



# USA har brug for en massebevægelse for udvikling NU!

## LaRouchePAC Internationale Webcast,

### 2. december, 2016; Leder

Matthew Ogden: Både Diane Sare og Kesha Rogers har skrevet  en artikel i denne uges *The Hamiltonian*; jeg mener, deres artikler meget fint tjener til at skabe en ramme omkring aftenens diskussion. Diane Sares artikel hedder "President Putin's Purloined Letter; the Poetic Principle in Political Affairs" (Præsident Putins stjålne brev; det poetiske princip i politiske affærer) – jeg kan godt lide bogstavrimet her. Kesha Rogers skrev en artikel, "Mankind Is Taking a Leap! You Should Ask 'How High?'" (Menneskeheden foretager et spring! Man bør spørge, 'Hvor højt?')")

Begge disse artikler tjener virkelig til at definere det, som hr. LaRouche pointerede mht. den nødvendige tankegang, når vi går frem i den nuværende situation i verden. Man må ikke blive fanget i lokal tankegang; man bør ikke tænke ud fra den laveste fællesnævner, eller tænke på alle de forskellige politiske taktikker, der plaskes ud over forsiden af *New York Times* eller *Washington Post* og de forskellige nyhedsmedier. Man må i stedet tænke som en leder; og man må tænke ud fra standpunktet om, hvad der er drivkraften bag den hastigt skiftende dynamik i globale anliggender.

Ganske kort: vi så dette meget direkte i denne uge fra et  par forskellige standpunkter. For det første, så var der en aktionsdag fra LaRouchePAC-aktivister i Washington, D.C. i

onsdags. Jeg havde den store glæde at deltage. Vi havde aktivister, der kom fra hele østkysten, inkl. fra 'Manhattan-projektet' i New York City; og vi var dér for at sætte hr. LaRouches principper, i form af de **Fire Økonomiske Love**, på dagsordenen. At der ikke er noget alternativ til en omgående genindførelse af Glass-Steagall og en omgående renæssance af Alexander Hamiltons principper. Disse er: et nationalbanksystem; direkte kredit til forøget energigennemstrømningstæthed og produktivitet i arbejdsstyrken; og princippet om videnskab som [økonomisk] drivkraft, som Kesha Rogers diskuterer i sin artikel i *The Hamiltonian*. Et aggressivt program for udforskning og udvikling af rummet, og for at opnå fusionskraft og en højere energigennemstrømningstæthed i produktionsprocessen.

Og jeg mener, dette kan ses meget klart ud fra det, der finder sted internationalt, og som hovedsagligt kommer fra Rusland og Kina. Der var for det første et meget vigtigt dokument, som netop er blevet offentliggjort, fra Kina, som vi kan diskutere lidt mere omkring. Dette dokument hedder »Retten til udvikling: Kinas filosofi, praksis og bidrag«. Denne hvidbog erklærer, at udvikling er den fundamentale, umistelige rettighed. Og for det andet, så er der nu en ny, strategisk doktrin fra Rusland, som blev annonceret i summarisk form af den russiske præsident Putin i sin årlige 'Tale til nationen', hvor han sagde, at verdensdynamikken nu er forandret. Vi er nu villige til at samarbejde med USA som ligeværdige partnere omkring fælles interesser – inklusive endelig at besejre de falske, konstruerede fjender, som vi har hørt om fra Obama-administrationen gennem de seneste otte år.

Så med denne form for geometrisk strategi har vi et meget rigt felt, vi kan intervenere i, og en meget rig mulighed.

Så der er mange detaljer, som jeg gerne vil have, vi kommer ind på under diskussionen af alle disse spørgsmål. Lad det være nok som introduktion, og lad os høre Kesha og Diane.

*(Herefter følger udskrift af diskussionen på engelsk.)*

DIANE SARE: OK, I'll just go ahead. I'm really glad with what you said, Matt; because there really is a transformation, and I think we tend to miss it. Or you catch a glimmer of it like the real joy that I certainly felt watching all the vote totals come in; and these poor silly reporters not having a clue what had hit them. But then, you get bombarded with the real fake news, which is what comes from the so-called mainstream news media; which has absolutely zero about developments in the world which are being created by billions of people. So, you have the most extraordinary, most gigantic Earth-changing events occurring under the leadership of Vladimir Putin, under the leadership of Xi Jinping, and their collaboration with leaders in South America, leaders in Africa. Not one word of it here, and then we're treated to some miniscule detail of a misplaced wart that a politician has somewhere or whatever. I think we would do well to bear in mind a little bit of what I tried to capture in that article. There is a poetic principle; there is a world revolution underway. These things are not separate, discrete events. The Brexit vote – contrary to the stupid media spin – was not a bunch of white racists who hate immigrants. Maybe there are some of those, but the real factor was that the whole euro system is bankrupt. It didn't work and it wasn't designed to work; and people were rejecting it. Similarly, you had these

recent votes: the winner in the French Republican Party nominations, François Fillon, who does not want a war with Russia. I think most people on the planet actually recognize that a nuclear war between superpowers is not a desirable policy or outcome; and it's not necessary because what President Putin is doing is leading a fight to eradicate terrorism. He has been very direct about this; especially after September of 2015, at his speech at the United Nations. He's reiterating again the call for a coalition to wipe out this terrorist scourge. So what you see in this election process here in the United States, is we have a potential now to join with the New Paradigm.

Therefore, the most significant aspect of what we know about the incoming administration perhaps, are the two phone calls that Trump had with Xi Jinping and with President Vladimir Putin; and this is absolutely not missed by people of the world. I just wanted to give a little bit of a report on an event last night at New York University with this extraordinary woman, who is the second only I think woman in history to be the chairwoman of the Foreign Relations committee in the Chinese national assembly. Her name is Madame Fu Ying; she is extraordinarily dignified, calm and very confident. She began her remarks at this forum at New York University by referring to the phone call between Xi Jinping and Trump. She made a point of saying the Chinese are always being accused of not contributing to good in the world, of not working with the world. So, we figured when we started

the Belt and Road and the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, that the United States – which is always accusing us of not wanting to work with anyone else – would have been the first in line to join. Instead, our invitation to participate in these extraordinary projects was rejected. Now, clearly there is a potential for this opportunity to be taken.

This is really very big. Similarly, the decision that Trump has made to have retired General Michael Flynn as one of his advisors; who has called for collaboration with Russia in Syria.

And Trump's reiterations of the necessity of that kind of collaboration – these things are very important. And the fact that Flynn has come out calling for a Marshall Plan for the region; which is similar to the Chinese; Xi Jinping made a tour of several of those nations not so long ago. The only way you are going to secure peace is through economic development – not on a low level, not on repairing the decrepit, aging, out-of-date infrastructure we have; but by leaping into a new domain. So, I think I'll stop there for a minute; because I think Kesha probably has a lot to add in that regard.

KESHA ROGERS: Yes. Just taking from that, we really have to advance mankind; we really have to have a leap forward for mankind. This is what Mr. LaRouche is committed to; this is what you see Russia and China committed to. I was greatly inspired by the discussion and some of the developments that came out of

the

President of Russia; President Putin's State of the Union address. The leap for mankind really requires putting the commitment to the future. This was really expressed very beautifully in his remarks, which captured in essence the conception that the responsibility of the nation is to foster creativity in science, and foster creativity in the youth of your

nation. The best expression to doing this, in terms of scientific and technological development. In his speech he says,

"Our schools must promote creativity, but children must learn to

think independently, work both on their own and as part of a team, address usual tasks and formulate and achieve goals; which

will help them have an interesting and prosperous life. You must

promote the culture of research and engineering work. The number

of cutting edge science parks for children will increase to 40 within two years; they will serve as the basis for development of

a network of technical project groups across the country.

Companies, universities, and research institutes would contribute

to this, so our children will see clearly that all of them have

equal opportunity and an equal start in life. That Russia needs

their ideas and knowledge and they can prove their mettle in Russian companies and laboratories..." And he goes to say,

"Our

education system must be based on the principle that all children

and teenagers are gifted and can succeed in science, in creative

areas, in sports, in career, and in life."

That should be the model for every single nation. That is the model for our space program, and it really starts with the question of what is human nature? If we're going to advance mankind and have leaps forward? As a part of this paper that Matt mentioned, from China they're expressing the same expression for their nation; and for mankind as a whole. It's not just "our nation is better than yours, and we're going to have our people pulled out of poverty and your people can stay in poverty. They're not thinking like imperialists or wanting to keep nations backwards; they want nations to move forward. So, China has pulled 700 million people out of poverty; you can't do that by taking baby steps and going with a few infrastructure projects. You have to have creative leaps. This has really been expressed for their Silk Road development offer of win-win cooperation and their commitment to space and space as the potential for opening for mankind across the planet and across the galaxy.

I think if people look at the very exciting developments that we're seeing coming from Russia and China, that has to be the model. We have that potential right now, because I think what Diane pointed out – that when President-elect Trump was elected, this was a mandate. This was a repudiation of the Bush/Obama destruction of this type of potential for a future; a repudiation of Hillary Clinton's commitment to continuing war. The American people said, we're not going to condone this any longer.

The question is, what is the positive aspect that you're going to fight for? We've put that on the table with LaRouche's Four Laws and our commitment to a future perspective for mankind, based on this very identity that has been clearly laid out by what we could be doing if we decide to make the commitment and collaborate on the basis that Russia and China have laid out.

OGDEN: Yeah, China really is an inspiration in that regard. Let me just read a very quick quote from that paper that you referenced, Kesha. The title of this white paper, again, is "The Right to Development: China's Philosophy, Practice and Contribution"; and they start by saying, "The right to development must be enjoyed and shared by all peoples. Realizing the right to development is the responsibility of all countries and also the obligation of the international community." If you just juxtapose that to the Malthusian philosophy of the British Royal Family and others in the so-called "West" today, where they say, "Well, no, you know, the right to development – it's not a right. All peoples do not have an equal right to the same living standard, and, plus, if we were to pursue that – as Obama said when he went to Africa – 'the planet would boil over.'" I mean, give me a break!

So, China's white paper is laying out the *opposite* philosophy, view, of man. I think, in accordance with what



Putin

said in that State of the Union, that, yes, every human being is a creative human being. That is the fundamental right of every human being – is to develop that creativity and to contribute it to his or her nation and to the future of mankind.

In the China white paper, they go on to state some really stunning statistics. You, Kesha, cited the lifting 700 million people out of poverty; which is just an incredible achievement in and of itself. Now only a little bit under 6%, 5.7% of the population of China, are officially under the poverty line. And in the white paper they were very proud to point out that China was actually the first to achieve this UN Millennium goal – which is a goal to lift such and such a percentage of people out of poverty. But they refuse to stop there! They say, "That's not enough. We have a goal, that we are going to eliminate poverty altogether!"

The statistics are amazing. If you compare China in 1949 to China in 2015, only a 70-year difference, the average longevity in China in 1949 was 35 years. Today it's 76 years. The enrollment of school-age children in school in 1949 was 20%. Today it's almost 100%; 99.8% of all school-age children are enrolled in schools in China. The difference between 1978 and 2015: the GDP was at RMB767 billion in 1978. Today their GDP is RMB68,000 billion! So, that growth is unbelievable. And then there's, obviously, much less tangible things that you can measure, but which are clear to see, including the spread of

art,  
classical culture, classical musical training among the  
children  
of China. So this is really a model for the rest of the  
world,  
an inspiration. As Xi Jinping has said, "We invite the United  
States, we invite the West to become a part of the New Silk  
Road,  
and to become a part of the One Belt, One Road initiative."

One event that was happening in Washington, D.C.,  
simultaneously with this Day of Action that the LaRouche PAC  
activists had on Capitol Hill, was really an unprecedented  
event  
that was sponsored by the Asia Society. It was an all-day  
event  
that was hosted by a scholar named Dr. Patrick Ho, who's the  
Secretary General of the China Energy Fund Committee. One of  
my  
colleagues who was there, said about the event that "This was  
one  
of those days in Washington, D.C. when all of the principles  
that  
you've been talking about as a LaRouche PAC activist for years  
and years and years, all of a sudden are being echoed by the  
person standing at the podium." We've had those experiences  
periodically, but this *entire* event was about the right to  
development, the One Belt, One Road Initiative, the Eurasian  
Land-Bridge, the World Land-Bridge, the New Paradigm, win-win  
cooperation, the United States joining the Silk Road – quite  
literally, in those terms.

Dr. Ho actually laid out five points of advice to the  
new  
incoming [Trump] administration on how to integrate the United  
States into the One Belt, One Road program. His five steps are  
as  
follows:

- 1) Consider One Belt, One Road a platform to spearhead

initiatives and programs to bring closer cooperation between the United States and China;

2) Realign trade agreements with Asia-Pacific nations to accommodate the One Belt, One Road;

3) Adjust the U.S. posture towards the international development banks – that's the AIIB, the New Silk Road Fund, the New Development Bank of the BRICS, and so forth – and promote their capacity to assist in support for infrastructure development;

4) Help secure security along the One Belt, One Road;

5) Get the international institutions to work with the One Belt, One Road.

So, I think that's actually a very clearly stated way to, as we say in this pamphlet that we've published from LaRouche PAC, have the United States join this new Silk Road.

These ideas, as Diane was saying, this is an active principle, this is the dynamic {elsewhere}, and our responsibility is to ensure that {this} is the dynamic shaping policy in the United States.

SARE: Along these lines – because I know there's discussion and there's an article about Sen. Schumer saying he will work with Trump on a \$1 trillion infrastructure package (something like that) – I think the idea of Hamilton and the ideas of people like Krafft Ehrlicke and what China is doing, really need to be understood by our activists, so that people can reflect. For example, there's discussion about one of the things that was promoted in the *New York Times* for Trump to do with his

infrastructures, that there should be a tunnel under the Hudson River, from New Jersey to New York. Right now I think the trains go, I don't know, every 90 seconds, or every three minutes, or something like that. There's an enormous amount of traffic. The Port Authority Bus Terminal is very old and decrepit. It's going to have to be rebuilt and relocated. The tunnels are very old.

So, this is something that has needed to be done for a long time. As everyone might imagine, there's an absolutely enormous amount of traffic between Manhattan and New Jersey across the Hudson River. So, you say, "What's wrong with a new tunnel between New Jersey and New York?" Well, in a sense, if you were to do that, it would be a sin of omission. Obviously we need a tunnel, but if the idea were to connect this tunnel to a tunnel under the Bering Strait, so that you could travel from Manhattan to Moscow, that would be a completely different idea. And I think what...

OGDEN: [cross talk] ...Manhattan to Jersey City; that's for sure! [both laugh]

SARE: Yeah! Or even, you know, for people who don't want to go to Moscow, for whatever reason. They could go to Paris, but they could travel through Siberia. All kinds of exotic, really wonderful places. It would be quite a ride. Although, I suppose,

if we get the magnetically-levitated vacuum trains, you wouldn't really get to see much. On the other hand, you'd arrive at your destination *before you left*, by the clock.

Anyway, all of these things would *completely* transform the way we think of *everything*. If you could take a train from New Jersey to San Francisco. Supposing even that it wasn't three hours – it was a normal high-speed train – so you got there in a day-and-a-half, that's a completely different phenomenon. It changes the United States: what you can ship; whom you can work with; the exchange of ideas; the exchange of goods. The ability for people to find the very most brilliant individual, whether they're in China or Somalia or India, who has expertise in a particular area, and you want to bring them in to collaborate with a team of scientists in your local laboratory. All these things become thinkable.

So, when Mr. LaRouche a few years ago had made the point that he doesn't like the term "infrastructure" anymore, because it doesn't really get at what is actually necessary; which is the question of how do you increase the productivity of every person. And that requires thinking in terms of a *platform*. The difference between not having electricity, for example, and having electricity, is not simply night and day. You just can't even compare it. It's *incommensurate*. Therefore, I think we have to be both open-minded, but we also have to set {really high} standards for what we think we should be doing. It would be absolutely criminal, even if it did employ millions of people,

to  
fill in every pothole in every major city in the United States.

That would not lift the standard of living or the productivity of  
the nation as a whole; whereas a high-speed rail link that went  
from Manhattan to Moscow would actually have a completely transformative effect.

OGDEN: Yeah, it's these {leaps} in progress that are unquantifiable, because it's a completely different measuring rod, from one leap to the next. Last week on the webcast here on  
Friday night, Ben Deniston gave an excellent presentation on what's necessary for a real space colonization and exploration program. I thought one example that he used during that presentation, was really interesting. Just think about what's the  
difference between Lewis and Clark's Expedition to explore the Louisiana Purchase Territory and to cross the continental United States vs. what we were able to do with the trans-continental railroad. That's a different universe vs. what we would be able to  
do with what you're talking about, Diane, with a magnetically-levitated train that goes from New York, to Los Angeles, all the way up to Anchorage, Alaska, and across the Bering Strait, into the Eurasian landmass. Those are just quantifiably and qualitatively different modes of action. And so,  
yes, it's "setting the bar" incredibly high.

Kesha, in your article, you said, "You should ask: How high?  
We should leap, we should jump. Mankind should take a leap. How high?" It's these kinds of insights that Krafft Ehrlicke, that

others, were able to discuss from the terms that now Mr. LaRouche has {scientifically} defined, in terms of energy-flux density, how much more productivity are you able to achieve, with less effort, with less energy applied, because of these qualitative leaps in technology and in the principle that you're employing.

Before we get into a little bit more of that, I do want to bring up, though, because you mentioned it, Diane, this article, this interview with Sen. Chuck Schumer. Mr. LaRouche was told about this earlier today when we had a discussion with him. He placed some importance on it and said, "You know, Chuck Schumer does play a significant role in the Democratic Party." He is now Minority Leader in the U.S. Senate, and, very significantly, led the fight against Obama's veto of the JASTA bill; very publicly broke with the Obama administration, in favor of the 9/11 families, in overturning the Obama veto of the JASTA bill. I'd like to say something about that later.

This article is an interview that's published on [syracuse.com](http://syracuse.com). It starts by saying, "U.S. Senator Chuck Schumer said Wednesday that he's optimistic Congress will strike a deal with President-elect Donald Trump, to pass a \$1 trillion infrastructure bill within the first 100 days of the administration." However, he warned, "the bill cannot rely on what he called 'gimmicks' or tax breaks." He said "any infrastructure bill must be paid for through substantial and direct federal funding." He said, "The bill needs to be stronger and bolder than ever before. Simple tax credits will not work."

He also said that the so-called public-private partnership that Trump's infrastructure plan and other incentives to build projects that would be privately owned, would not function. He said that he had personally told Trump in a private meeting, that such a plan would lead to investment only in the most profitable projects – people who are just trying to make a buck; and could lead to significantly higher tolls on privately owned roads and bridges. Instead, Schumer said, "The \$1 trillion could flow into the U.S. Treasury to be used for rebuilding the nation's infrastructure." So, this is a direct Federal financing, not a scheme, not a gimmick, not tax breaks, not PPPs [public-private partnerships]. That is a significant development.

I do not think it is a coincidence that that interview comes directly in the wake of a two-week mobilization by LaRouche PAC activists on Capitol Hill to force the issue of Hamiltonian national banking, direct Federal credit. I know that there were countless meetings from activists; there were several dozen meetings that Paul Gallagher personally had with staffers and Congress people on Capitol Hill to discuss the details of what Hamiltonian economics and Hamiltonian national banking actually means. If you haven't seen it yet, I would highly recommend going back and listening to the recorded Fireside Chat that Paul Gallagher did last night; that was on this question of what Hamiltonian national banking really means.



So this is significant; but, indeed, we have to have the view that {we} are setting the agenda. This nation and the leadership of the country need a very intensive course in what Hamiltonian economics really means.

ROGERS: Yes, and I think that the title of our publication which we are continuing to get out *en masse*, *The Hamiltonian Vision for an Economic Renaissance* is absolutely imperative to be understood as just that. We're not just talking about developing infrastructure or increasing manufacturing; because that's not what Hamilton understood in the increasing of the productivity of society. It was starting with advancing the creative powers of mankind; and Lyndon LaRouche has taken that to a very high level and conception, as you said. His work over the past 40-50 years looking at this conception of leaps in productivity of society based on this conception of the potential for mankind to advance in ways that had not been thought of before; to advance in ways where the creative leaps in mankind take the development scientifically and technologically to higher and higher states. Mr. LaRouche's understanding of this and Krafft Ehrlicke's were very synonymous; they worked hand-in-hand together. The German space pioneer Krafft Ehrlicke – the rejection of his ideas by the "limits to growth" imperialist budget-cutters, who didn't want to see mankind advance in this way, was as direct as the opposition to Lyndon LaRouche. If Mr. LaRouche's policies had been put through – along with Krafft Ehrlicke's – on the development of LaRouche's perspective in the '80s for a vibrant space program, setting the agenda of the

space

program to heights that had not been thought of up until that point, and continuing what John F Kennedy had laid out as a national mission for advancing not just in the moment for space

development; but looking far into the future. It's interesting

to go back and look at what the vision was at that time, and how

far we have been set back because we've had people who decided that it's not the place of human beings to develop.

Krafft Ehrlicke, as Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche have continued to

say, represented a quality of genius. It wasn't just that he understood aeronautics and was one of the best in terms of field

of technology. He was a real philosopher; his conception of space development started from the standpoint of the development

of mankind as a whole. That we on this planet, have a responsibility for the development of each and every human being

on the planet; but the way we're going to achieve is – as he said on many occasions – that you have to leave the confines of

one small planet. The idea that there are only limited resources

here for a limited number of people is not true. There's a very

beautiful conception of that drawn out by Krafft Ehrlicke in a very short writing that he wrote called "The Extra-Terrestrial Imperative; Growth and Life"; that's the model that he worked on.

I just want to read something quickly from that, because I think

it's very indicative of what we're talking about here. People have to get these ideas in a very advanced understanding of it

when we're going into Congress right now. It's not just about getting them to pass a piece of legislation. It has to be, and we're seeing, a total shift in the thinking of the population. He says:

"There was a time when the human mind was slow to accept growing evidence that Earth is not a flat center of the universe.

Now the concept of a closed, isolated world must be overcome. Viewing our Earth from space should make it obvious that the world into which we now can grow is no longer closed. By ignoring this new reality, current predictive world dynamic models fail. Adhering to an obsolete, closed worldview, they despair of the future growth prospects. The extra-terrestrial imperative enjoins us to grow and live through open world development which contains all the futures the human mind can hold."

So, that's what we're talking about. How far can the human mind advance? How far can the human mind see into the future? That's what we're talking about right now, and we have a potential to really bring that perspective into focus if we have a revolutionary change in the way we think about society, and we think about the responsibility of the growth in society which we have to now bring on, because it's long overdue. LaRouche's solutions really put forth exactly how we bring that into being.

OGDEN: This the moment of opportunity. If you look at, as Diane covered in the beginning of our discussion, this wave of unexpected and completely dramatic electoral results and otherwise; from Brexit to the Presidential election. We've

got  
the Italian referendum coming up this weekend; we could see  
some  
very dramatic results out of there. Hollande has now declared  
that he will not be running for President of France. This is  
a  
very dramatic and uncharted period; and the potential is  
there,  
the doors are wide open. I think we have repeatedly gone back  
to  
this point, but I think we should return to it again. It  
should  
have been seen that this was not business as usual at the  
point  
that the entirety of the United States Senate and a vast  
majority  
of the U.S. House – not along party lines – rejected Obama's  
treasonous veto of the JASTA bill. That was in no small part  
the  
result of the activation and the leadership of the LaRouche  
Political Action Committee in the United States. I think we  
who  
are on this discussion right now, can say that we know  
directly  
that the role that LaRouche PAC played was central and primary  
in  
leading that fight for years. Direct collaboration with the  
9/11  
Families; direct collaboration with the members of the U.S.  
House  
and Senate in forcing this through. That was not something  
that  
Obama – despite all of his bluster – and the Saudi government  
– despite all of their millions of dollars; they just could  
not  
handle that. That was something that overcame everything that  
they tried to throw up against it.

Now you have a pathetic effort by McCain and by Lindsey Graham to try and gut the JASTA bill in the last days of the lame duck session; but this is not going anywhere. There was a very good statement put out by Terry Strada and the 9/11 Families United for Justice Against Terrorism, where they said in their press release, "We wish to state our firm opposition to the proposed legislative language offered by U.S. Senators Lindsey Graham and John McCain that would effectively gut the JASTA bill; which was overwhelmingly passed by Congress in September." Later they say, "Notably, Graham's and McCain's efforts come in the wake of a massive lobbying campaign by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, which is now employing roughly a dozen lobbying firms at a cost of more than \$1.3 million per month." And then Terry Strada herself is quoted saying "In April of this year, Senator Graham met with 9/11 family members and told them that he supported our cause 100%. Senator Graham is now stabbing the 9/11 Families in the back. He and Senator McCain are seeking to torpedo JASTA by imposing changes demanded by Saudi Arabia's lobbyists. We have reviewed the language, and it is an absolute betrayal." She says, "We, the 9/11 Families, are fortunate to have Senators John Cornyn and Chuck Schumer to block this action in the Senate." I can tell you that Senator Schumer told me personally on Wednesday night that this effort is going nowhere; this thing is not going to fly. So, they are holding the line very firmly. But really, they have no choice; because this victory on the JASTA bill and then everything that has come

since

then, including this Presidential election, was a statement that

this is not business as usual among the American people anymore.

There is a mood of revolt among the American people.

I just want to read one very short excerpt from an article

in *The Hill* which I think excellently gets to that very point and I think is more generally applicable. The article was titled, "Note to Allies: Don't Underestimate Overwhelming Popular

Support for JASTA." The author, Alexander Nicholson, says in this article, "[O]n this particular issue..., no amount of money or insider Washington connections will be able to overturn the overwhelming will of the American people. Indeed," he says, "the

highly unexpected but highly populist-inspired election of Donald

Trump to the White House should serve as an indicator that no amount of inside-the-beltway inside baseball can achieve results

when it comes to certain issues at certain times. And this, too,

is one of those issues and times." And then he concludes the article, "The current arguments are as ineffective as the synthetic inside-the-beltway strategy it has thus far employed.

But the new era of empowerment of the American electorate is not

to be underestimated." So, I think that is absolutely the case;

and people should take heart to that. This is, indeed, a new political era for the United States; it's the "empowerment of the

American electorate."

Now's the time to take that empowerment and just keep

the momentum going; but it has to be from the standpoint of educating ourselves, as Kesha said, on the principles of Alexander Hamilton and the principles of the science of physical economy, and saying, "We now are committing ourselves to what the Chinese have called 'the inalienable right to development'; and we will not let go of our demand for that inalienable right."

SARE: Just on that, I think on the one hand it's sort of obvious; although I guess it shouldn't be, because we've tolerated such criminality for the last 16 years since 9/11 occurred. Droning people, torture, and so on. The NSA spying on every detail of everything of everyone. But there's a certain limit where people just said, "No, we're not intimidated." We saw that particularly strongly in Manhattan among first responders and others who died, who are still dying as after-effects, or who had loved ones who died, or colleagues who died. There's a certain sort of sacred commitment that "We are not going back on this," and they're not afraid. The challenge now again is to raise the standard; in other words, can we fight with the same fearless passion for those things that are necessary for mankind to progress? Could we get a situation where the population just says, "Absolutely not! We're not shutting down our nuclear power plants. Are you crazy? This is unacceptable. You're saying we're not going to go back to the Moon and build the means to get onto Mars from the Moon? This is

crazy!" Where no one even gives it a second thought that it's so obvious. I think that is where the two areas which Einstein excelled in both: the music – his violin as a certain source of inspiration and thought; and the science come together. When one is conscious of what it means to be truly human and creative, then anything on a lower standard than that, is the same kind of affront as the Saudi Foreign Minister traipsing through the halls of Congress in his robes lined with money. You just say, "Oh, this is beneath us." We saw that effect here when the Schiller Institute Community Chorus participated in this series of performances of the Mozart *Requiem*; and there's more music coming up – again sponsored by the Foundation for the Revival of Classical Culture – on December 17th in Brooklyn. A unity concert with the conception of, what does it mean: to be human? Because human beings are not animals, no matter how many environmentalist barbarians want to try and impose that on us. When you've located your identity in a realm which is truly beautiful, then a lot of these things that seem so difficult now – like the difficulty of these politicians standing up to Wall Street on Glass-Steagall. Why are they afraid? Why do they find that difficult? Because their own identities are right now on too low of a level; but if they began to look at the world from a higher standpoint – which is I'm convinced where people like this woman from China, the Vice Foreign Minister Fu Ying – you just get a sense among some of these people that where they're coming from is a much higher level and that such a thing would



be

beneath them. I imagine this was the effect of someone like President Abraham Lincoln, who was described when he was seen visiting the soldiers; because his identity was placed in a different location in a higher realm. Therefore, it wasn't just that he was fighting against fear; there wasn't fear because there was such a firm commitment to what is right.

So, I think the next phase in this process is to have a similar, almost ease; a soaring quality of mankind, even in the United States, to get ourselves into the realm where we actually should be living.

ROGERS: Diane, you keep getting them to sing; bringing more inspiration and optimism. So, we can get more singing and get more space development, then we can really succeed.

OGDEN: President Modi of India called it a mass movement for development; and I know Helga LaRouche has echoed that call repeatedly since he said that. And we really do see a mass movement for development among some of these Eurasian countries especially, but also with them reaching out to African and South and Central American countries, you have a majority of the world's population now getting in on this mass movement for development. But that's what we need demanded from the American people right now; and I think we can turn this new era of empowerment of the American electorate into a mass movement for

development. But we have to do it from the standpoint of a Hamiltonian renaissance in the United States. We have the materials for that, as we've said before. The new book, *Hamilton's Vision* is available on Amazon; and people can read those four reports that he wrote to the United States Congress as Treasury Security. We also have the Four Laws from Mr. LaRouche which are available on the LaRouche PAC website, and the related pamphlet, "The United States Joins the New Silk Road."

So, I implore people to become as active as you can. If you haven't yet become an activist with the LaRouche PAC, now is the time to take that step. Support us in every way you can, and make yourself into a world historical individual by acting on this current, very brief window of opportunity for mankind. You can sign up on the LaRouche PAC website; you can subscribe to our YouTube channel; you can become an activist through the LaRouche PAC Action Center; and you can share this video as widely as you possibly can. Let's make this a mass movement for development!

Thank you very much for joining us here today. Thank you to both Kesha and to Diane. And please stay tuned to [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com).