

The Method for Victory—Fighting for The Highest Conception of Mankind

The following is taken from the transcript of LaRouche PAC National Activists Call of March 2, 2017.

Dennis Speed: On behalf of the LaRouche Political Action Committee, I want to welcome you to tonight's Fireside Chat, the first one after the State of the Union Address. There have been discussions during the day today between our Policy Committee and Lyn and Helga LaRouche, and we're going to get right into the core of that.

During the State of the Union, one of the things that President Trump emphasized is that in nine years, it will be 2026, the 250th anniversary of the founding of the American Republic, and the question is what will the country look like at that time and what future will our country be projecting from that time. We should think about it this way: What will the country look like 250 years in the future—and ten weeks from today; because ten weeks from today approximately, there is a conference going on in Beijing which Donald Trump needs to be at and he needs to have a certain perspective in going into that conference. To discuss that and the other matters we're going to have Mike Steger take us into that discussion right now.

Michael Steger: We're clearly at a historical period of great, great change or at least the potential for it. There are two things that I want to address, and then I think over the course of the discussion tonight we can dig into more of the implications or aspects that stem from that discussion.

Mr. LaRouche put a very strong emphasis on continuing to integrate and unify the process. There are two aspects to that. One is clearly the question of the American political process at stake today. The idea, and I think this came from Sen. Joe Manchin from West Virginia, who basically described the process in Congress as nearly unbearable; that to even talk to a Republican is basically an act of treason at this point within the Democratic Party Caucus. Now this division is entirely artificial—it's a fraud, it's false, it's imposed. It's imposed by Obama. It's imposed by Obama's controllers—Valerie Jarrett, Soros. It's directly a British oper-

ation to break up what should be the real American political tradition, that you fight for the nation, you operate on the principle of the interest of the country, and not on the party. We have these kind of divisions in the country, and clearly the divisions exist in the minds of the American people, but they don't necessarily exist in the society. There is great unity as Diane Sare and Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche have addressed many times before, there is a clear unity in the American people. Even Robert Reich, the so-called "liberal from Berkeley" went out to Iowa and said, "Wow, these Tea Party guys actually agree on a lot of the same things that the liberals do: Glass-Steagall, going after Wall Street, maintaining Social Security and Medicare." If people go out and talk to the American people, you realize this is the case; 80 to 90 percent of the American people agree on core questions.

But the objective is to unify the process according to the future and that's what we've got to do. With Trump's speech, what he opened up—he increased the potential, because he took an optimistic tone. He captured the tone of Lincoln, of FDR, of Kennedy, in much of what he addressed in the more substantial aspects. That's where you see the real American political tradition.

As many on this call know, Mr. LaRouche has put forward *four new laws*, and we can get more into that in detail; but that is the base by which we pull together a bipartisan caucus inside the political process of the country to move on these policies and this agenda, this infrastructure, the space program, the collaboration with Russian and China—these legislative issues that have to be addressed—we've got to pull this thing together, of course, starting with Glass-Steagall.

The other aspect of it, though,—and this is where we have to take a step back from the immediate kind of melodrama of the American political media, because much of this is just straight political theater for distraction; much of it, though it seems to be targeted toward Russia and the United States, I would say that much of it is also a distraction away from the Wall Street question, which is the Achilles' heel of this entire failed British system. So if we take a step back from this political melodrama, what you see and what we have been very

clear on—what was very obvious during the Obama period—is that the interventions by Putin of Russia and by China are right now a substantial aspect of the political process of the United States. They have stabilized much of what could have been chaos and even potentially nuclear war under Obama, and they shifted the discussion drastically. They created very viable alternatives to deal with the terrorism question, to deal with the economic crisis.

I could say more on that, but to keep it pointed here, it is not just Russia and China; there is a shifting process globally and that has to be incorporated, and the actions we take and the interventions we are taking now, have to incorporate this kind of global change that is occurring. Because it really is a global crisis. This financial and economic breakdown is one of global proportions and the actions that are going to be taken to address it, have to be taken both within the United States, but then also in collaboration with many other nations on a global scale. A new global economic system has to be created. As Dennis pointed out, over the coming next two and one-half months, we are going into a summit in Beijing which definitely provides the potential for that.

A Renaissance of Global Proportions

Now, the other emphasis from the discussion this morning is that this organization must take immediate action: We have been the leadership on these questions for fifty years, the question of a new global economic system, the question of shutting down the drug war and the speculation and the terrorism by going directly after Wall Street; and using that as the basis for then creating the kind of funding for the development of the country—the scientific agenda, the space program, fusion research—and at an even higher level to really unleash, willfully, a new Renaissance for mankind. At this point, not just within the United States and Europe, but what is now possible, is to launch a Renaissance of global proportions. That’s what we’ve got to take as an initiative now.

What Trump has opened up is a potential. It is not a question of “like Trump, don’t like Trump.” There is clear potential today with Obama pushed off the scene, at least pushed out of power. You’ve got an opening for the American people to reassert the true intent of our republic. Our republic was shaped to escape the degen-



Michael Vadon

Donald Trump in Laconia, New Hampshire.

eracy, religious wars, and cultural deterioration of Europe, and that idea was launched by the very figures who founded and launched the Renaissance in Italy, and they looked to continue that in the United States. That’s what we are resurrecting today. So in nine and one-half years, at that 250th birthday of the founding of our republic, we should be celebrating not only a re-birth, but a birth of something entirely new for mankind, a flourishing of creativity on the planet as a whole for the first time in human history. I think that is really the intrinsic nature of what our country was founded to help initiate as a platform.

Now that means to do this—and to do this now, because the moment is clearly urgent. This is something Mrs. LaRouche clearly emphasized: The one thing we know for sure about Donald Trump is that our enemies, the enemies of mankind, the enemies of our country, are hysterical. That is a clear sign that there is something potential and available to us today, to create what has not been there before. I think their hysteria speaks for itself, as we see today on the whole Russia question reignited.

We are launching this tonight, and we are going to sustain our efforts over the course of this week with an intense level of mobilization. That means we’re going to have a new pamphlet, which will be released sometime by early next week, if not earlier. This will be a pamphlet which can be circulated digitally, by email, all possible ways—we’ll come up with different ways of distributing this. And obviously, we want to get this

thing printed and in physical distribution. But that will be available, and it will have an emphasis on the Four Laws with an emphasis on the fourth and third extensively, as well as the financial and banking aspects; but also a comprehensive overview of both the economic destruction of the United States, and the kind of international developments that have occurred over the last three years to make what is now a global Renaissance so very possible.

It was just last week that General Electric, one of the biggest industrial companies of the United States, was complaining about the lack of credit they had available. So, if you're going to really launch the kind of credit available, to lend and develop the United States, to the small businesses, to the large corporations, to re-industrialize the United States, we've got to move on Glass-Steagall. I think over 2,000 signatures were collected. If people have those, we should continue to turn those in. We want to get back to everyone that signed; we want to get back to them and fold them into this continuing mobilization. This is not an issue orientation: This is a mobilization for victory.

We're going to come out with another petition which will again focus of the Four Laws and help to bring even more people into this political fight. We are also intending to do another Day of Action in Washington. We had a number of good discussions with Republicans on the Hamilton National Bank. We want more meetings to discuss this because if you're going to do the infrastructure, you're going do the space program, you're going to continue to maintain an industrial manufacturing base in the United States, you're going to have to go with this economic program. There's no other way to do it. You can't just print more money, you can't just hack the budget, you can't go with private-public partnerships; you have to go with an entirely new banking system the way that Mr. LaRouche has put forward.

The idea is that there is clearly a unique moment. This past week, the State Councilor of the People's Republic of China met for two days inside the White House and with Secretary of State Tillerson, meeting with all the top advisors to the Trump administration. Clearly the question of U.S.-Russia collaboration is all over the media and our enemies are hysterical about that potential collaboration. And the questions of the devastation of the U.S. economy, as President Trump made very clear in his State of the Union—94 million people out of the labor force not working; 45 million people in poverty, 40-some million people on food

stamps the opioid addiction that's tripled in just the last four or five years in terms of overdoses and deaths.

So, we are at a moment of great crisis, but we are clearly at a moment of great opportunity. The [Italian] Renaissance was launched by a small handful of people, whom you would have described as fairly insignificant. They weren't in high positions of power, and yet had a clear intention to accomplish and achieve something that had never been done before, and to build something that by its awe and magnitude captured the imagination of everyone who saw it and even of those who just simply heard about it: the great Florentine Dome built by Brunelleschi. But, in building a new economic system and a new collaboration of nations today, we can strike a quality of the human mind to create a quality of optimism and development within the human species that is unparalleled in human history. That's what we have the potential to unleash, and it is going to take a very, very focused grouping of people dedicated to launch these kinds of policies now: on the banking question, on Glass-Steagall, but really to fulfill the long-term developments—the fusion program, the space program—and to reignite the productive potential of the American people.

Speed: When Mr. LaRouche began the Manhattan Project a couple of years ago, he emphasized to us that the issue was a “single unified effort by a single nation” and a population which subordinated all forms of confederacy, any form of localism, any form of weirdness (if you want to put it that way), to a single mission. I think the only thing I would say is we're embarked on that mission. We have a Presidency unlike the inhuman one which just vacated the White House, which can be responsive to our initiatives.

I'd like to get one or two reports from the lobbying in Washington.

Intervention in Congress

Question: This is Alvin in New York. So, first, in two particular meetings, where we had ten activists, the staffers were given very brief but very comprehensive presentations on Glass-Steagall, the Four Laws, the New Paradigm, Russia, China, the Ukraine dossier, and the attacks on Trump/the color revolution. These were discussed not as single or separate subjects, but that required an understanding in their relationship to one another and the action that then must be taken. Typically, for me, in the trips I've been making down there, that's the end of the meeting, perhaps a couple of questions,

we leave a stack of literature, and then the meeting's over.

But—you're talking about LaRouche calling for a unifying process—and for the first time that concept became real to me, because [New York City choral director and organizer] John Sigerson came down with us, and introduced himself at various points, and began to go through the cultural program of Mr. LaRouche and what he is in charge of, here in the United States: the generation of our citizens and how this type of culture around Mozart and beauty was really the only way to have a real victory and turn the nation around. And in each case, he handed both of these staff members the DVD of the *Requiem* concert for the memorial for JFK in Boston.

It really wasn't until the trip back that I began to realize what had gone on there, and this was a completely different dynamic from anything I'd ever experienced. I could only appreciate it on the ride back. Common sense would say that at the point where we finish the things we had to say, the meeting would be over, as it had been in the past, but this took the thing to another level. Their plates were full already, and then John comes by and lays this on them.

So to me, on the ride back, I laughed and said, "Lyndon LaRouche is really outrageous! And what we did today was outrageous and it was a lot of fun!" Who knows how they'll process all of this, but it was, again, just that type of unifying process that John has been working with us on.

John Sigerson: What Alvin said is absolutely right. One of the reasons why I intervened in the way I did was that I simply sat down the other day and re-read LaRouche's original piece called, "The Four New Laws

To Save The U.S.A. Now! Not an Option: An Immediate Necessity." And really what struck me—we have this as a handout now; the first page is all about the Four Laws, but then, there's a topic which is called "Vernadsky on Man and Creation" and then another topic called "Chemistry: The Yardstick of History."

The Highest Conception of Mankind

And I looked at this and said to myself, "Well, this is really interesting, because I'm sure that some people will read this first page, and say, 'Oh, that's it. And then, there's all this gobbledygook about Vernadsky and about Kepler and so forth. And I don't understand all this stuff, but I guess he just put in there to fill up the page, or something like that.'" But, knowing LaRouche as long as I have, I know the reason why he put this in, is specifically because he wants to indicate to people where he's coming from. Because in all of these cases, he's really coming from the highest conception of mankind. This paragraph really sort of blew my mind, when he says here that—I mean, here, we're talking about the Four Laws, and he's starting to talk about the fact that space and time are merely useful images, and therefore, you cannot say that "space" and "time" actually exist as a set of "metrical principles of the Solar System."

What?! I mean, c'mon! But then he says,

"The essential characteristic of the human species, is its distinction from all other species of living processes: a principle which is, scientifically, rooted for all competent modern science on the foundations of the principles set forth by Filippo Brunelleschi (the ontological minimum),"

—*What?!*



LaRouche PAC

Members of the LaRouche PAC "basement team" discuss LaRouche's ideas on science.

—“Nicholas of Cusa,” the discovery of “the ontological maximum”

—*What?!*

“and the positive discovery by mankind by Johannes Kepler, of a principle coincident with the perfected Classical human singing scale” adopted by Kepler “and elementary measure of the Solar System within the still larger universe of the Galaxy, and higher orders in the universe.”

Well! Well!

And this sort of reminds one of the kinds of classes that Lyndon LaRouche used to give, where he would always start with at least 2,000 years of history—usually many more than that. In other words, he always attempted to completely expand people’s conception of what they themselves are thinking and doing. And so, that to me is so important, and I think that the more people who do that, that is, that you have to say—well, first of all you have to say to yourself, “where am I coming from?” Am I simply coming from a sense of activism and anger and so forth? Am I actually coming from exactly this idea of mankind? Is that really my motivation? Or is it simply icing on the cake of whatever I think that I am doing. And I think everybody on the call should maybe go back and re-read this, but just think about that, in terms of—because the clearer you are about where you’re coming from, the better a leader you’re going to be. And that’s what we need, is more leaders.

Steger: Just to follow up what John said, LaRouche today towards the end of the discussion came back to that specific point: You’ve got to make it about mankind. It’s got to be a question of mankind. Because we’re calling on principles for human development; we’re not calling on things that maybe seem appropriate based on immediate circumstances—that maybe this we can stitch things together and solve the problems. We’re calling upon universal principles and acting upon those which are uniquely accessible to the human mind to address this problem, not just for our nation, but for mankind as a whole.

And so, Lyn echoed very much John’s sentiments from the Four Laws again today, and I think he probably has for the last fifty ears.

Question: K_____ from Seattle asks how we could pressure Trump to push Glass Steagall.

Steger: I appreciate your Question, it’s important to bring this back up. There are two aspects to this ques-

tion, and it gets to the heart of what John, and Dennis and Alvin were raising right now.

[Steger here delineates the various interventions people can do with elected officials and institutions, then proceeds to the issue of principle.]

How to Think

Then we get to the other Question, which is, *how do we think about it?* And I think this is where, oftentimes, every other political organization or movement runs into a problem, because without access to a sense of what creativity is, as a process, you lack to the ability to think, “well, wait a minute, we can do all these things, we can be very busy about this. How do you transcend a boundary? If you have a system in place, as we do today, that is fundamentally opposed to a policy like Glass-Steagall, because Glass-Steagall does not mean you’re adding on to the system; you are ending this system, you are transforming it. So there is a *huge* amount of resistance. There are other things you can compare it to, but you get this sense, there is a tremendous amount of political resistance to this.

As you said, President Trump committed to this in his campaign, and he’s re-verified that at certain points since he’s been elected. But how do we overcome this political resistance? And this is where, I think, what Mr. LaRouche laid out today, people have to have a sense of this—the American people; I talked to a couple of people today, someone from China, and she remarked that the American people are very parochial, which is very true! Now in some cases that’s good. Many of these people are the people backing Trump because they have their fifth, or sixth, or seventh generation American, and they have a sense of what this country’s been over the last century and a half. But there’s another problem, which is that they don’t know what’s happening in the world. And we are a leading nation in the world! Our economy is integrated into the world, and what’s taking place politically in major countries, especially in Asia, increasingly in Europe, is becoming a kind of political shift towards a new system, a new paradigm for development.

Willful Evolution

And this is something that takes people to a higher principled level, it gives them access to recognize that mankind as a whole is willfully deciding to evolve, to break out of the shackles of this monetary system, of so-called “cheap labor” policies, or just extraction of natural resources. Mankind is now beginning to look at its unique potential: to develop our planet, to de-

velop our species, and to develop the human population, and that's the most important characteristic.

China's been leading this, with a policy they call the *Belt and Road*. Russia has been directly involved in collaboration on that. India is fighting its own political questions, but they're getting involved. And there's an increasing number of nations in Africa, Central Asia, even in South America and Europe, who are joining this kind of orientation. And China is going to be holding a summit on May 14-15, with heads of state and government on this project of development.

So that's a significant question. And many Americans just don't have a sense—this project is eleven times the size of the Marshall Plan—and it's potentially much bigger. It involves over 4.5 billion people. We've gone through these numbers, but for those who haven't heard them, they're somewhat shocking.

And this is only one aspect, because, what John Sigerson just raised is, why does mankind have the ability to do this? Why do we have this voluntary ability to transform our environment, to think about three or four generations ahead of us, and to begin to initiate projects today that will ultimately be fulfilled by those generations, like the space program?

So, there are certain things that, when you engage in a discussion with someone, whether it be your congressman, your state representative, a speaker at a university, or your sister, or your son, or your parents, or your neighbor—how do you engage people to get outside the discussion which oftentimes is a very limited environment; how do we get Trump and Congress to, say, pass Glass-Steagall? That's what we want as an effect, but when you put it in that confined context, it almost seems like Zeno's paradox—the closer you get, the farther away it becomes.

So you have to say, well, how do we change that quality of discussion? And oftentimes, it's by getting people to recognize there's something much bigger taking place on this planet; there's something much more profound about humanity than the problems we're addressing right now. And we've got to situate people in that kind of discussion, and once we do, all of a sudden you see a light go on in someone's mind. You start to see them get more optimistic; you start to see them talk about things you never heard them say before. They end up more engaged in the process emotionally, and there's now a shift. There's now a more potential human being ready to do something.

Self-Activating Outreach

And Mr. LaRouche said this today: our outreach has to be something which is self-activating. We have to bring people who will begin to activate themselves and then begin to provoke others to then also activate themselves. It can't be something like we're going to marshal people out of anger. It's got to be a sense of what we're capable of accomplishing as human beings.

And so I think how we approach that, these quality of ideas—and if you go back, we've been re-publishing Mr. LaRouche's papers in *EIR* magazine; if you go back and look at any one of these, you get a sense that this is what Mr. LaRouche has been developing as a science for over 50 years—this question of how do you self-activate a creative process, within an individual, but also within a social process? And how do you then take advantage, or how do you employ that creativity toward a higher end for mankind? How do you turn it into a political process? And more and more of that kind of discussion is the substance of it.

We have to mobilize people now from the highest standpoint to move, because clearly just based on the reaction of our enemy, the time is of great urgency. We have a moment to bring Glass-Steagall to bear, that is very clear. There is a bipartisan effort in Congress; there is massive bipartisan support among the American people; we have a Presidency which is responsive. This is uncharacteristic of the last 16-20 years; of a Presidency responding to the immediate interests and demands of the American people. So we better take advantage of this opportunity.

And the global circumstances, with what Russia and China are doing, make it something unprecedented in human history. So really, we've got to think about how we act at this highest level, and immediately, politically in the coming week and weeks ahead.

What Is My Life?

Question: Hello, this is E_____ from Chicago. Well, it's very interesting that this subject, Alexander Hamilton—the way I'm looking at this, personally, is that there were some dramatic changes that happened to me in my life over the last period, and with the fact that I'm going through some health issues, it forced me to really look at the question of what is my life? You know, as an individual, from the standpoint of me being involved with Mr. LaRouche and this organization over the years, that has assisted me greatly, especially in the

times that we're in, because I'm really conscious of me being personally responsible.

And I'd just like to share an experience that I had, actually yesterday. I had to go to the VA because I was having some chest problems. I knew that I would probably be there for a while, so I took [The Vision of Alexander Hamilton](#). And the doctors and the nurses were commenting on it. So what I did, I had the leaflet where we were getting petitions for President Trump to support Glass-Steagall, and I just said, "OK, well, go to the website," and thus everybody was amenable to that. And that's the way I'm looking at self-activating, because I'm not in a position where I can get out and get to meetings and various things like that, so that's what I've come up with...

The idea is, we have to do whatever we can within whatever our circumstances are, and I'm trying best as I can to further this process. So that's my report.

Steger: That's great. This question you raised on immortality, I think it's a useful exercise, or what Einstein would call a "thought experiment," that everyone should put themselves in the shoes of President Trump, and think about that; by this time you're clearly aware that there are very, very powerful forces that would like to destroy you and your Presidency—and even kill you.

Around John Kennedy, there were a lot of people who were just no damned good—Robert McNamara, McGeorge Bundy, a lot of the people. But Kennedy recognized that there was a different quality, and the President has to have this; Reagan had this. This was what made Reagan special, even though he was dealing with Bush Sr. and James Baker and this whole Bush crowd and the whole Wall Street crowd around Bush. But you've got to come to terms with something about what your life truly means.

Someone like Trump, a President under these circumstances, to fulfill the question of Glass-Steagall, to fulfill this program, he has to go to the most profound characteristics of human identity possible; he has to touch that, the way Beethoven touched it, the way Lincoln grasped that sense of identity. Because that's where you find the strength to overcome this opposition, and to transcend it to a higher level of existence; but the only way a President is capable of doing that, is because there is an engagement with the population that has the same sense of commitment and value of human identity.

And so, I think, it's useful—you have to put your-

self in the position of where do we have to go to accomplish this? And we have to be able to challenge people around us and in the organizing, around these kinds of conceptions, of what does one's life truly mean? I'm sure Dennis can tell the story: one of Lyn's favorite cartoons, was the guy being marched in the casket in the funeral procession, and all of a sudden, he pops up in the casket, and it shows a little bubble, and he says, "What was *that* all about?"

You know, people don't think about what their life really is going to mean, especially at a moment of history like this, where big decisions are going to be made about the long-term characteristic of human existence, on this planet and beyond. And we are now today engaged in a discussion about what's absolutely critical to shape the coming next 500 years. The same way that people shaping the Italian Renaissance, like Nicholas of Cusa and others, were conscious of acting upon a fundamental shift in the nature of human identity and human development; and that we should recognize that this is precious, it's an honor to participate in, and it's a lot of responsibility to fulfill this kind of transformation.

And I think if people go back and read the *Four Laws*, as John Sigerson has suggested, you'll find that this Question is really the subject of discussion, of the *Four Laws*: once you get past the initial introduction, this is the actual content that Mr. LaRouche has always grappled with, and is really the great potency of why a small grouping of people can overcome what seems to be an all-potent political force—and yet, we can bring down Wall Street, we can bring down the British system. And we can transform it into an entirely new system.

So I appreciate your comments, because they're very provocative, and useful contribution.

Question: Hi, this is R_____ in Oregon. Mike, could you could review the Trump speech briefly and pick out three or four, or five of the things you found to be most interesting, the high points?

Steger: One of the most important things Trump did, at the beginning of the speech, and it was thoroughly composed from this standpoint, is he came back to the Centennial Fair; he started off with the 250th anniversary of the birth of our nation, in the signing of the Declaration of Independence; and immediately, people were cast out of the immediate crisis, the immediate circumstances that they all think are governing their re-

election, or how good they think they look in their white dresses...

So automatically, you're shifted out of the immediate circumstances and you're situated now into something of what is going to be the effect, of what we do here today? And he comes back and recognizes that the effect of Lincoln—because the Exposition in 1876 was clearly the effect of Lincoln's administration—yet, Lincoln was gone, he'd already been killed over a decade earlier.

Breaking Out of Cynicism

But Trump has taken off the lid, in terms our ability. This is something: we have to break out of the cynicism. What Trump's speech did was offer a potential for us to shape the policy; he's enabled us to bring the LaRouche program and the LaRouche policy to bear in the United States. He can't wave a magic wand and make it so, but he can certainly enable us, and that led into that Centennial Fair, these questions of the space program. I mean, you can split hairs on if there's too much discussion of privatization of space or not. We are now discussing in this country, can we get a man or woman back to the Moon; can we get men and women to the Moon by 2019, or will it be 2021?

Now, maybe it was just me, but for the last 8 years, if not 16 years—that was not even possible! And I know NASA's been working on these projects, but certainly for the last eight years under Obama, there was a complete shutdown of *any* of these discussions! And the Curiosity landing on Mars was countervailing against the Obama program, and it was a great success.

An 18-year-old's Perspective

Question: My name is J. and I was at the Congressional meetings yesterday. This is my report, from my perspective, as an 18-year-old. It was my first time lobbying, and when we first got there, we went into the House of Representatives. It was very busy—that was interesting, that post-Trump's speech, that suddenly, everything is buzzing, that the government is actually doing something for once. And then, we



[LaRouchePAC](#)

started going around to different Congressmen's offices and talking about Glass-Steagall and the Silk Road.

Some staffers, especially at one meeting, were sort of just listening and taking notes. After about maybe 15 minutes, you can tell, he just tuned out, or "he overloaded." But when you contrast that with our other meeting, with a high-level staffer, he was actually listening very intently. He also knew something about the JFK concert we had done in Boston four years ago, because he is from that state.

He asked towards the end of it, "So, what exactly do you want me to tell the others?"

What's the most important thing?" And I think it was T. who said, "One, definitely, talk about Glass-Steagall, and talk about these issues," because we were bringing up more than just Glass-Steagall; we were bringing up the Silk Road, because these issues aren't separate, and you can't pass a lot of the infrastructure that Trump proposes without passing Glass-Steagall.

I also was taken aback by how easy it is to just go into these congressmen's offices and just start talking to either them or their staffers. And you can also set up a meeting with them, the day of, or the next day, and we would just give them this information. I really don't understand why people just protest when they can go inside and tell them this.

Steger: That was really refreshing, J. It's true: Our government is so accessible: The ability exists for Americans to shape our destiny and act, especially at this kind of moment, when we've broken free of this fascist system of the last 16 years. There's no other country that I know of where you can engage the government in the way we can. And then, to take it to the level of ideas, I just think that your report was refreshing, and I hope that you stay engaged in the process.

Question: I hope so, especially realizing how easy that was. And knowing that I, or anybody, can walk into their local representative's office: It means that change can be done in this country much easier than people think.

Trump Reflecting on FDR

Steger: You know, it was interesting; there was an interview with President Trump recently, when he was walking around the White House—and you could hear the change in the tone of his voice when he referenced—he said, “You see those ramps right there? That was for Franklin Roosevelt.” And you’re somewhat struck by the fact that Franklin Roosevelt who pulled us out of the Depression with massive political opposition from within his own party *and* the opposition from Wall Street, and he pulled us out of the Depression, launched major development projects like the TVA and the Grand Coulee and the Hoover Dam, and all the other—the electrification programs, massive jobs works to get people working again? Then he fought two wars against two nations—and he did it all from a wheelchair. And that’s—I think when Trump sees those ramps—he recognizes that what you have to be willing to do to fulfill the legacy of this country, requires that kind of devotion, to something much greater in mankind than most people recognize.

So I think we’re looking to capture the efforts of Lincoln and Roosevelt, because these people were clearly of a sublime quality in their leadership. That’s really what we have to ask of our population, and the platform that we have to provide to this Presidency.

Organizing Everyone

Question: Hi, it’s Patrick from Connecticut. I’m just going to follow through with what I’ve been doing. I’ve been passing the literature around, and getting the signatures. And I’ve been talking to a lot of students over the last year, because there’s so many kids that are like lost; they have no place to turn except whatever they were told. Anyway, I give ‘em the *Four Laws* so they can look at what it means, and how it’s going to change the future for them. So whenever I go back to the stores, I ask ‘em, “what do you think?” And a lot of them are really, they’re happy because they see a future. Otherwise, there’s nothing on the other side.

Also I’ve been crashing Democratic town meetings, passing out the LaRouche’s *Four Laws*, and trying to get more people out of that vise-grip they’re in. And it’s very difficult, but it’s not impossible. And whatever I can do; I join groups or organizations so I can work with a lot of people. It’s expensive, but in the long run you meet a lot of people.

But I’m continuing to spread the New Paradigm of

development and infrastructure. And with that, I end.

Steger: That’s excellent. And the participation in this kind of political process is—it’s unique. What Mr. LaRouche has created, to have access to this discussion of ideas and political action is a remarkable change in the dimensions of human culture and human society. And we’re at the point where action according to these principles and the LaRouche method is of the greatest urgency and the greatest potential effect. Probably the fastest way we can shut down these anti-Trump protesters is to pass Glass-Steagall. This administration, this culture in Congress, we have to educate them now, over the coming weeks, not simply that Glass-Steagall needs to be done, but that they’ve got to wage a war against the enemies of our country.

We’ve got to mobilize them toward the higher agenda of putting Glass-Steagall through and launching the kind of development of the country that’s possible. There’s so much changing. There’s an article today in the *San Francisco Chronicle* that says, “California Republicans, the New Party of the Poor?” And basically, the Republican Party out here is realizing that the only way they’re ever going to come back to power is by going to organize the people in the Central Valley, and attacking the massive inequality, the hyperinflation in real estate. You’re seeing massive political changes in this country.

And these are the obvious predicates that are changing. The potential is to change the actual sense of human identity. That is what Mr. LaRouche identified back in the 1950s to be the basis for his own unique discovery in economics. It was a similar type of discovery that was made to launch the Florentine Renaissance. We are at that kind of break point, and I think if we take a devotion over this coming week, with as intense an outreach as we can—we’ve got these pro-Trump rallies on Saturdays throughout the country—I know Diane is going to be participating in one in New Jersey. We can organize people there, and we organize them to create a new American Renaissance, to fulfill what our Founding Fathers had fought and created a new country for, which was to unleash that industrial capability, but also the creative capability of the human mind, in the context of true political freedom.

That’s how we’re going to end this Obama tyranny, this Bush legacy. We’re going to launch a real economic recovery in the United States *and* in the world.