

LaRouchePAC Internationale

Fredags-webcast

26. februar 2016:

Mulighed for fred i Syrien

Jeffrey Steinberg giver os Lyndon LaRouches tanker om muligheden for fred i Syrien, og Benjamin Deniston taler om tre nødvendige aspekter af rumforskning.

Engelsk udskrift.

Jeff Steinberg gives Lyndon LaRouche's thoughts on the potential for peace in Syria, and Ben Deniston speaks on three necessary aspects of space science.

TRANSCRIPT

JASON ROSS: Good evening. This is February 26, 2016, and you're joining us for the regular LaRouche PAC Friday webcast. I'm Jason Ross, and I'm joined in the studio today by Jeff Steinberg from Executive Intelligence Review, as well as Ben Denison from the LaRouche PAC Basement team. The three of us had an opportunity to speak with Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche this afternoon, and the comments you'll be hearing tonight reflect that discussion.

To start off, the topic is Syria. As few days ago, on February 22, an agreement for a ceasefire was reached, brokered by the United States and by Russia, giving today as a deadline for armed groups to register themselves with the terms of the ceasefire, which is to take effect tonight. The institutional question to Mr. LaRouche, reads: "In your view, what efforts will make this Syrian peace process a success?" And I'd like to ask Jeff to deliver Mr. LaRouche's response.

JEFF STEINBERG: Thanks, Jason. Well, let's start with the positive side of the equation. As Jason just indicated, there is an agreement. It's been accepted by the Syrian government. It's been accepted by – at least nominally – by a number of the rebel groups. The only exclusion is ISIS and the al-Nusra, the al-Qaeda group inside Syria, who are both on the United Nations list of international terrorist organizations, and have not even been asked to participate. They are the targets, and they will continue to remain the targets as the ceasefire takes place in other parts of the country, and among other groups, both government and opposition rebel groups.

There are many difficult and complicated challenges here, obviously starting from the fact that you're talking about a ceasefire that will be going on simultaneous to ongoing combat. And the Russian government, the Syrian government, have made clear that they do intend to continue taking the war to the al-Qaeda and Nusra Front areas. And of course, they're not always going to be so clearly delineated.

What's important is that the United States and Russia are taking co-responsibility for the monitoring of this process.

Now you've seen a number of fairly dramatic announcements over the last several weeks. You had the announcement a week ago today where the terms of this detailed ceasefire agreement were worked out. Earlier in the month, on Feb. 11, on the sidelines of the Munich Security Conference, there was a meeting of the International Syria Support Group, again chaired by the U.S. and Russia, and that's where they announced the original earlier framework for the ceasefire. Needless to say, when Secretary of State Kerry and Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov sit down, they're not starting out simply with an empty clean piece of paper. There's an enormous amount of back-channel secret diplomacy that's been taking place between Russian and American officials leading to the point where these breakthroughs are at least potentially in sight within a matter of hours. And so you've had extensive

U.S.-Russian military to military coordination. In fact, the advances being made against the Islamic State heartland, hardcore area of control, by the group known as the Syrian Democratic Front, largely the Kurdish YPG and certain Sunni tribes that make up that Syrian Democratic Front, they've been getting active support for their advances both from Russia and the United States. So, there are things that are going on that you will not read about in the mainstream American media, but which have all contributed to this process.

Now there is strong opposition to this entire arrangement, coming from elements within the Obama administration. President Obama himself has been caught in a kind of a trap, because on the one hand, a success by Secretary of State Kerry, who's clearly the point man on behalf of the Administration for this effort, looks good on Obama's report card, makes his legacy appear to be better than it actually should be. So, he's got a certain tendency to want to see this thing succeed.

But there's a deeper underlying hatred of Russia, and after all, he is a tool under the orders, under the thumb, of the British Empire faction. And I'll get to that aspect of the situation in just a moment.

To go at the heart of the question that's been posed, to make this work, you've got to have a solid economic foundation, and fortunately, in the Eurasian part of the world – say, the area from Russia extending all the way out to the Pacific Coast – you've got coordination among major states, particularly Russia, China, and India, and the Chinese policy of One Belt, One Road – which involves both the New Silk Road, the overland, high-speed development corridor transportation corridors, and the Maritime Silk Road, are all ultimately programs that are the basis for a stabilizing and full development of the Middle East Region.

I should say that quite a number of years ago, Lyndon LaRouche

was invited to the Zayed Center in the United Arab Emirates, to deliver a paper on the economic future prospects of the Persian Gulf, and he identified this region as the crossroads for where Eurasia and Africa come together under one great big development design that he's been working on, that Helga Zepp-LaRouche has been working on, literally for decades and decades.

So, we have a living experience from not that long ago, when under the impetus of President Bill Clinton, the late Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat, head of the PLO, chairman of that organization, and Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin of Israel, where you had back in 1993, a breakthrough secretly negotiated in Oslo, and then finally signed and commemorated with the Oslo Accords which were signed at the White House. And I remember vividly that Prime Minister Rabin called this the "peace of the brave," because peace is only realized when you are willing to come up with a common plan with your worst avowed enemies, for the betterment of all.

Now, what Mr. LaRouche said at that time by way of a warning, because of his clear understanding of the overarching power of the British Empire system, the dominant political-economic system in the trans-Atlantic region: he said the only way that Oslo would work is if there were shovels, crane, building material brought in immediately. Start building up the West Bank, building up the Gaza Strip. Tap into the tremendous scientific and technological capabilities of Israel. Create a new fundamentally different reality on the ground, a reality of optimism, born of genuine economic progress.

That did not happen. The World Bank interceded. The British, through their radical elements inside Israel, assassinated Prime Minister Rabin. In all likelihood, Chairman Arafat was also assassinated through poisoning. And so that whole process basically disintegrated, and leaves us now with a worse cancer in Israel-Palestinian relations than probably we ever had.

So, it's a powerful lesson to be learned, and it's the same exact neighborhood. So, unless you've got a perspective of a genuine Marshall Plan, that is anchored in the Chinese policy of One Belt, One Road – because that's where the momentum is in the world today for real development. Unless you do that, then this will not succeed. Yes, Kerry is doing a heroic job, working in partnership with Lavrov. Putin is playing a key role. He's holding his nose and engaging in an open dialogue to keep President Obama boxed in, and prevent him from wrecking this whole thing. But really, the key is going to be fully integrating the One Belt, One Road policy, the New Silk Road, with the Middle East, as precisely the kind of crossroads that Lyndon LaRouche talked about quite a number of years back in that lecture that he delivered at the Zayed Center in the UAE.

Now, to fully answer the question, and to step back further and really face the cold hard reality: You've got to start from the fact that so long as President Obama remains in office, there is an imminent danger that the British Empire will pull the plug not just on the Syria situation, but will pull the plug on the whole planet, and draw us into a devastating war that will likely be a war of thermonuclear extinction.

At the very same time that Secretary Kerry was working on this Syria situation, in full partnership with the Russians, you've had the spectacle this week on Capitol Hill of General Breedlove, the head of NATO, Defense Secretary Ash Carter, making their pitch for a major defense budget, and in so doing, demonizing Russia. You've got all kinds of demands for added defense spending in order to put NATO forces on the borders with Russia, in addition to their various minions around Europe and the United States. And so when you're coming under that kind of pressure, that kind of psychological tension, the tendency is going to be to look for some avenue of relief. And the avenue of relief that they're looking at is

war against Russia, and secondarily, war against China.

They know perfectly well that the world from Russia, extending eastward all the way to the Pacific Coast, is an area of relative economic recovery. Russia to be sure has major economic problems, major economic policy problems. But Russia has taken a critical leading role in taking up the Syria flank in a way that has completely overturned the apple cart in terms of how the British and how Obama were steering that Middle East situation, in partnership with Turkey and Saudi Arabia. Russia seized the initiative because Putin understood the strategic principle of the flank.

China is the center of scientific and technological growth on this planet. India is aligning with that combination. So you have an area defining where two-thirds of the population now live and work, that is relatively doing well, particularly when you compare it to anything going on in the trans-Atlantic region. So you've got a situation where the British Empire is bankrupt, is desperate, and will continue by impulse to drive for war, so long as they continue to exist.

So therefore, ultimately, if you want the Syrian peace agreement to succeed, in addition to the urgent need for a Marshall Plan, Land-Bridge cornerstone to make sure that that peace is durable, you've got to remove Obama. And you've got to bring down the British Empire system.

You've got options for replacement, but those replacements will only come about when Obama has been removed for cause, for good Constitutional cause, and at the point that the British Empire has been put through an orderly funeral.

ROSS: Thank you, Jeff. On the other direction, in terms of what is possibly outside of the dying, collapsing current trajectory of the trans-Atlantic, Lyndon LaRouche has been very emphatic over the recent period on the role of space as a driver for a uniquely human mission of discovery and of

economic development, pointing in particular to the role here in the United States of Kesha Rogers, for example. I'd like to ask Ben to deliver some prepared remarks that he has on space, economics, and where we need to go.

BENJAMIN DENISTON: Thanks, Jason. I want to take a few minutes just to lay out some conceptions about how to think about approaching this perspective for a new space program that Mr. LaRouche has been re-emphasizing recently.

And I think, to start, the most fundamental point is this is an issue of understanding the nature of mankind: getting a deeper understanding of what is mankind and mankind's mission as a uniquely creative species in what Mr. LaRouche has defined in his work, as a creative universe. That we cannot separate the ostensible space program, maybe the way a lot of people tend to think about it, in terms of spaceships and rockets and spacesuits – those are all elements of it – but this is a necessary expression of the true scientific principle of mankind's existence, as not just another animal species on this planet, but a species that has a fundamentally unique creative capability. And we must always continue to exercise that creative capability in new domains, new frontiers, new deeper principles of the universe, and that's our destiny. That's what we have to do, and that's why we look to space. That's why space is necessary at this point in the development of mankind. And as we juxtapose the horrid direction under Obama and the trans-Atlantic and the British, this is – as Jason just said – the alternative, the reality that we should be pursuing if we return to an issue of principle.

This really defines what some people discuss as, to some degree in the highest sense, the common aims of mankind. This is the common unifying objective of the human species as a single species: the pursuit of our true nature as this creative force, into the Solar System in the near term, and looking out farther into the galaxy and the galactic

perspective as the frontiers we want to push towards.

And the point is, this is what is happening in the Asian sector of the world. This is what China is doing. This is what Russia is doing, what Russia would like to do. This is what China's lunar program is vectored towards. And this is what China and Russia and their allies are openly asking the United States to come join. This is the offer being presented to the United States. China's explicit policy of "win-win" cooperation. And I want to just reference that that was a very beautiful concluding remark given by the Chinese Foreign Minister Wang Yi at a press conference he had with Secretary of State Kerry, just this past Tuesday, where he said, again reiterating China's conception of this "win-win" policy, he said, "Our two countries, China and the United States, we should work to make the pie of our common interests bigger. We should enlarge the pie of our common interests. We should look through telescopes to visualize the future, rather than a microscope to magnify our differences." So again, you're just continually getting this from China; this perspective of if we cooperate in true, fundamental scientific economic progress, we expand the pie. We create more wealth; we create more resources available to the human species as a whole. So, let's just get rid of this crazy imperial perspective, and get on board with the development of the future in this very real sense.

As Jason emphasized, one of the most important things I think about what Kesha Rogers has done, is she has shown that the American people want this; that they're ready for this. What she demonstrated in her campaign is, that if there is real leadership out there, the American people will respond; they want this. They want this perspective; they're sick of what's going on. If we can provide real leadership and remove this terrible fake leadership running our country right now, there's the potential, the inherent desire in the American people to move in this direction. And she showed that very

clearly in her leadership in her multiple Congressional campaigns; where with orders of magnitude less financial support than her adversaries, no support from the Democratic Party establishment – the certified hacks of the Democratic Party over there – despite all this seeming lack of resources, she showed a couple of resounding victories. Which shows you that if you have real qualified leadership out there, this is what the American people want; this potential is there.

So, this is where we have to go. Now from this standpoint, to break this down a little bit and to just kind of put some of this on the table, I think we ought to look at the space program perspective from the standpoint of two dimensions; two dimensions of what we mean about the space program. We have first, what I think is really the primary issue; and I think this is something that Mr. LaRouche is rather uniquely focussed on, and very focussed on; and I think this is something that he has uniquely and emphatically brought to the forefront of this discussion. Which is the primacy of the role of fundamental scientific discovery in this whole process. If we want to talk about space and the Solar System, in a certain very real sense, you're talking about pursuing the fundamental potential created by the scientific revolutions and discoveries of Kepler through Einstein, for example. That it's that quality of fundamental scientific discovery which is what ultimately in the most basic sense, enables mankind to rise to a fundamentally different relationship to the universe as a whole. That our ability to not just be a species on Earth interacting with the universe from the standpoint of Earth-based processes; and to actually fundamentally change our relationship to the very substance, the nature of organization of the universe. That comes in the most primary sense from the unique quality of creative discovery per se; typified by Kepler, typified by Einstein. And I think if you draw an arc between Kepler's initial discoveries of the organization of the Solar System, the development of Kepler's work all the way up through Einstein is kind of defining another bounding

condition on our understanding of the organization of the Solar System. You get a very clear picture of the kind of fundamental, uniquely human, discovery process which is the substance, the real root, of our ability to progress and transform the nature of our species, of our organization. So, that's one dimension; that's in a sense the more fundamental issue that we need to put up front and center when we talk about the "space program".

I would say the second dimension is, you could say in a sense, the realization of the potential created with those types of revolutions. Stuff we might discuss more as the infrastructure, or the physical economic development, or maybe physical economic platform which enables mankind to realize his potential to develop the Solar System. And Mr. LaRouche has been putting a lot of emphasis on the work of the German space pioneer, Krafft Ehrlicke, as a critical person defining many of the key elements of mankind's development of the Solar System. He was one of the original German space pioneers, the visionaries who really worked through in really significant on a very real sense. And anytime we bring up the work of Krafft Ehrlicke, who was also very much a collaborator of Lyndon and Helga LaRouche in the 1970s and 1980s; and there was a very clear resonance with the perspective that Lyndon and Helga LaRouche were defining at the time, and Krafft Ehrlicke's own work in terms of bringing mankind into this next stage.

But anytime we talk about Krafft Ehrlicke's work, I think it's worth emphasizing what we have on the first slide here [Fig. 1], his three laws of astronautics; which I think define very beautifully the scientific principle that he worked from when developing his whole perspective for the space program. So, I just want to read this; I'm sure many people have heard these, but I think it's worth continuing to re-emphasize his insight into this. His first law states: "Nobody and nothing under the natural laws of the universe impose any limitations on man, except man himself." And his second law: "Not only the Earth,

but the entire Solar System and as much of the universe as he can reach under the laws of Nature, are man's rightful field of activity." And his third law: "By expanding through the universe, man fulfills his destiny as an element of life endowed with the power of reason, and the wisdom of the moral law within himself."

So, this was Krafft's own insight into the nature of mankind, the destiny of mankind, and defining a space program from that standpoint, from that perspective. More work is being done on reviving and continuing Krafft Ehricke's approach, but he defined and elaborated in great detail much of the fundamentals of the development of space from this proper scientific perspective.

Now, going from Krafft Ehricke's work, the work of LaRouche in the 1980s with his own space program proposal, I think it's useful just to fill out a little bit this idea of what I would call a physical economic platform for the development of the Solar System. I think there are three categories of activity which we should take a serious look at and focus on, if we want to enable a great expansion of mankind's capability to be an active force in the development of the Solar System.

If we really want to fulfill the potential created by Kepler and Einstein in that sense, and fulfill Krafft Ehricke's vision and bring mankind to a level of really mastering and developing and interacting with the Solar System as a whole; I think there are three key categories that we want to look at. That we need fundamental breakthroughs in. So, one, first, is the issue of getting into space; space launch. The issue of getting from the surface of the Earth up into Earth orbit. And it's been said that getting from the Earth's surface into even low Earth orbit is halfway to anywhere in the Solar System; that's very true in a certain sense.

We can see this in the next graphic [Fig. 2]; this is illustrated rather clearly if we look at the case of the

Saturn V rocket. The rocket that took the Apollo astronauts to the Moon. Some people might be familiar with this; some people may be not, but most of that entire rocket was not the elements that actually landed on the Moon and brought people back. Most of that was just to get up off the Earth. 92% of the mass, the weight of the entire Saturn V rocket, was all fuel; most of that fuel was used just to get into orbit. So, in the pie chart, you can see the breakdown; just the total amount of weight that's fuel – 92% – the dry weight of the rockets and the systems to utilize that fuel is another 6.5%, and around 2% of the weight of the entire thing is the actual people and the stuff you're trying to get on the Moon, and the stuff you're trying to get back. So, you can get a clear sense of how much effort it takes just to get into space; this is also illustrated in the bar chart next to it. If people are familiar with the way the Saturn V worked, you had a series of stages; so you had the first main rocket fires, it gets up off the ground, and starts taking you up through the atmosphere, through the sky. And once that first rocket burns up all its fuel, it's jettisoned, it's released, and a significantly smaller part of the total rocket then continues as a new stage fires, a new rocket fires. So, you had three stages to the Saturn V rocket; the entire first stage, the entire second stage, and part of the third stage was all needed just to get into orbit. And then from there, the third stage carried the astronauts to the Moon; it landed and came back, and then that third stage carried them back to Earth.

So, as we saw with the case of the Apollo, it's a nice, clear case study illustration of how much energy and expense it takes right now, currently, just to get into orbit. If we want to get a little bit more technical, this could also be expressed in terms of what's discussed as changes in velocity, changes in speed. This is a way to look at travel around the Solar System. Now, to get into Earth orbit, you don't just go up into space; if you just went straight up into space and then stopped firing your rockets, you'd just fall straight

back down. Orbit is not just getting into space. You have to get up to a certain speed, where you're orbiting the Earth; and you're talking about thousands of miles per hour. You're talking about miles per second; so you have to get up to very high speed to actually get into orbit. And if you want to change orbits, once you're in low Earth orbit, and you want to get into a different orbit, you again have to change your speed, you have to again expend energy to change your speed. So, one way people discuss and analyze space travel, is what is referred to as changes in speed. So, here is just an illustration of the amount of change in velocity, sometimes called "delta V" is the technical terms sometimes used. The amount of change in velocity, the amount of change in kilometers per second needed to get to different destinations. And as you can see on the graph, each of those bars is to a different destination; the first one is to low Earth orbit, the second one is to geo-stationary orbit, the next one is to lunar orbit, and then we have each of our planets there. Venus, Mars, Jupiter, etc. So, in all of those cases, you can see that they all have that grayish-blue chunk at the very bottom; which in most of those cases, is well over half of the total change in velocity requirements is just to get into low Earth orbit.

So again, when you say that getting from the Earth's surface to low Earth orbit is halfway to anywhere in the Solar System, that's very true. So this is a major impediment, a major challenge and expense factor for space travel, for developing the Moon, for sending out more satellites, for everything we want to do. To the degree we have to bring stuff from Earth, this is a huge part of the cost. Now, there's been various designs proposed for ways to dramatically reduce this cost. One thing I want to – this is by no means the only method used, but this is something I think is worth putting on the table for greater consideration and examination, is what's been designed as vacuum tube, maglev space launch systems. So, a magnetic levitation system, so you can propel a rocket, a

spacecraft with magnetic levitation; if you put it inside a vacuum tube, you can actually get to much higher speeds. Because even with maglev technology, the main impediment to getting the higher speeds very quickly becomes wind resistance. So, if you put this in a vacuum tube, you can get to very, very high speeds. Remember, we need to get to high speeds to be into orbit. And then if you can elevate that track up above much of the atmosphere, you can actually use a maglev vacuum tube launch system to get into space.

And what's depicted here [Fig. 3] is a NASA illustration of one design done by a former senior scientist at Brookhaven National Lab, Dr. James Powell, who actually has some of the original patents on maglev technology; he was one of the first designers of maglev technology back in the 1950s and 1960s. He developed this proposal for a vacuum tube maglev space launch system in collaboration with Dr. George Maise; and this particular design they called the "startram". So, just to give a sense, through the analysis they did, this would lower the cost of launching things into space from the current range of something around \$10,000-\$20,000 per kilogram to something more on the order of \$40 per kilogram; just to put it in monetary terms. So, you're talking about a 100-, 200-, 400-fold drop in the cost of putting stuff into orbit. And this particular design was actually examined by an independent group in the Sandia National Labs, who had a so-called "murder board", which is a term for a group of people set up to see if they could find any fundamental technical flaws in a design like this. And so they examined it, and they gave it a clean analysis; they couldn't find any fundamental technical flaws in this general idea of this design.

So, you have these types of proposals out there, for dramatically lowering the cost and expense of getting stuff into orbit. And this general idea is being pursued in China. No surprise; China is where we see interest in actually pursuing these frontiers, and people are actually thinking

about these things, are looking at these frontier technologies which can greatly give us a new capability to do these things. Specifically, at Southwest Jiaotong University in China, you have a group there looking at maglev technology, looking at vacuum tube maglev technology; they actually even have a test vacuum tube track actively working, where they're testing vacuum tubes for maglev. And the head of that project has openly discussed, he said this could also have great application for space launches; so, this is being looked at in China. So, this is one category of activity we want to get a fundamental breakthrough if we want to dramatically expand mankind's capabilities to develop the Solar System. And there are other variations, this isn't the only design out there that can address this. But this is just one that is worth highlighting to look at.

Second issue; second category of activity if we want to expand our ability to develop the Solar System – actually travelling in space, moving around in space. Once we're in Earth orbit, how do we get to the Moon, to Mars, to Jupiter, to Pluto, as we did recently? Well, to get to Pluto, it took us nine years; and after travelling for nine years, scientists hoping everything goes right, hoping they can turn the spacecraft back on because they had it in hibernation. They spent more years before that designing the mission. Finally, they're reaching Pluto, they finally get there; the space craft turns on, starts taking all kinds of pictures, readings. We're totally surprised by what we see; Pluto is actually a much more active planet than we thought. It's got all kinds of diversity in its geographical, geological features; evidence for a lot of recent activity. Stuff we didn't expect at all; just totally surprised, shocked the scientific community. And then the space craft just passed by and kept going; didn't stop, didn't enter orbit. If it had entered orbit, we could be finding all kinds of more stuff; it could be getting awesome pictures of the entire thing, doing active studies to see if we can see changes taking place currently. But it didn't do

that; it just kept going. Why did it keep going? Because we're still dealing with chemical propulsion for space travel. If New Horizons, the mission Pluto, wanted to stop and enter an orbit around Pluto, they would have had to carry the fuel needed to slow down enough to enter orbit; and also the rockets needed to use that fuel. And if they had carried that fuel with them, the launch would have had to have been much bigger, because you would have to lift all that fuel off the ground in the first place. So, this is just one illustration of how difficult it is to have any serious development and travel and moving around the Solar System

travel in space. We still don't want to take everything with us everywhere we go; we want to develop the resources of various environments in the Solar System. In the technical community, they talk about "in situ resource utilization"; I guess they want to make something exciting sound boring or something, so they call it "in situ resource utilization".

But developing the resources of the Moon, for example. What people in China again have talked about – mining the Moon for Helium-3, an excellent, perhaps the most advanced fusion fuel available to us. Which doesn't really exist in any significance at all on Earth, but it relatively abundant on the Moon. We could be mining the Moon for Helium-3; we could be getting oxygen from the Moon, water from the Moon. Being able to use the material of the Moon to build buildings and shelters, whatever; actually having the ability to use and develop all the resources available to us on the Moon, or on Mars or wherever else. So, again, the third category – maybe the third leg – of areas we need to make qualitative leaps and breakthroughs in to enable mankind to be a real controlling presence in the Solar System. And again, China is looking at this; they're looking at the Moon, they're looking at the far side of the Moon in particular. Their next mission is going to be a lander on the far side of the Moon, which will be the first time that's ever happened in the history of mankind in

space; they'll be landing something on the far side of the Moon to further prepare themselves to pursue these goals.

I think if you take these together – addressing the issue of getting from the Earth's surface up into Earth orbit, addressing the issue of travelling around the Solar System, and addressing the issue of utilizing and developing the resources of the Solar System – if we had leaps in all of those areas, the point here is not to detail exactly what those leaps will be. They can have various aspects to them; some of these breakthroughs are probably not even thought of yet, but those the three categorical areas where we need fundamental jumps in our capabilities there. With breakthroughs in these areas, we really have a new platform, a new physical economic platform; the kind of integrated infrastructure system that will enable mankind to be an active presence throughout the Solar System as a whole. And that defines a very useful set of boundary conditions that we have to focus upon if we want to pursue this type of perspective. And again, this is something that Krafft Ehricke spent a lot of time on and elaborated in great detail some of these aspects. The development of the resources of the Moon; he had extensive investigations into that himself already. Nuclear fission and fusion propulsion systems. So these are not new concepts I'm presenting to you; these are things that have been thought through by Krafft Ehricke and others. But together, they define the needed platform that we must develop now if we really want to be an active force, an active presence in the Solar System in a serious way.

But I think that just brings us back around to the more fundamental point, because what we want to do is bring mankind into a higher role as a creative force and active presence in the Solar System. But then that becoming the platform to create the potential for the next higher leap. And one thing that immediately comes to mind, is Mr. LaRouche's work on this back in the 1980s; where he had designed his own proposal for

a Moon-Mars colonization program. And in some of his presentations of this, and a particular paper he wrote on the subject, he organized the entire perspective from the standpoint of the most important being enabling mankind to make new fundamental scientific revolutionary breakthroughs. How do you want to do that? We need some really big and excellent and advanced space telescopes; things that cover the entire orbit of Mars with an interferometer system. From an integrated series of telescopes, you can integrate to operate as a single system. So, why don't we build something like that? What do we need to do that? Well, we need to be able to get into space. We need to develop the Moon; we need to develop Mars. We need mankind to be an active force throughout the Solar System to do that. But that whole perspective was unified around a mission of giving mankind the new capabilities to provide the human mind new generations of scientists with the new clues, the new anomalies that will lead to new fundamental discoveries. And this takes us to things like the galaxy; understanding the higher order principles organizing our galaxy and other galactic systems. Or, even higher than that, what organizes multiple systems of galaxies.

So, as Kepler through Einstein had defined, in a certain sense, an arc of fundamental creative discovery that brought mankind to the level of the Solar System in true scientific fundamental potential; as they did that, so too, must we today look to the development of the Solar System. Expanding mankind in the Solar System, from the standpoint of giving new generations of scientists the capability to have the opportunity and the indications and the evidence needed to make new, completely fundamental breakthroughs in basic science; basic physics. The discovery of new physical principles; the types of things associated with our galaxy, other galactic systems, areas of science which are completely outside of our knowledge currently.

So, I think when we talk about the space program, people get excited about the rockets and the space suits and bouncing around in space – and those might be elements of it to some degree; to some degree not maybe. But the most fundamental thing is this issue of mankind; and this is really defining the necessary future common aims of mankind as pursuing the developments and the realization of our existence as a creative force in the universe. And that is something that unifies all of our nations; and it's something that we need to pursue today. So that is, I think, the positive perspective that we have to look forward to, and which will give us the inspiration to defeat these very ugly figures like Obama and his controllers. Because they're holding us back from that; and we shouldn't waste any more time.

ROSS: Thank you very much. That will be the conclusion for our webcast for tonight. I do want to let people know that there will be a live-streamed event on this website tomorrow, February 27, from Texas; where Kesha Rogers will be hosting an event on there being no limits to mankind's growth, and about the potential we have in space. I'd like to ask you to "like" this video, to subscribe to our Youtube channel; and if you have questions about things that were presented, or for future shows, leave them as a comment. Thanks for joining us.