

LaRouchePAC Internationale Fredags-webcast, 3. juni 2016:

Vi må rejse ud i rummet og virkeliggøre vores fælles bestemmelse

Ben Deniston gennemgår bl.a. de mange, internationale tiltag, med grafiske fremstillinger, der støtter alternativet til det anglo-amerikanske imperiums fremstød for global atomkrig, og Kesha Rogers fra Texas taler om afdøde tysk-amerikanske rumforskningspionér Krafft Ehrickes filosofi omkring menneskets indtagelse af rummet, og mennesket som et 'multi-globalt' væsen, der ikke er begrænset til blot én planet, m.m.

Engelsk udskrift.

WE MUST GO OUT INTO SPACE AND REALIZE OUR COMMON DESTINY

Friday LaRouche PAC Webcast

June 3, 2016

MEGAN BEETS: Hello! It's June 3rd, 2016. I'd like to welcome

all of you to our regular Friday broadcast here at LaRouche PAC.

My name is Megan Beets. I'm joined tonight in the studio by Ben

Deniston, and I'm also joined, via video, by LaRouche PAC Policy

Committee members Kesha Rogers, joining me from Houston Texas and

Diane Sare, joining us from New Jersey and Manhattan.

To start things off tonight, I'm going to read the question that came in to Mr. LaRouche from our institutional contact in Washington, and then turn it over to you, Diane, to deliver Mr.

LaRouche's response, as well as some opening remarks, to start our discussion off.

The question reads: "Mr. LaRouche, the U.S. Senate passed a controversial bill known as the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act (JASTA) that would allow the families of 9/11 victims to sue the government of Saudi Arabia for its alleged financial support of al-Qaeda. The bill now goes to the U.S. House of Representatives for a vote. What are your recommendations to the House of Representatives?"

DIANE SARE: Well, I can report what Mr. LaRouche had to say about that, specifically, and then more in the background. He said that "We must state the case straightforwardly. It must be a clean bill with no loopholes, i.e., loopholes which would allow the Obama administration, or whatever administration that's covering up for the Saudis, to claim that there's negotiations going on with them that would prevent the families from being able to sue." He said, "It must not only be passed, but with a veto-proof majority. The issue is clear. The British and the Saudis were behind the crimes of 9/11 and should be held legally accountable."

I think this is extremely important with what I wanted to say, in terms of starting off the discussion this evening, which is that the American population is in somewhat of a quandary. They're in an unfair position because, thanks to our terribly

controlled news media, they're operating without full knowledge of the situation that they're in. They're thinking that we're in a presidential election campaign where they have to choose between Hillary Clinton, who is nothing but a lying, killer clone of Barack Obama; maybe Bernie Sanders, who's really just a fraud, and who has never met an anti-Russian policy that he has not supported; or Donald Trump, who is an FBI agent with a glorified toupee.

Actually, this is simply not the case. There's a much greater dynamic in the world right now, which is that the trans-Atlantic system is completely bankrupt. That means the British Royal Family and their Saudi and American puppets like Barack Obama, like the Bush family, are in a mad scramble to somehow maintain their grip, even as their system completely disintegrates. What Ben is about to present is the new dynamic of the planet, which is absolutely huge. It involves over half of the world's population and it involves over half of the world's population actually moving in a progressive, future-oriented, direction, which is something completely anomalous to most people and most people's thinking in the United States today.

So, what I just wanted to give a sense of is (1) the danger, in terms of the urgency of yanking down Obama by exposing his collusion with Saudi Arabia and Britain, the very people who committed the atrocities on September 11, 2001 in our country, so that we don't have thermonuclear war; and (2) that the United States can be brought to join this greater paradigm, which is actually what's affecting everything inside the United States,

not the local affairs as you see them.

I'll just say, people may recall that our Defense Secretary

Ashton Carter a couple months ago actually said that we should quadruple our defense spending in Europe. He said that we had to

be prepared for a threat from Russia – which is not threatening

us. But, what we are in fact doing is aggressively moving against

Russia, by supporting NATO military drills in the Baltic nations.

Germany has sent 1,000 troops into Lithuania for these drills.

NATO is erecting anti-ballistic missile systems. They have already been placed in Romania. Now we're talking about placing

them in Poland. These systems can easily be converted to carry {offensive} weapons; they're not just {defensive} systems. You can equip any of these rockets with nuclear warheads.

Putin has addressed this very directly. I'll just share what

Putin had to say about that. He talks about these compact launch

pads. "At the moment, the interceptor missiles installed have a

range of 500 km (310 miles), soon this will go up to 1,000 km (621 miles), and worse than that, they can be re-armed with 2,400

km (1,491 mile) offensive missiles even today, and it can be done

by simply switching the software, so that even the Romanians themselves won't know. How can this not be a threat to us? It certainly is. That is the reason why we have to respond now, and

if yesterday some areas in Romania did not know what it is like

to be a target, today we will have to take action to ensure

our security. Let me repeat, these are response measures, a response only. We were not the first to take such steps. The same will be done with regard to Poland. We will wait for certain actions to be taken in Poland. We are not going to do anything until we see missiles on the neighboring territory. And we have the necessary resources. You saw, the whole world saw our capabilities in term of our medium-range sea- and air-based missiles." He's referring to what Russia just did with regard to Syria, the phenomenal accuracy of missiles launched from the Mediterranean and elsewhere on wiping out ISIS targets. "We are not violating anything, but our ground-based Iskander missile systems have proven themselves as superb."

This is what Putin is now saying, and then our Defense Secretary Ashton Carter went on to give a raving speech in a U.S.

Naval Academy Commencement Address, where he talked about the great technological superiority of American weapons, which is simply not the case. Kesha will elaborate further [that] since Obama has dismantled out space program, we simply do not have the science and research to produce accurate and effective defense weapons systems. It's simply a fraud. I'm sure we are spending a lot of money. It's probably like our health care system, where we're spending more money than anyone else on the planet, and doing the worst job of producing anything.

I'll just say that there was just this study that came out from a fellow at Dartmouth College, and the Bush School of

Government at Texas A&M University. Secretary of State James Baker III, at the time when negotiations were being held with Gorbachev for the reunification of Germany, was {lying to Gorbachev at that time} [in 1990] – that the United States was already engaged in plans for expansion of NATO, even as we were telling Gorbachev that we were not, in terms of the conditions to reunify Germany.

So, it is no wonder that Putin is responding in this fashion. The aggressor is NATO and Obama, as tools of a bankrupt British Empire system. And what Americans need to know, and what the world needs to bear in mind, is the strength of the new paradigm, which is actually huge. It is the actions of Putin and Xi Jinping which are the reason why we've not plunged into thermonuclear war earlier. I think, as you'll see, they definitely have the upper hand in this situation. This is something that Americans should actually be acting in concert with, as opposed to the myopic focus of the current U.S. election campaign.

BEN DENISTON: Thanks Diane. We were discussing with Mr. LaRouche and Mrs. LaRouche yesterday, and had some discussions earlier in the week, and I think maybe just to reference what Mrs. LaRouche defined as just two stark directions the world is going in. On the one side, as you're saying, you have this insane, frankly imperial-style push, still, as long as you have Obama as this Puppet-in-Chief for the British, they're going for this threat of war drive. Every step they take is just further

and further to insanity.

I think part of what we're facing in the United States is people are not going to understand what's really going on unless they look at the global picture, and unless they look at the global picture from the right perspective. I think you're absolutely right. These elections are a joke unless you see them in the context of where the world's actually going right now. Obviously, the United States plays a critical role, but you're not going to define what the United States does, or where the United States goes, from within the United States. People have to look at what's happening in the world, to know how to act here in the United States to actually achieve something.

So, we want to take some time today and just put a little bit of depth – and I think we're going to be doing more of this in additional shows, additional segments in the future – but we want to put some depth on this new paradigm that is emerging. I just want to reference some of the developments, some stuff recently, some stuff from the months and years, but look at it together as one picture of an emerging – I would really call it this "win-win" paradigm to reference the refrain and the concept of China's President Xi Jinping, where he said that what China is pursuing is a "win-win" policy.

What we've seen recently, over years, but also just in the recent days and weeks, is a real consolidation of other

nations

coming around that policy, coming around the idea of a win-win principle. Maybe different nations are approaching it in different terms, or they have different words for it, or different expressions, or maybe stated in different languages, but I think there's a clear unification around this principle –

that we have to move beyond the idea that every nation is competing for some finite set of resources, and the gains of another nation are somehow implicitly and inherently going to be

a loss for your nation. In other terms, sometimes, this general

"geopolitical view," as some people discuss it and think about it

– the idea that the world is this big game being played and you

have to ensure that you get the biggest slice of the pie, and any

gains made by another nation are somehow going to be detrimental,

because that's less potential gains for you.

You've seen a very clear and explicit break from this, not

just in words, not just in statements, but in actual action from

this new paradigm, centered around China, China's alliance with

Russia, and increasingly, cooperation with India. And you're seeing a clear commitment to the idea that the future of mankind

depends on cooperation in common progress, in common development

– that progress and development in joint cooperation between nations benefits both parties and other parties involved in, in

the nearby area: this idea of win-win cooperation. It's not

win-loss cooperation. Just because you win doesn't mean the other guy loses. We need to rise to a real mature understanding of how mankind progresses, what the nature of progress is for the human species – that mankind creates wealth, creates progress, by creative development, and the only way we're going to have a stable, progressive, future-oriented world – or any world at all, frankly, at this point, at the level of thermonuclear technologies – is a policy based on this principle, this recognition: that we can no longer tolerate the suppression or the denial of progress of other nations, and we must embark on policies that ensure cooperative development among nations.

These are nice ideas. We could talk about this. Everybody's heard politicians saying these kind of things. Maybe not in the U.S. so much even, these days. The point is this is actually happening. These are not just "nice ideas." This is where the world is going. This is happening now. This is the dynamic taking over the world. This defines what we have to do in the United States to ensure that we can be part of this process.

On the first graphic here we have displayed [Fig. 1], a lot of this centers around China's pivotal role with their One Belt-One Road program, comprised of a land-based revival of the Silk Road orientation, as a real development corridor, bringing development into the interior regions of Asia and Eurasia, but also coupled with their Maritime Silk Road initiative. This has kind of been a keystone of an expanding development of Asia as a whole, bringing in more and more nations, again, not in a

competitive way necessarily, but in a way of a win-win policy.

I do want to illustrate, just give a quick sketch, on some of the developments that have been occurring. But I'd like to premise this by just referencing some of the recent statements by the leaders of these nations. Again, Russia, China, and India coming along as a critical third partner in this whole process.

Just to highlight a few things, the President of India was in China just this past week; and while he was there, he gave an address on India-Chinese relations. And just to quote what he said, he said: "India and China are poised to play a significant and constructive role in the 21st Century. When Indians and Chinese come together to address global challenges and build on their shared interests, there is no limit to what our two peoples can jointly achieve." He went on to say, "Both sides should work with the aim of insuring that we do not burden our coming generations, by leaving our unresolved problems to them." So, that was the President of India speaking in China.

Also earlier this week, you had a former Chinese ambassador to Russia travel to Moscow and speak about Russian-Chinese relations. And he just said quite frankly, bilateral relations between Russia and China are now at a 400-year high. You hear politicians in the United States, you're lucky if they talk about a 4-year perspective or a 4-year analysis; let alone a 400-year assessment. This former ambassador to Russia from China said there's obviously differences; anytime you have two major

nations, you have differences. But he said, these are of a secondary level; and he said it's his assessment, as somebody who deals with top-level relations between these two nations, that the Presidents of the two nations – Xi and Putin – have a clear conceptual understanding, a clear conceptual agreement. So that's significant; again, reflecting this orientation.

Just this past Tuesday, the Premier of China was speaking to media editors and newspaper editors for various Asian publications; and then speaking to an Indian editor, he really emphasized that Chinese-Indian cooperation not only benefits China and India, but all of Asia. So again, here's the Premier of China, you had the President of India saying similar things; the Premier of China saying similar things. It's a reflection of Russia being a part of this. These are clear statements just in the recent period of this move towards this integration perspective. China's Premier also said – as an interesting note – that China welcomes India's leadership and role in this new development project linking India, Iran, and Afghanistan; we can see this on the next image here on the map [Fig. 2]; centered around Iran's Chabahar port. This new proposal for water transport, shipping, the development of this port; the development of the rail lines and related industry, and stretching up into Afghanistan. So, this is a new development project that India's partaking in; Iran's partaking in; and is going to bring critical development also into Afghanistan. And this is just typical; this kind of project – if you look at it in the old paradigm, maybe China could say this threatens our interests, because it's insuring other nations are gaining

more

power and that might be more threatening to our geopolitical role

in the region. But no, this is a different paradigm; this is a new paradigm.

That kind of thinking applies in the US and London still; it

still dominates the trans-Atlantic. But you go to Asia, and the

Chinese Premier is saying, great; this is excellent. We encourage

India's role in this type of development; we want more of this.

So, I think this project is just one of a number of projects that

I think are moving closer and closer to what the LaRouches defined with their Eurasian Land-Bridge perspective. A lot can be

said, but just to highlight a few things. You have this Chabahar

port project, linking India and Iran into Afghanistan. You have

the One Belt, One Road, including the New Silk Road program going

through the heart of the Eurasian continent. You also have just

within the past year, the completion and upgrading of some of these rail lines; where now you can travel directly from China all the way to Germany, faster than you could by shipping route,

by direct rail connections through the whole heart of Asia into

Europe across Eurasia. You have the prospect of regular upgraded

rail connections and transport from China down into Iran, now that the Iran sanctions are lifted; and we have the prospect of

Iran playing a larger role in the development of this region.

These are just a few examples of building off of China's One

Belt, One Road, further related development projects; just reflecting the overall orientation towards growth, infrastructure

investment, scientific investment, development throughout the Eurasian continent, led by these nations.

I think also indicative of this whole New Paradigm orientation, very interesting and illustrative of what we're talking about; you also have in the last two years, the creation

and emergence of another economic development bloc – the Eurasian Economic Union – highlighted here in yellow. Of which Russia is the largest component of this economic agreement, this

new economic zone which includes Russia, Kazakhstan, Belarus, Armenia, and Kyrgyzstan. So, this is kind of central north Asian

bloc of economic development.

So again, if you're thinking like a British geopolitician,

you might think this is a competition to China's One Belt, One Road program. Here you have Russia coming in, working with these

other nations in the northern regions, trying to expand their economic development; while China is leading the way with their

One Belt, One Road program. But in Asia, in the New Paradigm, in

the way these leaders are thinking in a real sane, human fashion,

they're not thinking about it in those terms. You had President

Putin recently explicitly saying that they're looking towards integration and cooperation with the One Belt, One Road

program

explicitly. He said they're even working on specific projects as

part of the Eurasian Economic Union, which will directly integrate into the New Silk Road, the One Belt, One Road program.

It's not competition; it's not a geopolitical perspective. It's a

perspective of win-win cooperation of development, or progress;

and this is what has the trans-Atlantic powers, these geopolitical mindset people all freaked out.

Just to highlight a few other things, you have space.

You

have a Renaissance of space exploration in Asia, while the US is

decaying under Obama's cancellation of the manned space program

and his cuts and his complete lack of leadership in space; you have rapid progress being made in Asia. Just within the recent period, you have two new space launch centers, advanced space launch centers now open in Russia and China; as indicated here.

[Fig.3]

You have major water projects; massive south water north

projects, which is remarkable. They've made manmade rivers of a

large scale, directing water from the abundant waters of the south to the water-starved regions of the north. And they've made

major steps in managing and developing their water system as a nation as a whole; and they've got plans to further that with some of the more challenging aspects going further west with some

of the western routes. So, they've already accomplished certain

parts of this; and they're taking further steps.

But again, they're looking at positive developments for the whole region; they've recently said that they're looking towards helping the development of the Mekong River valley down in Southeast Asia. Where you have the Mekong River running through Laos, Thailand, Cambodia, Vietnam – this region here – and there's been recent droughts, major water shortages and difficulties; largely just from lack of development, lack of doing what the US did under Franklin Roosevelt with the TVA [Tennessee Valley Authority]. Lack of developing basic dams, irrigation reservoirs, water management systems to actually manage this river valley as a whole to insure regular, steady water supplies are available to the people. So, China's saying they want to look into helping to facilitate that process as a new project.

You have India now re-raising the prospects for another massive water transfer program – their river inter-linking project; where they can actually interlink some of the major rivers and again manage their water system as a national territory as a whole in a much more efficient and much more productive program.

And I'd just like if you look at these projects together, and this is just a sample of some of the stuff that's either in process, or is becoming likely, or is being coming discussed and could be a future orientation. If you look at this together, you're looking at the greatest and development and management of the water cycle in this entire East Asia, South Asia, Southeast Asia region, to be the greatest management of water that

mankind

has ever undertaken in the history of our species on this planet.

So, these are the kinds of things you see happening, in a win-win cooperative paradigm. And I want to end with just one last project; something very close to Mr. LaRouche specifically, because he's played a major role in supporting this. Which is the Kra Canal proposal; and this is a canal for water transport that's been proposed to cut through the Kra Isthmus in Thailand.

To facilitate greater trade between, as you can see here, the South China Sea and obviously stretching into the Pacific and China and Japan and Korea and into the Indian Ocean. From which,

India is obviously a major player there; but then also, those routes obviously go up through the New Suez Canal – constructed

by Egypt in a remarkable amount of time – and up into Europe. These major anchor points of world trade – in the Pacific with China, Japan, Korea on the one side; and then in the Indian Ocean

and over into Europe on the other side. This entire trade process

suffers a massive bottleneck currently, as all this trade has to

currently go through the Malaccan Strait; which is this narrow passage between Malaysia and Indonesia.

Right now, something on the order of one-fourth of all global trade goes through these narrow straits; not one-fourth of

the trade in this region, or one-fourth of the Asian trade. One-fourth of all trade globally goes through this region. I've

seen different estimates, I'm not sure; that might be one-

fourth
of total ships or one-fourth of tonnage, or one-fourth of
value,
I'm not sure exactly. I've seen other estimates say that it's
40%
of global trade; I think it probably depends upon exactly how
you
count. But this is a major chunk of all trade occurring on the
whole entire planet; going through this one congested, some
parts
very shallow and narrow, region down around Singapore in the
Malaccan Straits. And this has been known now for many years
to
be major bottleneck constraining cheap, efficient, rapid trade
between these sections of the world. So, in the '80s, Mr.
LaRouche became very involved in this proposal to make a new
canal through this relatively narrow passage; this narrow
isthmus
in Thailand. And enable a dramatic increase in the volume;
reduction of the cost; increase in the speed of trade through
these regions. Despite having been fought for for many years,
now
in this new paradigm, this is now being put on the table
again.

You just had an official advisory board of the
Thailand
government endorsing this program. China has made it clear it
would like to do this program, and maybe even finance the
whole
thing if it goes forward. You have official experts in the
United
States recognizing the importance of this program as kind of a
keystone; relieving this bottleneck, and another major
component
of facilitating this vast expanse of economic growth, trade,
and
development in this whole region.

So, this is a very exciting, singular project, but it's emblematic and I think an example of the whole perspective we're talking about. And again, I think the theme is win-win. You have China, you have Russia, you have India; they've had conflicts, they've had wars, they've had tensions. But you have leaders now in these nations – typified by Xi Jinping, typified by Putin, Modi's role in India. They're now saying, we as mankind, as nations, as participants in humanity, need to move beyond this geopolitical approach to our existence on this planet. We have to move to a policy where we recognize growth, development, progress; all these things we're talking about here are necessary for everybody. Not just for us. We can no longer tolerate the suppression of this kind of development for others; we have to go to a global system centered around this kind of development. And again, that's not just being talked out, as you saw here, as you see what's going on with these developments.

Again, this is just a sketch; you could spend weeks going through what's happening in the world. And by the time you got done, you'd have a whole other set of things to catch up on; because a lot would have happened since the time you started. But this is now the center of what's happening in the world; and this defines how we need to think about what's happening. This is what has these London-Wall Street imperial faction people freaked out.

Because how have the British existed? Well, it existed on geopolitics; they've been the geo-politicians. They've been existing based upon looting; if there's nations they can't loot directly, I'm sure there's perpetual conflict between different regions. And especially under Obama, the United States has come under this geopolitical imperial orientation.

And to just come back to what you said Diane, the opposition from this imperial faction couldn't be clearer. They're taking step after step towards what would be thermonuclear annihilation in response to this emerging New Paradigm. This NATO summit coming up; the exercises being started now by NATO. Putin couldn't be clearer or saner in his response; saying, we've been talking about this for years. You guys are making clear overt military threats to us with your expansion of NATO, with the development of more advanced weapons systems closer and closer to our borders. What do you expect us to do? We have to respond for our own safety, and for the safety of the world, quite frankly.

So, I just think the situation couldn't be more stark; but I think especially here in the United States, we have to uplift the level of discussion to this global perspective. What's happening in Asia now, what's happening between Putin and Russia and China, increased collaboration with India; that is now increasingly becoming the defining factor for the world situation.

ROGERS: I think that what we're seeing going on in the world right now, and what you just laid out, really puts the perspective on the table of the decades-long fight of Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche now coming to fruition. I thought that it was important that you brought up Mr. LaRouche's fight around these development projects; around the Kra Canal in the '80s. And the fact of the matter is, at that very time, he was also fighting for the development of space exploration; around the "Woman on Mars" Mars mission, and the importance of mankind in space.

Now, I think what we're seeing right now can really be characterized from the standpoint of what the German-American space pioneer Krafft Ehricke described as the emergence of mankind into a poly-global world. And I think when you think of this conception of a poly-global world, where mankind is not confined to the limited resources of one globe, but moves out into the expansion of space; that's what we're seeing happen right now. What Russia and China represent is a move away from — we're not just talking about one globe; we're talking about one globe that has been dominated by a British Empire, a policy of murder. A population reduction, and defying this conception of the creative nature of human beings and the human mind. When you think about Russia and China are doing to pull together over 50% of the world, this is quite remarkable; and it can only be looked at from the standpoint of a new species of mankind. It's a real force of good versus evil; and the evil is completely being destroyed and losing. Because the drive right now for thermonuclear war being pushed and perpetuated continuously by

the stooge Obama in the White House; who's been pushing the murderous policy to protect the British Empire, protect the Saudis. And to continue to push a policy that's going to lead to not just a continuation of a confinement to one world; but a one world where people are on the verge of being exterminated and blowing themselves up, unless we change our attitudes now. And I think the matter is, is what Diane and you both presented; which is that we have a real clear choice and opportunity before us. I think it's very important as to the very important fight that our international organization is leading right now, that we have to put an end to Obama, to this drive for thermonuclear war, and to NATO and what it represents in terms of its escalations and provocations of war towards Russia and China.

But I think to continue to look on the optimistic, positive side, which most of the world is moving toward, we have to give the United States and American people a sense of what we must be participating in, in terms of our mission to join in this drive toward peaceful cooperation and progress. I think it's very important to note that today is the 51st anniversary of the first American to walk in space – Ed White; which was June 3, 1965.

As I was stating, you take the conception laid by the German space pioneer Krafft Ehricke; what he conceptualized was not something that was confined to one people or one nation. But

that
was going to be the intention that was going to unify all
people
in a common interest that our destiny and mission as mankind
was
to break with the confines of Earth that put limitations on
man,
and that bestialized human beings and pit human beings against
each other; to find our common interest in the development of
space. And you're seeing more and more people starting to
recognize this intention and this need for cooperation. It was
just reported today that at an international air show in
Germany,
the head of the European Space Agency, Johann-Dietrich Wörner,
actually made the point of manned missions being indispensable
for space and planetary research. He said because human
astronauts can access and act independently – unlike robots.
He
also talked about the need for building permanent lunar bases;
and he called this a Moon Village. And he said that this Moon
Village can be constructed with a lot of material already
existing on the Moon; and that the Moon Village would be a
stepping stone to reaching other planets such as Mars and so
forth.

Now, I wanted to say in that context, that I attended
an
event last night, and the speaker was speaking on the
Curiosity
mission; which most people remember landed on Mars in 2012.
What
I brought up at that time was that the excitement around the
fact
that – as Mr. LaRouche conceptualized it – that the mind of
man
and the extended sensorium of man had now been put on Mars;
but
that there are limitations to that. And the speaker recognized

those limitations and he said something to the effect of what Mr.

Wörner said in Germany; which is, we have an obligation as mankind to actually go out into the reaches of space. To colonize

the Moon; to colonize Mars. And to build these colonies because

of the limitations that are put on mankind. And he said that we

have to look at it from the standpoint that this is our destiny.

This is exactly what Krafft Ehrlicke recognized as he presented a principal work called {Lunar Industrialization and Settlement; Birth of Poly-Global Civilization}. In the work, he

summarizes "the major aspects of lunar industrialization and settlement, and identifies that scientific and evolutionary facts

leading to a definitive justification of why man must industrialize space. Changing our present closed world into a present world. He also establishes the philosophy of the extra-terrestrial imperative as a defense of justification for a

long-term based on mankind's ability to transcend the limits of

one small planet." And that is what Russia and China are representing; the transformation and transcendence of this one small planet being controlled by an imperial policy which is ready to be ended and to be destroyed, {if} we do the right thing

and we take the right actions.

If you look at this from the standpoint of the continued

aspect of what you presented, Ben, as the objective of what China

put forward as a win-win strategy of cooperation. They're continuing to do that, as the Chinese space leaders have just

put

forth an additional perspective to that win-win strategy of cooperation, international collaboration on the future Moon missions. The first Chinese astronaut presented that a study is

being conducted to justify the importance of lunar exploration;

and Russia and the European Space Agency are already discussing

collaboration on lunar missions. The intention is that there would be astronauts sent to the Moon by China by 2036; and he presented this speaking at a conference on manned space exploration in Russia. I think that that is quite extraordinary,

because when you look at the fact that Obama has continued to push a murderous policy against our space program, and to continue to drive and perpetuate an extermination war for mankind. The question is, why are the American people still stuck

in a completely insane world of lies and fraud; thinking that an

election actually has some real bearing on the future of mankind,

when it doesn't?

What is going to determine the future is that the United

States has to join with this perspective of a poly-global world,

a world not confined by limitations; as Krafft Ehricke laid out.

I think what we're going to witness – and Megan has presented this on many occasions – within the next two years with China's

mission to the far side of the Moon, puts a real perspective on

the development of space. And building the permanent colonies; but more importantly, it puts a perspective on that which is

going to determine what the future of mankind is going to be. It's not going to be this election; it's not going to be this bankrupt British Empire and Wall Street system. It's going to be the emergence of a new human species that – as Mr. LaRouche has defined – is actually focusing on what type of future do we want to create and must we create for our children and grandchildren. And that's the way that Russia and China and 50% of the world is joining them; they're not taking up these projects just because they want to build infrastructure and new projects. No lower intention of our perspective as a species can be taken up, except for the one which actually transforms the conception of who we are as a human species. That's what this political election is missing; that's what we've been missing in society as we've sat back with our eyes closed, blindfolded. Doing nothing about the injustices, the murderous policy, the war and so forth that has been dominating our society for far too long. Now that you're seeing that this drive for evil is about to end now, we should be a part of participating in that perspective for mankind; which is the alternative that's being presented right now.

SARE: Well, I think that's great. And to return to what was brought up at the very beginning, one of the flanks on this matter is the question of the Saudi role and Obama's protection

of them in the 9/11 attacks. If you think about all of the wars that the United States has been engaged in since September 11, 2001, if that could be addressed in a sharp fashion; and if Obama were to be brought down, jailed, impeached, indicted. That obviously would have a dramatic impact on what the future of the United States looked like, and the potential for our nation to be a welcome partner in this phenomenal change of direction for the world.

DENISTON: Yeah, that's definitely the critical flank we have. And I know, Diane, that you've expressed the importance of this obviously in New York in particular; obviously the major epicenter of these attacks. But the other aspect of this is, Obama has to go; the idea that we're going to wait for the election or something. This is bigger than that; this is about freeing the United States from this 9/11 dynamic as a whole. You look at this British-Saudi operation; it wasn't just something in and of itself. It was the event that was used by these British assets, who were created well before the event and had been operating well before the event, for these types of activities. Something that LaRouche has been going after since the '80s in terms of these covert, irregular warfare-type operations the British have created; including these Saudi fundamentalist factions.

I was just looking back at Putin's statements recently; how he was referencing the threat Russia is being faced with in

regards to this NATO advancement. And he again referenced the US pulling out of the ABM Treaty in 2002. What was the ostensible reason for us doing that? 9/11. Now are we worried about ballistic missiles coming from the mujahideen in Afghanistan? Is that why we had to pull out of the ABM Treaty; because we worried about Osama bin Laden out of some case we can't even find, operating ballistic missiles? It's been the cover to really pursue this whole insane perpetual war policy; this police state policy in the United States. The things you hear – "It was Bush, not Obama. So, how are you blaming Obama?" Obama is actively covering up for the worst atrocity committed against Americans on American soil in American history; and he's protecting that. And he's protecting the continuation of that as a process to ensure that the United States continues to act in this post-9/11 mode.

So I think breaking this issue, like you're saying, there's nothing else that needs to happen but that at this point.

BEETS: And on that, I think people are beginning to wake up to the war danger, which is becoming impossible to ignore especially in places like Europe. You had on Thursday night, a significant television segment on German TV which was titled "The Backers of 9/11; The Secret of the 28 Pages". Which centered on an interview with former Senator Bob Graham; going through exactly how the Bush and Obama governments have covered up

what
was clearly known to be Saudi government involvement in
funding
9/11. And poses the question that not only do the past 15
years
have to be re-examined and understood from a new perspective;
but
also raising the question of what this means for Germany. And
I
think that's very important from the standpoint of what you
just
raised, Diane. What are the flanks; what are the things we can
pull? And we have this petition featured on the LaRouche PAC
site
right now, which is beginning rapidly gain signatures
internationally; which is called "The Warsaw Summit Prepares
for
War; It's Time to Leave NATO Now". And I would encourage
everybody to get on the site, sign it, and circulate it. I do
think this discussion has been very important, because it
really
does pose the question to the American people: Are we going to
continue in this perpetual state of childhood, adolescence?
Closing our eyes and sleepwalking into what would be the
biggest
disaster for mankind in all of history – complete extinction
warfare – will we permit that? Or will we choose a more
beautiful and better future? Which I think you laid out
beautifully, Kesha. And it reminded me, I just finished the
memoirs of the astronaut Michael Collins last night; the
third,
sometimes forgotten member of the Apollo 11 crew. And he says
at
the end of the book, I wish every member of government could
get
out into space and look down onto our planet; because borders
completely disappear. And you begin to realize that the so-

called

"conflicts" between people on Earth amount to nothing and that we

have a common destiny. So, I think what you laid out there, Kesha, really is what people need to be thinking about.

We need to forget our commitment to this dangerous insanity and silliness; and decide that we're committed to building a future.

So, unless there's anything else, we could leave it there for this week.

DENISTON: We have a lot more coming. I know there's going to be a rather exciting conference in the San Francisco Bay area, coming up in the middle of next week; June 8th. So, I think we'll look forward to getting reports on that, and more focal points of focus on getting the United States shifted to the direction we need.

ROGERS: If you're in the area, you should attend this.

DENISTON: Absolutely. It's to be seen as another follow-on after the excellent conference we had in Manhattan just recently. There's a lot going on; we're going to be doing a lot more. And again, this petition; we can post a link to it in the description below. People should be circulating it, signing it; getting as many signatures as possible. This is certainly a critical flank right now in the build-up to the upcoming NATO summit.

BEETS: Good. Thank you Diane and Kesha; thanks Ben.
And I'd
like to thank all of you watching; so stay tuned to
larouchepac.com.