

“Vi må atter blive sande amerikanere”.

LaRouchePAC Internationale Fredags-webcast, 10. juni 2016

Jeg vil indlede vores diskussion med at påpege, hvad hr. LaRouche i de seneste dage meget klart har sagt: Vi befinder os i en ekstraordinært farlig periode i verdenshistorien. Det kan ikke ses tydeligere end af disse militærmanøvrer, der finder sted på de østeuropæiske grænser (Ruslands vestlige grænser). Disse kombinerede NATO-øvelser, der finder sted hele vejen op og ned langs Ruslands grænse, fra De baltiske Stater, ind i Polen og derfra mod syd. Dette er en kombination af fire forskellige, angiveligt uafhængige krigsspil, men det involverer live troppemanøvrer, af hvilke den største hedder "Anaconda 2016". Denne manøvre involverer 30.000 tropper fra 24 forskellige lande, inkl. 14.000 amerikanere, 12.000 polakker, 1000 faldskærmstropper og den virkelige krydsning af nøglefloden dér, Vistula-floden; samt træning af natlige angreb, tungt militærisenkram, 35 helikoptere, 3.000 militærkøretøjer, flådemanøvrer osv.

Engelsk udskrift.

WE MUST BECOME TRUE AMERICANS AGAIN!

LaRouche PAC Friday Webcast; June 10, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good Evening! It's June 10th, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden, and you joining us for our weekly Friday evening webcast here from larouchepac.com. As you'll notice, we're taking a little bit of a different format than customary

today. We have a roundtable format, joined in the studio by Megan Beets and Ben Deniston, from the LaRouche PAC basement science team; and also Kesha Rogers and Mike Steger are both joining us from the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee via video. So, we're going to have a little bit of a freer kind of roundtable discussion here.

I'd like to begin our discussion by just pointing out, what I think has been said very, very clearly in the recent days by Mr. LaRouche, that we're in an extraordinarily dangerous period of world history. This couldn't be made more clear than seeing these military maneuvers which are happening on the eastern border of Europe (the western border of Russia). These combined NATO maneuvers which are happening all the way up and down the border of Russia, from the Baltic States, into Poland, and then south from there. This is a combination of four different, supposedly independent, war games, but it involves live troop maneuvers, the largest of which is called "Anaconda 2016." That one involves 30,000 troops from 24 different countries, including 14,000 Americans, 12,000 Polish soldiers, 1,000 paratroopers, the actual crossing of the key river there, the Vistula River; and the exercise of nighttime assaults, military hardware, 35 helicopters, 3,000 military vehicles, naval maneuvers, and so forth.

If you take that, together with the three other maneuvers that are happening right now, you have approximately 60,000 troops that are engaged in military maneuvers all along the

border of Russia. As Helga LaRouche pointed out, this the greatest troop and military hardware maneuver that you've had on Russia's border since World War II – the mobilization by Hitler of the Nazi forces prior to the invasion of what was then the Soviet Union. Obviously, this many troops engaged in live military maneuvers, not only creates a very strong possibility for some accident occurring, which could trigger a rapid escalation towards a very hot war, which could escalate very quickly; but also it's very clearly a provocation, which is being taken by NATO with Obama in the leadership, directly towards Russia. And it's being seen as such in the context of other things, by the Russian President and other leading members of the Russian military. It's also being recognized as such by various forces within Europe. {Der Spiegel}, one of the leading news magazines in Germany, put out a story on Wednesday, saying these war maneuvers along the Russian borders, are "going too far", and "are playing at real war". Clearly, any war that were to break out between NATO and Russia would very quickly lead to not a limited, not a tactical, but an all-out strategic, thermonuclear war.

If you combine this with Obama's upcoming to trip to attend the NATO Heads of State Summit in Warsaw, Poland, while these war games are actively taking place, along with his refusal to sit down with President Putin to discuss the deployment of these AEGIS anti-missile systems along the Russian border, which have been characterized as a "Cuban Missile Crisis in Reverse,"

along
with the trillion dollar allocation that Obama has recently
signed off on, to modernize the U.S. military arsenal,
including
these B61-12 nuclear warheads, and the long-range LRSO [Long
Range Standoff] cruise missiles; all of these, taken together,
along with the simultaneous provocations that are happening by
U.S. forces against China in the South China Sea.

Any sane person should be asking themselves, "Why are
we
driving the world towards the point of a war of extinction,
when
we could be taking up Chinese President Xi Jinping's offer to
engage in a new strategic and economic architecture for the
planet, based on win-win cooperation?" This danger, and also
the
very real possibility of a paradigm shift, were both put on
the
table at a very significant seminar sponsored by the Schiller
Institute that occurred on Wednesday in San Francisco,
California. Both Kesha and Mike were participants. It was
titled,
"Will the U.S. Join the New Silk Road? Global Scientific
Development, or Nuclear War?" Mrs. Helga LaRouche gave an
extensive and very thorough overview of this war danger in her
keynote address; and Mr. LaRouche, in his remarks, said very
clearly – this is the very beginning of what Mr. LaRouche
said,
"The key thing I'm concerned about, is the threats to the
existence of the human species in the total area right now;
because right now, at this time, the existence of the entire
human species continues to be on the edge of jeopardy. And
therefore we have to attune ourselves to understanding what
the
problems are that are involved in this, and what are the
remedies
for which we can get an escape for humanity in general.

Humanity

in general right now is under serious threat of jeopardy on a global scale." So, that's very clearly said by Mr. LaRouche.

Also, I consider very significantly, in response to a question which was posed from former United States Senator Mike

Gravel, who was also a participant, a speaker in this seminar. He

posed a question to one of the other participants, Sergey Petrov,

the Consul-General of the Russian Consulate in San Francisco, to

which Mr. Petrov said that there is no such thing as a limited nuclear war, as some as some people would be delusional enough to

believe. What the Consul-General of Russia said at the Schiller

Institute gathering in San Francisco, is the following: "I share

the understanding that we are very close to a major conflict. And

I add that there is no possibility of a 'limited nuclear war.' If

that starts, it will be the end of the world."

I think the starkness of this statement, combined with what

Mr. LaRouche and Mrs. LaRouche both had to say, really underscores the sobriety with which we have to approach the discussion which we will have here today. Since both Kesha and Mike were participants in that seminar, I'm going to leave a little bit of the further discussion of the proceedings of that

event until a little bit later in the show. The seminar also involved Mr. Howard Chang, an internationally renowned expert on water projects.

But before we open up the discussion, I would like to

play a
short – approximately 10 minute – excerpt from the keynote
speech that Mrs. Helga LaRouche gave. This is the concluding
excerpt of her remarks. She asked two questions: (1) How did
we
get here?; and (2) What is the solution to the crisis we now
face? I just want to underscore, what you'll hear Mrs.
LaRouche
say in this excerpt, is what Mr. LaRouche reiterated, and I
think
is the subject that we have to pay attention to here today:
that
both the LaRouche movement in general, and Mr. and Mrs.
LaRouche
as individuals, {have played the crucial, central, historical
role} in not only creating the possibility for a solution to
this
crisis, going all the way back to their proposal for the
Eurasian
Land-Bridge: the New Silk Road, in the aftermath of the
collapse
of the Soviet Union; but also continued to play the crucial
role
in providing the possibility for humanity to escape this
crisis.

This seminar in San Francisco was a crucial element of
that,
but it's part of an ongoing series of interventions
internationally, which include a very prominent conference in
Europe that the Schiller Institute is sponsoring, coming up
within the next two weeks. So, we'll have more discussion on
all
of that after we hear this short except from Mrs. Helga
LaRouche's keynote speech.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Okay, now, let me introduce the third
[subject I want to talk about]. The solution to all of this

would

be a piece of cake. It is already there! A New Silk Road is integrated. We called it at that time, first, the Productive Triangle; in 1991 we called it the Eurasian Land-Bridge: the New Silk Road, which was the idea that when the

Iron Curtain had fallen, [to integrate] the populations in the industrial centers of Europe with those of Asia, through development corridors. This New Silk Road program would have changed the world in the direction of a peace order already in '91, but, unfortunately, you had Bush, Sr., you had Margaret Thatcher, you had François Mitterrand, who all had completely different ideas. They [wanted to reduce Russia] from a superpower

into a Third World, raw-material-producing country, and they imposed the "shock therapy" in the Yeltsin period. They dismantled the Russian potential in three years , and they had no intention to allow Germany to have any kind of economic relation with Russia. So it did not happen.

You had the '90s, which were genocide against Russia.

You

had all of the consequences of the Bush period. You had the eight

years of Clinton, which was a certain interruption; but then with

Bush, Jr. and Obama, you went back to the old project of an American Century doctrine and the idea of a unilateral world.

Fortunately, in 2013, President Xi Jinping announced a New

Silk Road to be {the} strategic objective of China. In the almost

three years which have passed since, this idea to end geopolitics, to establish in the tradition of the ancient Silk Road, a win-win cooperation among all nations on the planet, is

progressing extremely quickly. Remember, the ancient Silk Road was a fantastic cooperation in terms of exchange of culture,

goods, paper, technology, porcelain, silk, silk-producing, and many other cultural manifestations. It led to a tremendous benefit for all the countries which participated, from Asia to Europe.

The New Silk Road, obviously, is doing exactly that. The amount of projects which have been concluded between China and ASEAN countries, China and Latin American countries, China and Europe, China and African countries, China and East European countries, and now, in a very clear fashion, the economic integration between the Eurasian Economic Union, headed by Russia, and the New Silk Road, [is progressing very well. An alliance] has been formed between Russia and China, with India being the third factor in the situation. Many, many other countries have been joining.

Contrary to what you read and hear in the mass media, China is not doing badly. They are shifting their economic orientation from an export orientation, because the export markets in the trans-Atlantic sector are shrinking. They are now going more in infrastructure investment in many countries in the world, and to develop the inner region of China. [To raise the] consumer [to a] higher standard of their own population, since they have lifted 600 million people out of poverty, [into a] decent living standard in China. This is indeed the absolute correct policy, to say we will uplift the remaining people who are still poor, and also make them participate in the Chinese economic miracle.

Xi Jinping has [offered] to President Obama that the United States [should] not only by helping to ,

which I think is the moral obligation of the United States, given the fact that they were the key reason why these countries are now in such disarray; by participating in the building of Africa, which I think the West has an absolute moral obligation. The reason why you have millions of people as refugees, not only risking their lives, drowning in the Mediterranean, dying in the Sahara, which has even more victims than even the Mediterranean. Fifty years of IMF policy has denied economic development to Africa! The reason why people are taking a risk of a 50% chance that they will die, to cross the Mediterranean, is because they are running from war, from hunger, from epidemics, and this is the result of Western policy denying this continent economic development! We have a moral obligation to join hands to develop southwest Asia, to develop Africa.

The United States also needs a Silk Road. If you look at the figures of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, productivity has collapsed over seven years in a row. All the indexes are going down. The United States population is in a terrible condition, or at least in the poorer parts; while the rich become more rich and Wall Street is having a heyday with cocaine parties and plotting destruction for the rest of the world.

The United States needs an infrastructure project. The roads are bad, the traffic is ridiculous. People spend hours and hours

every day in commuting, risking to disappear with their cars into a pothole. They have no rail system. China has built 20,000 km fast train system up to the end of last year; they plan to have 50,000 km by the year 2020, uniting every major city in China through a fast train system, which are fantastic – they're smooth, they're fast, they're quiet. How many kilometers of fast train systems has the United States built? Zero!

So, for the United States to build its own Silk Road, to connect with the global development perspective is a question of its own best self-interest. We have to get the United States off this confrontation course, and simply say, we have to shift this policy and all this trillion-dollar investment in modernization of nuclear arsenals and the largest military budget in the world, trying to maintain an empire which is collapsing anyway. Rather, shift, get rid of Wall Street, impose Glass-Steagall, get back to a policy of Alexander Hamilton, a credit policy; invest in infrastructure and go in the direction of a win-win cooperation with the other nations of the world – with Russia, China, European nations, India; build up Latin America, build up Africa and Southwest Asia.

This is really the choice before the United States. I know this is very difficult for you to think how this should be done,

but you know, think about Kennedy; think about the kind of optimistic country the United States used to be. Think about the idea that America was built to be "a beacon of hope and a temple of liberty," where people from the whole world would go and try to be free. The U.S. singing the National Anthem, "the land of the free." Is the United States the land of the free today? I don't think anybody who is in their right mind would say that today.

Go back to the values of the American Republic, as it was founded by people like Benjamin Franklin, or George Washington; go back to the policies of Alexander Hamilton, Franklin D. Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King. I think if the United States could mobilize itself to bring back that nation, the whole world would love to be friends of the United States again. Right now, I can tell you, the rest of the world has almost given up on the United States, and when they look at the election process, the choice between a very, very irrational Donald Trump and unfortunately a very, very predictable Hillary Clinton, given her statements about confrontation against Russia and China. I think you have to really mobilize now. And I think the 28 pages, Glass-Steagall – these are flanks which can derail the situation long before this election is going to take place.

We have to have a completely new world. Remember, mankind is not a beast, and mankind is not bound to do what seems to be

inevitable. Mankind is the only species capable of reason, capable of free will, of defining and designing a beautiful future, and then going to implement that. The last time was with

Kennedy, the Apollo Project. I think we can absolutely do it again! I think you have a great possibility in front of you. I would encourage you – be American! Be true Americans again, and

the whole world will be the most happy and embrace you!

OGDEN: So, that was a short excerpt from Helga LaRouche's opening remarks at the San Francisco seminar; and the full proceedings of that seminar will be made available as they are processed. The first panel is available on YouTube now. And as

I said, both Kesha and Michael Steger were participants in that

event; so maybe I can just throw the discussion open to one of the two of you guys right now, to follow up on what we just heard

from Helga.

MICHAEL STEGER: Sure, thanks Matt. One of the most interesting, one of the key aspects of this whole process and what our organization does, was demonstrated at the discussion process in San Francisco on Wednesday. You have key people in their areas: Obviously, Senator Mike Gravel represents what is a

true American political tradition; to recognize that you fight for what's true, you go against popular opinion and peer pressure. And he was very clear on that question; you don't go

along to get along. As Lyndon LaRouche often says, "You can't fight politically and go along with the popular opinion."

Dr. Howard Chang is a leading civil engineer; obviously the Consul-General of Russia was someone who spoke on behalf of

his country. But the key question is that the standards our organization represents in this existential crisis is something unique; it gives these individuals an opportunity to wage a political fight at the level necessary that inspires them towards what mankind can accomplish, and also addresses the real crisis in the world today. It's far too often that people who want to address the economic crisis, people who want to address the increasing and escalating war danger, fall far short of the necessary to want to work with us. And two, to recognize the quality of method which is necessary to address these problems. These problems are of great scope and magnitude; it's not fixing a pothole, although we have many potholes to fix as Helga points out. And apparently, the Chinese won't even be allowed to build – they wanted to build a small segment of high-speed rail between Los Angeles and Las Vegas; very easy. Actually, east of Los Angeles in the desert. And I guess apparently they won't even be allowed to build that in the United States. So, we can't build any high-speed rail; it's just been outlawed basically. This just came out.

But the size and scope of these problems cannot be – steps cannot be taken that simply alleviate one's guilt; or the tension on one's own identity regarding the dangers of nuclear war, or the increasing crisis that the economic collapse presents to many

Americans. Too many people want to look for a quick solution; an easy mechanism that "Maybe I can vote for this person, or that person." At this point, I think most people realize they can't vote for either of these people; yet you'll still find them consumed to discuss "Well, who do you vote for, though?" They're not willing to recognize that there's a higher method which is required to act to address this kind of crisis. And I think if you look at Lyndon LaRouche's comments at the discussion, he makes this somewhat clear in his remarks. Because there is something unique towards mankind's ability to advance. Mankind does not advance – unlike any other animal species on the planet – simply because it doesn't like the problems it sees. It's able to advance and evolve because of a unique creative capacity; essentially to become more beautiful, to become more creative. To make the discoveries about the Universe that have not been discovered before. And that commitment, that approach is oftentimes what's lacking; and as Helga said, we need real leadership in the United States, we need leadership in Europe today. The problem can be solved so easily.

The New Silk Road, the Eurasian development projects are so extensive, they're ongoing; there are collaborations between China, India, and Russia. And then the nations of central Asia, of Southeast Asia; the strategic intervention in the war domain in Southwest Asia; all of these are now being addressed in a fundamentally different way than they were by the United States

and NATO for the last 15 years since the 9/11 attacks. Which has just been ongoing war and destruction.

So, there's a comprehensive picture that the United States and Europe could participate in. So, why aren't we? Why don't we take those steps? Simply raising red flags that we're near nuclear war, or simply complaining and trying to figure out which of the lesser evils you vote for, are just obviously insufficient. So, why does that remain the discussion? The discussion has to take on a higher standard; and I think that's what Lyn has already recognized over these 50 years. Because if you think of it, 50 years ago, there was a quality of leadership of this nature. John Kennedy recognized that the way you uplift and strengthen a country is to set out on a mission that's never been accomplished before; but it wasn't just the Moon. It was the largest water projects, and the development of Africa. John Kennedy's view of the world and of the Universe had a great scope and magnitude to it, to help uplift the population; it wasn't a practical campaign. Someone like Martin Luther King had a similar outlook; and you saw that inspire people like Bobby Kennedy and Malcolm X, but there was a resonance. You saw the same thing from the great scientists like Krafft Ehricke; the visionaries in the space program didn't look at it as kind of fun engineering projects. They saw it as something of a cultural advancement of the human species. And there was a resonance

with

this quality of leadership politically, that unfortunately, I think what was made clear by the seminar, is that many people are

attracted, they gravitate towards this quality of leadership if

they have a sense of honesty; but that the ability to demonstrate

this method, to act upon that quality of the human mind and human

creativity is a challenge for much of the population in the United States and Europe today. And the standard that they have

to come up to, is not just acknowledging the dangers, but a standard of operating to embolden and strengthen the population

to solve these problems and to move our civilization upwards.

And I think that really was the culminating nature of the

discussion on Wednesday at the seminar; and it really is to bring

more people into this quality of an organization. Of what we are

as a political organization, but that we are must become what the

nation is. And that requires our population must become better;

they must become more courageous, more intelligent, and more beautiful if we're actually going to address these problems.

Because they're not going to be addressed from any simple mechanisms; and I think that really was the fight we waged here

for the seminar, and I think the only way to deal with the current crisis you presented at the beginning.

KESHA ROGERS: I want to continue with that theme, and add that I

think what we have to look at is the unique role of Mr. LaRouche over these years to identify a science of physical economy; which characterizes him in a way that was the understanding of both Krafft Ehrlicke and other leaders from the standpoint of the rejection – shall we say people that Michael brought up, such as John F Kennedy, such as Lincoln, Martin Luther King. A rejection of a limits to growth policy. And this is what Mr. LaRouche has organized as the founding principle of his economic policy in terms of what is the essential role of the advancement of mankind.

During the presentation, I had an opportunity to actually work with Michael and others there for the conference that was just held in San Francisco. And I presented on the unique role of Krafft Ehrlicke, the German space pioneer; and what he represented from the standpoint of putting forth the epistemology and the philosophy on human nature's identity in terms of creating an open world system. Which was this idea that you reject the Club of Rome meadows and foresters limits to growth population reduction; the Malthusian policy that human beings are nothing more than small lily pads, mindless beings. That they have no conception of advancing human creativity. And this is what was the unique role defining Krafft Ehrlicke from the standpoint that he knew that is was not just a matter of promoting technological advancements; but what do these technological advances do to improve upon the conditions of human life and the progress of mankind overall.

And this has been something that Mr. LaRouche

understood is crucial in his science of physical economy, from the standpoint that you're not just looking at technological advancement from speaking of just one leap. But you're talking about a succession of leaps in economic progress in society. And during the relationship that Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche developed with the identity and role of Krafft Ehrlicke as a scientist and genius of his time, is really exemplified in what Mr. LaRouche continued to develop around his policy for a Moon-Mars colonization program. I think that people who have not actually studied the significance of Mr. LaRouche and why he became a threat to this zero-growth policy, because he continued to push the limits, push mankind beyond the so-called limitations that have been put on mankind; just as Krafft Ehrlicke understood that our extraterrestrial imperative was to actually remove all limitations and barriers from the progress of mankind. And the best way to do this was through the advancement of man into the colonization of space.

And I think it's important to note, that some people start to put themselves into this smallness of thinking, in this mindless thinking. "Well, how are we going to travel into space if we can't actually solve the problems here on Earth?" And Mr. LaRouche made it a priority to actually organize an understanding of what real technological advancement is; this was exactly the thinking of John F Kennedy in the progress of the commitment of

the Moon landing, of sending a man to the Moon and bringing him safely back to Earth. That this was going to lead to technological advancements that would pay themselves off several times over; but what was going to be essential for it, is that you had to have breakthroughs as Mr. LaRouche called for, in several categories of technology that was actually going to be essential for bringing about an increase in the productivity of society. You take the example; you look at this massive undertaking of what Krafft Ehrlicke did in the design and development of what took men to the Moon, in terms of the Saturn V rocket. It wasn't something that was just thrown together on the cheap; you couldn't have just Wall Street and Elon Musk going in there and saying, "OK, let us just throw a spacecraft up." This took some real engineering; it was a total transformation in terms of the economic conditions of society. Thousands, millions of people were put to work; the spin-off technologies that went into it. Mr. LaRouche called for the advancement of four categories of technology, in thermonuclear fusion and related plasma technologies; or development of electromagnetic radiation of high energy density. Basically promoting new synthetic materials or the production of the colonization of Mars; that you were going to actually have to have flotillas in developing low-Earth orbit. And putting materials on the Moon to actually lead to the colonization of Mars. How are we going to get there?

We had to have engineers, we had to have astrophysicists.

The technical considerations are all laid out very prominently, but I think what it really represents is a transformation of the human species; and that's what Mr. LaRouche was very crucial in, saying that you had to actually have a different identity of who we are as human beings. That we are actually distinct from the animal species; and that no limitations can be put on mankind to keep them in a state of bestiality. And the question of technological advancement is, are these advancements being made in a so-called barbaric society that wants to keep human beings down and keep them enslaved; and promote a policy of limitations on growth and population reduction so these policies would not be advanced. Or, are we talking about a cultural Renaissance, where these advancements are made as Krafft Ehrlicke understood, from the standpoint of a new conception of mankind. This is what has really brought together the minds, and why Mr. LaRouche sees Krafft Ehrlicke as extremely fundamental to how we overcome the threats facing us today in society.

OGDEN: Well, I think that's something that certainly you elaborated very clearly in your speech at the conference, and I think as we had a discussion with Mr. LaRouche yesterday; everybody who is on this show was engaged in that discussion. Mr. LaRouche put a very emphatic emphasis on the personality of Krafft Ehrlicke and his courage in fighting for a vision which was not a popular vision even among the people in the space community. And Mr. LaRouche asked that more research be done

on

this; and I know that both you, Ben, and Megan have been immersed

in this a little bit in the recent few days and weeks. So, maybe

you want to give people a broader idea of some of this.

MEGAN BEETS: Well, I can say something briefly. I was just looking back at comments that were made by both Helga LaRouche and Lyndon LaRouche at the memorial conference that was held in

honor of Krafft Ehrlicke in 1985, following his death in 1984.

And

both Lyndon and Helga LaRouche reflect something which I think really does go to the essence of the importance of the personality of Krafft Ehrlicke in what we were able to achieve in

the space program. And what they both reflected was the fact that his life made a contribution to moving the species as a whole forward; but why? It's exactly because he was not motivated by the kinds of practical considerations that were impinging on most of the population at the time; and both Lyn and

Helga reflected the fact that Krafft Ehrlicke was motivated by a

total cultural optimism. That not only was it necessary, but it

was also possible to move mankind forward into the Age of Reason;

to move man into a paradigm where we completely left the cultural

vestiges of the beast behind us. And if you look at Krafft Ehrlicke's work, which ranges from extremely technical papers on

the use of liquid hydrogen fuel to fictional stories which are envisioning the first manned mission to Mars; but all of them

I

think are motivated by this passion and vision for a better mankind as a whole. And he came to the conclusion himself as a young man, that the way to realize that had to be space travel; had to be space colonization.

Just to add one more thing, Mrs. LaRouche was reflecting on a speaking tour that Krafft Ehrlicke did with the Schiller Institute in the 1980s in Germany. And what she reported was, that at that time, the resistance from the Greenie movements was so intense at some of these meetings, the police had to be called in. What Krafft Ehrlicke reflected on at the time was that these Greenie movements were very reminiscent of the fascist movements of the 1930s; and that's why the only way to move forward had to be by addressing exactly what you just raised, Kesha. The essence of the cultural morality of mankind; is mankind a culture of beasts, or is mankind actually representing a culture of what Schiller would call beautiful souls?

BENJAMIN DENISTON: I think highlighting the fight for that; he fought for that. He went against the opposition even within the scientific community for that kind of idea; and I think that also goes back to something that Michael was saying about what's needed today. It's people like that; it's people who are going

to fight for what's true. Not because they think it's what their neighbors will like, or because they think it's what will make them popular; it's because they have an internal drive that they know that's what's needed. You pulled up this quote – it's just one thing among many – I just thought it was indicative; this quote of Krafft testifying in Congress in, I believe it was in 1960, the early '60s. And really emphatically pushing the need for nuclear power for space; he said, the Universe runs on nuclear power. The stars are run by nuclear power; this nuclear power is an inherent part of the Universe and mankind is going to be obsolete in his attempt to be part of the Universe more broadly – go beyond Earth, fulfill this extraterrestrial imperative – if we reject nuclear power. That's one thing. Already in the early '60s, he said, if we don't do this by the end of the decade, we're going to be obsolete in terms of our space efforts. Nuclear power is one issue; one critical issue, obviously, for mankind as a whole, for space development. But you see this visionary quality of fighting against the opposition to these breakthroughs; and being the force that says, "No, this is what's needed," against massive opposition. The tragedy is that the opposition has taken over.

We had, under the leadership of Krafft Ehrlicke and people working with him, we had a nuclear rocket pretty much built by the early '70s; it was basically a few steps away from being ready to go, and it was just cancelled. It was not found to be too difficult; it was not found to be some failure; it was not

found to be too expensive; it was just cancelled. And we've had this zero-growth policy take over at that crucial pivot point — the late '60s, early '70s — when Lyn really came on the scene and started to continue this fight. Obviously, Krafft resonated with that, and came to work with the LaRouches directly based on that; but you see the failure of departing from this visionary quality and this fight to move into the future. But I think he exemplifies what's needed from the US population right now; you're not going to find solutions from the existing cultural, social framework. It's failed; that's expressing the failure of society.

We heard at the beginning, one of the things that strikes me in discussing this whole war danger and the fact that we're taking steps towards nuclear war, which I think it's important, it was stated clearly. There's no limited nuclear war; there's no small nuclear war, you don't take small steps. If it happens, everything's over; it's gone. But what's potentially even more striking than that actually being a reality on the table? Who's talking about it? We have a Presidential election; are these candidates raising this as an issue? Is there any discussion about this? I think it just underscores the importance of that quality of leadership needed; and exemplified by what was done in San Francisco. We're going to be having, coming out of the

Schiller Institute conference in Germany coming up; and what really this movement represents in the United States.

And I think this should also be an appeal to our viewers.

Really, this is a time when we need escalation; we need increase;

we need more support; we need more people to be these type of creative leaders like Krafft Ehrlicke, like Lyndon LaRouche.

That's the only thing that's going to save the country at this point.

OGDEN: Yeah, Michael made a point which I thought was very significant. That, at a time like this, when it's very clear how

huge the dangers are, you cannot allow yourself to be any less than the magnitude of the crisis challenges one to be. And the

magnitude and scope of thinking which is necessary to solve a crisis of this sort, of a civilizational scale, must be huge in

those terms. And I think one thing out of this discussion about

Krafft Ehrlicke, that occurred to me is, when you're thinking about where the entire idea of the geopolitics of the last 70 years has been rooted; it is rooted in the zero-growth

technology, no development kind of paradigm. The idea that there

are limited resources that a growing population is fighting over,

and these territories and so forth; that is the fundamental tenet

of the geopolitics that has dominated this paradigm which has now

failed. When you talk about a New Paradigm, when you talk about

"win-win" as Xi Jinping says it, instead of winner take all, all

are winners. That fundamentally requires, it begs a new attitude towards our concept of growth; that there is no idea of limits to growth, of fixed natural resources. But that you have an ever-expanding possibility of ever-increasing potentials of growth. I think as very demonstrated, China, in a certain way, does understand that in the way that Krafft Ehrlicke understood it; is a central element of their current policy, is not only the One Belt, One Road policy, but it is also this exploration of the Moon. Now just going to the Moon, as a sort of space race or setting your foot on a foreign body or something like that; but saying we're going to discover fundamentally new about the Universe. And as Mr. LaRouche has been emphasizing, this Chang'e mission to explore the far side of the Moon and everything that is there to be discovered. We don't even know; we don't know the extent to which we will discover brand new things about the structure of the Universe when we explore this new territory. That, I think, speaks to this idea that the idea of a New Paradigm, a new "win-win" system, is rooted in overturning the last 70 years of this Malthusian concept of zero-growth, zero technological development, and fixed resources.

And it's only natural that Krafft Ehrlicke understood it in those terms.

DENISTON: Anything else just goes to the longer legacy of the Zeus vs. Prometheus fight. You talk about this zero-growth

paradigm; where did this come from? The British; the British royal family. People like Prince Philip; people like Prince Bernhard. This oligarchical mindset. These guys are so explicit, their view of mankind is just disgusting cattle to be managed. Zeus would just pal up with these guys; they wouldn't even need to introduce themselves. They would just get together like they've known each other for ages. That mentality of this imperial conception of the management of mankind as a bestial species; that's where this zero-growth paradigm came from in this recent period, but it stretches back through history. You look at the writings of Aeschylus on the Prometheus vs. Zeus fight; the attack on Prometheus. And you see that as a reflection of a true negative principle of society at the time, which is carried through to today. This hatred of human progress; this hatred of creative development; this desire to keep mankind suppressed to this lower level. What angered Zeus wasn't just that he had something stolen from him; it's that he had a whole class of people he was managing, that Prometheus then gave an ability to uplift and realize their own humanity. And for that, Zeus punished him.

It's the same fight today; but today, Zeus has thermonuclear arsenals at his fingertips. We're at a clear, and I think this was very well expressed even in the discussions back in the '80s that we're talking about, with the need to move to the Age of

Reason. We're at the point where mankind has developed technologically to the point where if we allow that type of process to continue, you're talking about mankind annihilating himself; and that's what we're talking about right now, with these NATO deployments. It's complete insanity. But again, as we're saying, it's not going to be solved in the negative, by just saying, "Stop that. Don't do that." It's going to have to be resolved in the higher realization and actualization of the true nature of mankind as a Promethean force; as Krafft Ehricke represented. Today, as much as then, this need for an Age of Reason is the imperative; and space is emblematic of the Age of Reason, the age of mankind, really.

OGDEN: Well, I think it's important in the context of everything that we've discussed, also to note that we really are on the edge of a meltdown of the trans-Atlantic financial system. It was noted this week that now major European banks are beginning to cease their investment into the ECB, because of the ECB's negative interest policy. They said, why should we be putting money into the ECB if they're just going to be charging us for putting our money there? So, Helga LaRouche said, there's a lot of European bankers who are sleeping with billions of dollars underneath their pillows in the current days. But this is, even without the instability of what could happen in the build up to the Brexit vote at the end of this month. I know our institutional question for this week, which we haven't addressed; was on the subject of the Brexit. And Mrs. LaRouche said, if

this means that Ireland and Scotland are going to leave the UK,
and the UK will break up; then sure, I welcome this. But in seriousness, we are on the verge of the meltdown of the trans-Atlantic financial system; the productivity of the United States is through the floor; unemployment in this country is unbelievable, especially youth unemployment. It's at levels that are unprecedented in the modern history of this country. And at the same time, you have the possibility of an entirely economic paradigm presenting itself in the form of the New Silk Road; everything that's coming out of the BRICS. We have the visit by Narendra Modi to the United States this week; he spoke to a joint session of Congress. There's a lot that could just happen; as Helga LaRouche said, it would be very easy. It would be a piece of cake for the United States to join this New Paradigm; and I think that's the ongoing of the LaRouche Movement internationally, is making that possibility very, very real. It requires a policy revolution in the United States to bring that about; but as was clear from the seminar in San Francisco this week – and I think will continue to be clear in our interventions in New York City around the Manhattan Project that Mr. LaRouche has initiated; and then this upcoming conference that's being sponsored by the Schiller Institute in Europe in the coming weeks. The activities of the LaRouche Movement internationally are crucial; and it's very significant that we're

at the breaking point in terms of several aspects of this.

Mrs. LaRouche also put a big emphasis on the continued fight around the declassification of the 28 pages, because of what this would imply in terms of the potential to bring down the entire Anglo-Saudi empire. And also everything that was contingent on the lies that were told in the aftermath of 9/11; and what that has led to in terms of the perpetual war policies, the refugees who are coming into Europe from North Africa and the Middle East.

So, all of these things taken together, represent a situation which is dynamic, it's changing very rapidly, and it is fertile ground for the types of interventions that the LaRouche Movement is making internationally right now.

So, let me invite Kesha or Mike, if you want to say anything more, in terms of reflections at the conclusion of this discussion, you're welcome to.

STEGER: I'd say, let's get rid of Obama and join the New Paradigm.

ROGERS: Yeah. I think it's true; we are at the end of an era of representation of barbarism, war, and these limits to growth consequences that Krafft Ehrlicke was very well aware of. We're seeing the emergence of a new system of cooperation, a new collaboration and dialogue among civilizations that's being

led

by Russia and China. And I think the continued question being presented by our activity is, will people actually join with LaRouche and join with the nations who are representing this new

direction for mankind? And that means doing what Krafft Ehricke

did, and breaking with all practicality, and as you said Ben, popularity; and actually going out and doing that which is seemingly impossible. I think China gives us the light and the

inspiration as to human beings; that is our mission, that is what

we do. We do those things which seem almost impossible. And we

do those things that actually help to bring about the solutions

that are going to lead to a greater condition for mankind.

So, I

think that's what we're representing right now, and we're on the

brink of a total breakthrough; unlike anything that's been seen.

But also, as Mrs. LaRouche said in her opening remarks, this breakthrough is going to come with rejecting the absence of any

discussion on the threat of this thermonuclear war and what mankind really faces. Because the question is, what kind of society are we going to actually demand be brought into existence? What kind of future are we going to actually bring about for those generations not yet born? And Mr. LaRouche is committed to that, and many more people as we've stated, need to

do the same.

OGDEN: OK. Well, thank you very much, Kesha. With that,

I'm going to bring a conclusion to this webcast here this evening. I'd like to thank both Kesha and Michael for joining us; and also thank you to Megan and to Ben. So, please stay tuned to larouchepac.com; and as I think you can tell, we have a very busy few weeks ahead of us, and a lot of responsibility. So, thank you very much; good night.