrhausen and then took over Deutsche Bank and turned it into a disaster. These people are responsible for this, and they should be punished in a way that would begin to restore confidence to people that there was justice.

It is also the case that the majority of Americans are tired of war. We have been in perpetual war frankly since the reunification of Germany – which was the intent; but particularly since September 11th. I think people can reflect on

what happened with the override of Obama's veto on JASTA; the vote against Obama was 97-1. I would say that's a pretty strongly unified Senate against the Saudi role in terrorism and

the cover-up. Whatever occurs on Tuesday and Wednesday, the potential following that is going to be extraordinary for us to

pull the nation together and demand that the policy – starting with LaRouche's Four Laws – which is Glass-Steagall and emphatically a system of national banking and credit that allows

us to fund the things that are on the most advanced scientific levels. That is, our nation can pull itself together and do this; and it is not going to be a period where people just doze

off, because as I said, everyone hates both of the candidates so

intensely that no one will feel safe giving them a grace period

to see what they do.

So, I think everyone who is watching this, should mobilize;

inform yourself of the program, study the material on the larouchepac.com site, and presume that 90% or more of your neighbors on what has to be done to save the nation, and that that's the direction in which we can move.

MICHAEL STEGER: I think there's been a number of cases where people have gone out to the American people and found out what's

actually out there. This is an undeniable characteristic. 70%

to 80% of the American people agree fundamentally on that; and they also agree that our political establishment – the people who have been run by Wall Street, by this war policy – are bankrupt. There is no trust or commitment towards their ability

to lead the country; that's why you saw such an upsurge in support for populist candidates like Sanders or Trump. And that's why this Hamilton conception – and it stands out more and

more as we get deeper and deeper into this kind of crisis, and closer and closer to where a decision has to be made to address

it – what Mr. LaRouche did on the question of Hamilton. Because

Hamilton really captures this as an essence of the unification of

the American people around a conception. Hamilton's politics, Hamilton's economic policy recognized the very clear necessity of

every person in the country. Hamilton, as any real economist would, recognized that we had a deficiency of people; we need more immigration, we needed more diversity. We needed different

people from different backgrounds. That's how an actual nation

thrives and functions; there's that commitment.

I think probably the best example we have today on the

planet is what you saw from Vladimir Putin's leadership. Because Putin came in, he was dedicated to the Russian people; there were a lot of factions, a lot of anger, a lot of resentment towards what had happened in Russia. And Putin's commitment – as was Hamilton's, as is Lyn's and is our organization's – is a commitment to the entire development of the entire nation and all of its people. That's what we have to have; you're not going to find – no candidate right now is going to be perfect. That's pretty clear I think to every American. But is there a devotion, a deeper one? What we've referenced in people like Joan of Arc; or what you saw in examples of Abraham Lincoln? Lincoln captured that same Hamilton almost to a deep, profound spiritual commitment to the people of the United States; all of them. There was "malice towards none". That we're going to take the entire population of our country and develop it in a very rapid capability. Any executive, any Presidency that comes in today – and one must – that adopts these programs; the Glass-Steagall, the basic Hamilton Four Laws that Lyn has put forward; our collaboration with Russia on the terrorism question, with China on the economic question will easily gain the favor and support of 70% to 80% if not more of the American people.

I think the one thing that stands out – because we raised this question to Mr. LaRouche over a year ago in discussion. What he raised I think is worth raising here, and I think we can

discuss it more. Why do the American people then think there is this separation? How can they be easily deceived into thinking this separation exists? It's because of the attack on the human mind going back to the early 20th Century. They took the human mind and said, actually there's two different kinds of human minds. Some people have a left mind and some people have a right mind; some people have a math mind, some people have a poetry mind. They attacked the actual characteristic of human identity; that underlying, unifying creative characteristic that makes us human. They separated it out into styles and to niches and categories. Once you have that, you then have all of a sudden, people identifying in different factions or categories of society based on the way they think their mind works versus the way somebody else's mind works. That's where you get the scientific flaw; that's the fraud. That was the fraud of Bertrand Russell; that was the power of the creative genius of Hamilton, or of Einstein, or of Lyn to recognize the human mind is a universal characteristic. That's the basis of economics; that's the basis of a nation or a political process. That really is the basis of real leadership; why Percy Shelley says the poets are the true legislators of the world, because they identify that human characteristic in human identity. I think is what is really critical; that quality of leadership today with this kind of crisis.

OGDEN: One thing I think, "with malice toward none" and with charity towards all; the sense of the development of the entire nation was a devotion that Abraham Lincoln possessed. But the key word is development. When you look at the situation at this point in the United States, after 15 years of a Bush-Cheney and Obama policy, you have mass despair, desperation, anger, rage. Why did we reach the point now where we've got an election which is unprecedented in history? Where you have drug addictions and drug overdoses that are unequalled in recent memory? Where you have no productive work for people to be engaged in? Now the working class is somehow defined as people who are greeters at Walmart, or work at temporary jobs at Target? This is not a working class; this is not a skilled labor force; this is not a population that has a sense that their lives have consequence, or meaning. I think if you look at the situation in other countries where you've had real leadership in the recent years – at the same time that we've been suffering under the lack of leadership of the Obama administration – you've had other nations who have had leaders who have been devoted to the development of their nations. And they took populations that were similarly desperate, demoralized, enraged; take a look at Egypt, for example – and have given them a sense of mission and purpose. The accomplishments in Egypt, the accomplishments in China; lifting 700 million people out of poverty. The kind of radiation of optimism that has come from nations such as that,

through this New Silk Road paradigm and otherwise; this is something which the American people are desperate for access to.

Perhaps they don't realize that that's the key, that's what they

are seeking. But I'm sure that the expression of despair, demoralization, anger, and rage – the only antidote for that is

a commitment to the development of the nation, much in the way that Abraham Lincoln in his way, applied the principles of Alexander Hamilton and understood that that's how you bridge the

seemingly irreparable fault lines within a people. And that's how you bring people together again, with a sense of commitment

to building the future.

With that said, it would be critical for us to get a sense

of exactly, in detail, what are the particular ways in which that

kind of program could happen, with the commitment from the top,

within days, weeks, and months of a completely new paradigm and

new Presidency in the United States.

JASON ROSS: I've put together a few aids to thinking about this.

In particular, thinking about what the implementation of LaRouche's Four Laws look like. In discussing that, I also want

to think about this in terms of Hamilton. I'm very happy to say,

that Hamilton's four great economic writings, along with the Four

Laws of Lyndon LaRouche, will be available on Amazon {very soon}.

It's been submitted. It should only be a few more days. I'll be reading some quotes from this.

Let's take a look at what an economic recovery would look like, using LaRouche's Four Laws. Let me read what LaRouche said the remedy to the current situation is. LaRouche writes,

"The only location for the immediately necessary action which could prevent such an immediate genocide throughout the trans-Atlantic sector of the planet, requires the U.S. government's now immediate decision to institute four specific cardinal measures – measures which must be fully consistent with the specific intent of the original U.S. Federal Constitution, as had been specified by U.S. Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton while in office. (1) Immediate reenactment of the Glass-Steagall Law, instituted by U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt, without modification as to principle of action. (2) A return to a system of top-down, thoroughly defined national banking." Skipping ahead: "(3) The purpose of the use of a federal credit system, is to generate high productivity trends in improvements in employment, with the accompanying intention to increase the physical economic productivity and standard of living of the persons and households of the United States." And "(4)", LaRouche writes, "Adopt a fusion-driver 'crash program.' The essential distinction of man from all lower forms of life, is that it presents the means for the perfection of the specifically affirmative aims and needs of the human individual and social

life."

Let's take a look through some of these Four Laws. The first step is Glass-Steagall, which I'll just say a little bit about.

This is something we've discussed frequently [laughs] and to great effect, I think, in our programs and on our website.

Take a look here. [Fig. 1] This is what percent of supposed

U.S. income, what percent of the value added in our GDP, comes from manufacturing – you see that there in blue—vs. "f.i.r.e.,"

which stands for finance, insurance, and real estate. For over 30

years now, the world of finance itself has {supposedly}, according to official thinking, contributed as much to U.S. productivity and economy, as has manufacturing. Flipping houses

– that kind of thing – is now as productive as manufacturing steel, or building things. It's crazy!

Over this period, [Fig. 2] – this is Lyndon LaRouche's Triple Curve, a pedagogical device that he had used to describe

the increase in monetary and financial aggregates, at the same time that the {physical} economic output of the economy was collapsing—something that we've been in a situation of for decades now.

What we need to do, then, is make it {possible} to be able

to finance a recovery. Alexander Hamilton, in his reports on public credit and the national bank and on its constitutionality,

describes the importance of banking. Banks can provide an essential function for the economy. They're not optional. They provide an essential useful function. Now, they're tied up, in a

way, where the potential of the banking sector is impossible

right now, because they're involved in all sorts of speculation and gambling. By implementing Glass-Steagall, we make it possible for the banking sector to be able to play that useful role, while jailing and shutting down all of the people behind the caused collapse that's been created and the looting that's been taking place via Wall Street.

We've got a lot of very good recent editions to our website.

The Economics Frequently Asked Questions page at larouche.com/econ-facts. This addresses some of these questions that come up that {you} may have heard when talking to people about these things. [For example:] "If Glass-Steagall were still law, it wouldn't have stopped the crash of 2007-8." Are you sick of hearing that? Well, you can now just send people the explanations here. You don't really need to waste your time with it. It's very clear.

So, Glass-Steagall's the first step. Step 2 that Mr. LaRouche describes is national banking. This is definitely a more complex concept. I direct people, again, to the works of Alexander Hamilton on this, to get a sense from the beginning, of what it meant to have a national bank, or the role that banking could play in the nation. I'd point to the success of this approach under the administrations of Hamilton, of John Quincy Adams, of Lincoln, and of Franklin Roosevelt, who, in various ways, created the effect, if not in deed, national banking, through a facility for the promotion of credit and directing

it
in an economy.

One of the most horrific ideas that people have about how economics works, is that you shouldn't try to direct anything; that government should always stay out; that the "invisible hand" does everything in the best possible way. This is something that Hamilton addresses very directly, countering the arguments of Adam Smith's {Wealth of Nations}, for example, in these reports.

Once we decide that we're going to have a national orientation, and actually choose a direction to go, the question then is, how do we direct this credit in the direction of programs that are going to increase the energy-flux density? How then do we understand "energy-flux density?" This is an economics concept that Mr. LaRouche has employed over the years in his understanding of economy.

We have to think about what is the basis of the transformation of the human species, over time, in a way that's uncharacteristic of any other form of life. This chart of Population Growth Over the Historical Time Period [Fig. 3] is of {human} population growth. It couldn't have been the growth of any animal species acting on its own. Animal species don't transform their relationship to nature. They can't discover principles. They might use a tool, like a stick, to do something, or a rock. They don't use principles as tools.

The beginning of this, the real starting point for this for us historically, certainly in Europe, or extended European

civilization, is Prometheus, the Greek story of Prometheus, who really created humanity. Before Prometheus, who, as the story goes, took fire from heaven and gave it to mankind, human beings were animals. Prometheus describes that when he saw mankind, we were just animals. We had eyes to see (but we didn't understand); we had ears, but we didn't understand anything. We lived like swarming ants. What did Prometheus do? He brought fire, he brought astronomy, he brought navigation, he brought beasts of burden, he brought sailing, he brought agriculture, he brought the calendar, he brought poetry, he brought written language, mathematics, science, knowledge, fire. What defines us as a species, as in this original story of the creation of the specifically human species, is this power of fire.

We now consider the different kinds of fire that have been developed over historical time. Take a look at this [Fig. 4]. This is the Use of Different Forms of Energy over the History of the United States. Two trends we can see here: (1) the Energy Used per Person has, overall, increased – although not at a uniform rate. It's not increasing now. The other thing that we can notice, is that (2) the Type of Fuel Used has changed, over time. Wood has very niche applications at present, as a fuel. Wood is used for furniture, not for burning. Coal replaced the use of wood, saving forests, making it possible to not have to cut down all sorts of trees to make metals by making charcoal out of the wood. Oil and natural gas supplanted the use of coal. Nuclear fission – which never reached its full potential – in this projection, from the era of the Kennedy administration, was expected to become a primary, dominant form of power for the

United States, and, indeed, as seen in the world.

What this shows us, is, yeah, using {more} energy. The other thing is the {type} of energy. What can you do with that energy?

Think about what you can do with oil and natural gas that you can't do with coal or wood. You can't run a car with wood. You can't run a car with coal. You can run a car on oil. You can't run a train on wood! You can run a train on coal. What can we do

with nuclear power that we can't do with lower forms? Think about

how with coal we can use wood for furniture instead of for burning. Oil: that's what we make plastic out of. Oil is a useful

substance. It's a wonderful material. It's a great source of carbon, which, by its chemical nature, is able to form {enormous}

molecules. Here it is, sitting in the ground, ready to be used to

make all sorts of products, and we're burning it! It's, you know,

it's stupid!

With the potential that we've got, of shifting to a real

nuclear economy, of developing fusion, we would be reaching another stage of energy-flux density. What's the power, the throughput power of your energy source? And, what qualitative improvements does it bring? What new things does it allow you to do?

You can't have economic development without power, without energy. Here's a chart [Fig. 5] of Electricity Use per Capita vs.

GDP per Capita. I know GDP per Capita is not the best measure, but it's very clear what you see with these things. If you

say,

which parts of the world seen here are relatively wealthy and have higher living standards and life expectancies? Well, it's the places where you see the most light. The places where it's dark, that's not because people are people are fond of astronomy

in that region and keep their lights off at night so that they can see the stars better. It's because there's not development.

Infrastructure itself really serves as the mediator, the great mediator, of higher forms of energy-flux density into the

economy as a whole – the mediator of bringing new technologies into achieving a maximal expression in the economy by partaking

in almost all of the processes that go on in an economy.

We now consider the fourth of Mr. LaRouche's Four Laws,

which is the call for a crash program on nuclear fusion. This [Fig. 6] is a chart that was created back in 1976, which frequent

viewers of this website no doubt have seen several times. What this chart showed was, based on how much money was devoted to achieving the fusion breakthrough, at what year it was anticipated that the great breakthrough for a commercial fusion

reactor would take place. In '76 it was considered that if a maximum possible effort were put into this – something on the scale of the Manhattan Project, or the Apollo Project to go to the Moon – if we took that approach with fusion, it was anticipated that we would have had it over 25 years ago! Even at

a moderate level of funding, we should have had it a decade ago,

according to this projection, which isn't necessarily exactly right. Actual funding for fusion has been {below the level}

that

was anticipated in the '70s to {never achieve fusion}. In other words, there has been a decision not to reach the next level of

Promethean fire; not to make that breakthrough on fusion.

Why would that happen? Who would hold back the development

of fusion power? Is it the oil industry trying to make money selling more oil? No; that is way too simplistic. It is the brutish outlook of the British Empire, of Zeus earlier – Zeus, the character from the Prometheus story. Zeus, the tyrannical god who created his own power in part by holding back others. By

preventing mankind from making this step, this is one of the greatest crimes that has ever been committed; the deliberate underfunding of fusion and the campaign to prevent its development.

I don't want to go on forever; let me just show a few projects that the US ought to participate in with a sane outlook.

There's a different paradigm going on in the world right now, with the BRICS highly representing this; it represents the decades of work by LaRouche and the LaRouche Movement.

Organizing for this World Land-Bridge proposal; something that's

been promoted for decades now. This proposal, the power of this

idea to change the world, is absolutely being realized at present. This concept that Lyndon and Helga LaRouche have been

organizing for, is now Chinese policy; the One Belt, One Road program that is now bringing together over 70 nations

[representing] the majority of the world's population. The greatest potential for economic growth in the world; this is a policy that is taking place.

Instead, the United States under Obama – who should be thrown out of office yesterday, as Diane said, if not last

week,

last month, last year; those would all be even better – is holding these things back. What would it look like if we joined?

One thing would be the Bering Strait crossing; a proposal that was first discussed over a century ago. Really bringing the United States, via land, into coordination and connection with Eurasia and Africa, with the rest of the world in a very serious

way; a new way and a more efficient way than sea-borne shipping.

Within the United States, we've got [Fig. ??] to test your geography here, this is the US on the left; and on the right that

is China. Similar nations. Look at all that high-speed rail in

China that you see in blue, and probably some of the red; since

this map was made, they've probably completed it, they're building it so rapidly. The United States doesn't have a high-speed rail network; we barely have a rail network. Instead,

we use the less-efficient form of road transportation for freight

and for people stuck in traffic jams. What would it mean to build a network that makes the United States more efficient, more

productive? How many jobs would be involved in building new cities, in building the kinds of power plants that would be required? What kind of power could we have over our physical economy with the really full development of control over the water cycle? It is within our means to create desalination right

now in California to provide for coastal water needs if we wanted

to do that. It's within our ability to serious and in-depth research on atmospheric ionization and other technologies to

control the water cycle. It's within our ability to transfer water that has already fallen on land; but we need to insure that there's actually enough to make that a possibility.

So, let me read a couple of quotes from Alexander Hamilton here, in terms of where an understanding of an increase in energy flux density, of where economic growth comes from. It doesn't come from money; it comes from the human mind. Here's Treasury Secretary Hamilton. He's describing in the beginning of his "Report on Manufactures" whether it makes sense to have a manufacturing economy, as opposed to a purely agricultural one; which today seems like a stupid argument to even have, but it was something that Thomas Jefferson didn't get, for example. Because he wanted to keep the American economy from developing; he didn't have that same outlook of human beings – clearly – that Alexander Hamilton did.

So, Hamilton writes that "the work of artificers as opposed to cultivators", that is, manufacturing as opposed to farming, "is susceptible of a greater improvement in a proportionately greater degree of improvement of its productive powers; whether by the accession of skill, or from the application of ingenious machinery" – labor saving. How does the development of a new technology transform the potential of a production in an economy?

This is a quote Matt had used: Hamilton writes – on page 148 when you get the book – "It merits particular observation that the multiplication of manufactories not only furnishes a

market

for those articles which have been accustomed to be produced in

abundance in a country, but it likewise creates a demand for such

as were either unknown or produced in inconsiderable quantities.

The bowels as well as the surface of the Earth are ransacked for

articles which were before neglected. Animals, plants, and minerals acquire a utility and value which were before

unexplored. Iron ore wasn't iron ore before the Iron Age; it was

a rock. Malachite wasn't copper ore before the Bronze Age; it was just a green rock that Egyptians used for mascara." You

transform the value of the things around you; the mind transforms

what those things are. That rock was transformed into ore by the

human mind. We change the universe through our discoveries; we

transform our relationship to it, we change what it is, what it

can participate in.

Hamilton understood that the purpose of the United States

was nothing less than the promotion of the General Welfare.

This

quote is a bit long to read, but it's on page 187; and it's where

he describes that there shouldn't be a limitation – except what

comes up in the Constitution – that the promotion of the General

Welfare he says "the term General Welfare, doubtless intended to

signify more than was expressed or imported in those parts of

the
Constitution and Congress' powers which preceded it. This
phrase
is as comprehensive as any that could have been used, because
it
was not fit that the Constitutional authority of the Union to
appropriate its revenues should have been restricted within
narrower limits than the General Welfare." The real point to
take is that it's a different economic outlook. What China is
doing is great, but it's not up to the level of what it should
be. The concept embodied in the One Belt, One Road project is
positive; it's very good. But what really needs to be brought
to
this is the explicit understanding of its basis in the human
identity. The human ability to make discoveries that
transform
our relationship to Nature; that's the key to economics. We
see
its effects in various studies we might do about how building
a
road transforms the amount of agricultural production in an
area;
or how bringing in a stable power supply allows factories not
to
have to turn off every three hours when the power goes out –
what transformations that has. But the real key is to give a
mission to people by participating in the ability to bring
that
to a yet higher level of understanding, of living standards,
and
of participation in that process. That's the key thing;
create a
society where people are able to participate knowingly in that
increase.

OGDEN: As Jason said, the four economic reports that Hamilton
wrote were the founding documents of the American republic in

a
very real sense; and he was conscious of that. He said, we
can
have political independence, but without economic independence
we
are nothing; we won't survive as a country. And there are
scientific principles which need to be understood and applied.
But just as those were the founding documents at that point,
we
now have a founding document of a new era in the economy of
the
United States in this LaRouche Four Economic Laws. It's a
distillation and an elaboration of the principles that
Alexander
Hamilton understood, for the 21st Century, for today. A
commitment to the fusion program, a commitment to space
exploration on a massive scale. The same way that Franklin
Roosevelt had the New Deal, the same way John F Kennedy had
the
new frontiers, we have a new paradigm. And it's a vision of
the
future which, if fully committed to, will absolutely within
the
lifetimes of the people who are living today, transform what
the
human species is capable of. And it's that sense of the
opportunity of an evolution of the entire human species to an
entirely new level of capability; that's what we experienced
in
the aftermath of Hamilton's breakthrough, the aftermath of the
American Revolution. It's an opportunity in perhaps a larger
and
more comprehensive form today, where you have the opportunity
for
a collaboration among nations that is unprecedented in the
history of mankind.

So, if you hold up against that, the kind of

criminality of
Wall Street; the kind of rabid war-mongering and saber-
rattling,
the threat of World War III and thermonuclear war; I think the
gut feeling of the American people around Glass-Steagall,
around
stopping World War III, this is something which – as Diane
said
– has the potential to unify the population in a way perhaps
we've never seen before or in a long time. But it has to be
developed to a level which contains the type of depth that you
just witnessed with the presentation that Jason just gave.

SARE: I just want to add – I know we're getting close
to
the end of our time, but Mr. LaRouche has said on numerous
occasions that the American people need to assemble
themselves;
that they have lost confidence in their own ability to reason
through the crisis and to act in their own interest. But I
think
what we've seen in this presentation is what LaRouche has been
putting forward frankly for years; and the material that is on
our website allows us to have the program and the conception.
Particularly the conception of what it means to be human;
which
is what the United States is based on, according to Alexander
Hamilton and our Constitution. That is something around which
the American people can mobilize; just as when the Berlin Wall
came down, the Soviet Union disintegrated in 1989. You had an
economic system that completely collapsed, and people turned
to
Beethoven and Schiller. Well, we are seeing such a moment now
in
the trans-Atlantic system; and we have here Alexander Hamilton
and Lyndon LaRouche. I am confident, although we cannot count
on

anything 100%, that the population of the United States can be mobilized on this level, and not something lower; and that that potential will become very apparent in the next few days.

STEGER: I think it's just worth stating – China just accomplished another major advancement in their space program. They launched the Long March 5 rocket; this is a 25-ton payload rocket. Japan is now going to be working with Russia it looks like, based on the discussion that Putin and Prime Minister Abe will be having in December, of Japan making an even larger investment into the new Cosmodrome, the new space city up in the Far East of Russia near the Pacific. These nations are dedicated to this kind of advancement; and it only condemns further what Obama has done these last eight years. The first initial steps of this Presidency were to tear down the very space program that these nations have now recreated in their own way on an advanced scale. An Apollo project-like scale of development is what you see now in China with their space program. How dare Obama do this? How dare Hillary Clinton think that she can win a Presidency while chaining herself to this insane legacy? The drone killings; the murders; the wars; the bail-outs; the shutdown of the space program as the first act of the Presidency; the failure of Obamacare? Bill Clinton had the intelligence to recognize this Obamacare was the most insane policy anybody ever adopted; and as soon as he said that, I guess he was thrown

into
the broom closet, because you haven't seen him since. Then
you
see Obama and Hillary marching hand-in-hand; it really is
insane.
Obama should be condemned in every possible way. And if
Hillary
is going to tie herself to this legacy – blaming the KGB on
email leaks from her server? Blaming the KGB and Putin
because
she has not operated in a way of the dignity of the US
Presidency
to lead the American people at a time of crisis? To bomb
countries like Libya? To support the overthrow of Assad and
the
possible conflict with Russia?

You have to remind Americans – and I think what
Jason's
presentation did so well – what the Four Laws indicate; what a
real Presidency looks like. What is the true United States?
For
30 years, FBI and British factors and our own government, like
the Bush family, went after Lyndon LaRouche and our
organization.
We've lost a sense of what the real United States is; the
world
has. And during that period of time, the world has gone
nearly
crazy; barreling towards world war and nuclear destruction.
We've got to revive a true United States. We need it in the
United States, and so does the world. There's never been a
greater moment to develop that around Lyn's ideas.

OGDEN: Good! I think that's a perfect conclusion.
So, as
Jason said, {The Vision of Alexander Hamilton} book will be
available within the coming days. It's something to

absolutely

purchase and find access to; we'll make that clear. And if you

haven't yet, please sign up for the daily emails from larouchepac.com; these are the critical strategic updates that are coming into your inbox on a daily basis. We make sure that

you have that at your fingertips. Things are going to change very rapidly over the coming days; and you need to be connected.

So, please sign up for the daily LaRouche PAC email list.

Thank you very much for joining us here today; and please

stay tuned to larouchepac.com. Good night.