

# Der er INGEN grænser for vækst.

## Menneskeheden må erobre rummet!

*Det er denne form for menneskets potentiale for at transformere vores magt, transformere vores relation til selve Solsystemet, som de kinesiske tiltag i dag kan tilbyde. Og det er denne fornemmelse af mening, denne fornemmelse for mobilisering og forpligtelse over for fremskridt for hele menneskeheden, som er det, vi nede i Texas minder folk om. Det, som Kesha Rogers minder folk om – selv folk, der var en del af disse store præstationer for 40 eller 50 år siden, og som nu måske har mødt en fornemmelse af demoralisering, pga. handlinger siden den tid. Vi trækker folk ud igen til en forpligtelse til denne mission. Og Kesha viser atter engang, at USA kan, og må, forpligte sig over for denne form for formål for hele menneskeheden.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

## Gå ud i rummet med Kina, ikke ad Helvede til med Obama

*6. marts 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – Da Barack Obama annullerede USA's planer om udforskning af rummet, begik han den største af sine forbrydelser, selv i sin egenskab af en »Vinder af Nobels Fredspris«, der udtalte til en*

krigspræsident og massedræber. Rumprogrammet var Amerikas kultur, dets mission og fremtid, og Obamas handlinger vendte i realiteten den historiske kurs omkring og drev USA tilbage.

Tilstanden for økonomien i USA – for ikke at tale om Europa – er i en håbløs spiral for nedadgående og dræber millioner af mennesker gennem håbløshed, narko- og medikamentafhængighed og krig, som truer hele den amerikanske befolkning.

En total genoplivelse af udfordringerne i forbindelse med udforskning af rummet kan ændre alt. NASA's rumprogrammer, der nu er skåret væk og suspenderet, er Amerikas eneste potentielle center for økonomisk håb.

For at vende degenerationen af USA og dets befolkning omkring, er den totale genoplivelse af rumprogrammet, på et højere niveau, den eneste farbare vej.

LaRouche-demokraten Kesha Rogers fra Texas fører an på denne vej, med den mobilisering, hun har genlanceret sammen med veteraner fra NASA, for at bringe rumprogrammet tilbage. *EIR's* stiftende redaktør Lyndon LaRouche kalder dette for videnskabeligt arbejde af højeste rang; det er den eneste, videnskabelige aktivitet i USA, der har ægte betydning for menneskehedens fremtid.

Og Amerika vil stå foran et samfundsmæssigt kollaps, hvis vi ikke meget snart gør dette.

De eksempler, som USA må samarbejde med om enhver bestræbelse inden for rumfartsvidenskab, som der gives mulighed for, er Kina og Rusland.

Dér, hvor den amerikanske »fremskridtskultur« engang blomstrede – i udforskningen af rummet – dér er Kina nu den drivende kraft. Kinas plan for de næste fem år er centreret omkring rumforskning. Med målet om at undersøge galaksen fra Månens bagside inden for de næste to år, inkluderer Kinas nye plan for økonomisk og samfundsmæssig udvikling »en forståelse

af universets oprindelse«.

Under en diskussion om det økonomiske program den 5. marts sagde chefen for Kinas største rumforskningslaboratorie: »Rumforskning er uadskilleligt fra Kinas innovationsdrevne udvikling. Hvis Kina ønsker at være en stærk, global nation, bør det ikke kun varetage sine umiddelbare interesser, men også bidrage til menneskeheden. Kun dette kan vinde Kina verdens respekt.«

USA har mistet verdens respekt under Bush, og især under Barack Obama. Obama må fjernes fra embedet, omgående, og hans onde »værk« må omstødes. Og mere presserende end alt andet må hans mord på Amerikas rumforskningsprogram vendes omkring i en total genoplivelse af rumforskning – »for en forståelse af universets oprindelse«.

*Titelfoto: NASA's adm. dir. Griffin præsenterer en billedmontage for formand og adm. dir. ved Kinas Akademi for Rumteknologi, dr. Yuan Jiajun, i 2006, under det første besøg i Kina af en NASA-direktør.*

---

**RADIO SCHILLER den 7. marts  
2016:  
F16-fly til Irak og Syrien//  
Kinas femårs-plan inkl.**

# videnskab og innovation

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

---

## Intet kan lykkes uden opdagelsen af princippet om Månens bagside

*3. marts 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC)* – Hvad er nationer? Hvorfor har vi dem? Hvorfor er de der? Deres formål er i realiteten intet andet end at forbedre vilkårene for menneskeheden, som John F. Kennedy sagde, da han annoncerede missionen om at sende end mand til Månen og få ham sikkert tilbage til Jorden, ved slutningen af de for længst hedengangne 1960'ere. Midlet til denne fremgang for menneskelige vilkår – det er både målet og midlet på samme tid – er gennem ægte opdagelse eller noesis. Det, der er sandt for en nation, er endnu mere sandt for en alliance af nationer som BRIKS, den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union eller Shanghai Samarbejdsorganisationen. Selv om de stadig er nye og skrøbelige, så peger sammenslutningerne af eurasiske nationer allerede frem mod menneskehedens fremtid.

Netop nu, i dette øjeblik, har den russiske præsident Putins bemærkelsesværdige og uventede succes med hans intervention i Barack Obamas og Hillary Clintons morderiske sammenkog i Syrien, tvunget den erkendelse, at det transatlantiske samfund har været en fiasko – en historisk fiasko – op til overfladen. Vi må rette vort blik mod Eurasien, og USA må fremover snarere være orienteret mod Stillehavet end mod Atlanterhavet.

Obama skinner tydeligt igennem som en britisk agent, og intet andet end en britisk agent, der har dræbt mange mennesker. Og Hillary Clinton er af samme støbning.

Det transatlantiske samfund er en tabt sag netop nu; det kan ikke, og vil ikke, komme tilbage i denne form. Hvis det skal komme tilbage, må det fødes på ny. Resterne af det transatlantiske samfund, i denne form, er færdigt. Vi må skabe en ny form for samfund, som det er blevet gjort i fortiden – af Karl den Store, f.eks. Det er, hvad vi må kæmpe for: en fremtid, som virkelig vil være en fremtid.

Dette er betydningen af Kesha Rogers' yderst intellektuelle og yderst inspirerende kampagne for at vende tilbage til vores fremtid gennem udforskningen og erobringen af rummet i vort Solsystem og vor Galakse. Nøglepersoner tiltrækkes allerede mod Kesha fra hele landet og fra hele verden.

Betydningen af dette er det, som Lyndon LaRouche sagde i en diskussion den 1. marts:

*»Vi må sige én ting. Én ting: intet vil lykkes, med mindre nationerne erkender opdagelsen af princippet om Månens bagside. Med andre ord, så kan man ikke sige, at man kan tage det, der foregår netop nu, og fortolke det til en god effekt. Man må annullere dette og sige, 'Problemet er, at vi endnu ikke har forstået, hvad det er, der ligger bagved Månen'. Og når vi finder ud af, hvad der findes bag Månen, hvilket kineserne og andre arbejder på, og vi går tilbage til det oprindelige rumprograms ABC, uden at gå tilbage til disse ting, som Obama beskar – Obama slog disse programmer ned, og dette burde han blive straffet alvorligt for, for sine forbrydelser i denne henseende. I stedet for at forsøge at fortolke noget og give det et andet og bedre spin – det fungerer ikke. For, uden rumprogrammet, hvilket vil sige den anden side af Månen i særdeleshed – uden en sådan tilgang får man ingenting, man kommer ingen vegne. Man må gøre dette! Det er ikke en mulighed, man kan tilvælge eller fravælge. Man kan*

*ikke afvise det: man må erkende, at det er, hvad man må gøre.»*

*Foto: Præsident John F. Kennedy får en forklaring på opsendelsessystemet Saturn V, det system, der sluttelig skulle bringe mennesket til Månen, af dr. Wernher von Braun (i midten), på Cape Canaveral i november 1963.*

---

## **LaRouchePAC Internationale Fredags-Webcast 4. marts 2016:**

### **Vi må udvikle rumprogrammet for hele menneskeheden.**

### **Engelsk udskrift**

*Megan Beets fra LPAC Videnskabsteam rapporterer fra en begivenhed med Kesha Rogers i Texas om rumprogrammets betydning for USA og hele menneskeheden; Jeffrey Steinberg fremlægger en analyse af begivenhederne omkring Libyen, som Hillary Clinton var en del af, med afsættelsen og mordet på Gaddafi, og hele operationens konsekvenser for den aktuelle situation i Nordafrika og Mellemøsten, der kan føre til generel atomkrig; og Jeff Steinberg fremlægger hr. LaRouches tanker om en genrejsning af USA's økonomi, med en genoplivning af rumprogrammet som spydspids. Engelsk udskrift.*

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening. It's March 4th, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden and you are joining us for our weekly

broadcast

here on Friday evenings for the LaRouche PAC webcast, at [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com). I'm joined in the studio this evening by Jeffrey

Steinberg from {Executive Intelligence Review}, and Megan Beets

from the LaRouche Pac Science Team. And Megan Beets just returned

from a trip to Houston, Texas where she was involved in a very significant event and other meetings with Kesha Rogers. Many of

you might have seen the recording of this event, which was also

live-streamed on this website last Saturday. It featured Tom Wismueller, and Kesha Rogers, as well as Megan Beets.

We're going to begin our broadcast this evening with some remarks from Megan Beets, coming off the discussion that we had

with Mr. LaRouche this morning. As many of you know, Mr. LaRouche

has placed a premium on Kesha Rogers' role as a champion, a unique champion, of the resurgence of the United States space program. Kesha Rogers very aggressively campaigned for this cause

in her three campaigns for Federal office that she has run so far

– 2010, 2012, and 2014, in which she was the Democratic nominee

two elections in a row, in the 22nd District of Texas, for the United States House of Representatives, and also ran an internationally profiled Senate campaign in 2014.

So, without further adieu, I would like to ask Megan Beets to come to the podium to deliver a few opening remarks, and then

after that, we'll feature some more discussion coming off of the

meeting we had with Mr. LaRouche this morning, with Jeffrey

Steinberg filling in some of those details.

MEGAN BEETS: Thanks, Matt. I can tell you from my visit to Texas that at this moment, when the breakdown of the trans-Atlantic system is undeniable – we're witnessing the complete malfunctioning and shutdown of this old system – we're also see the reopening of the space program down in Texas. Now the event that I was privileged to participate in with Kesha and Tom Wismueller down in Texas, represents a real beginning of a change of direction of the United States, a rebirth, so to speak, of the United States as a nation. Now, the requirement today is that the United States dump our commitment, our addiction, to this dead, dying trans-Atlantic system, and decide once again to take up a mission in the sense of purpose and contribution to mankind. Now, you look around today. You look around at our citizens. You look at the heroin epidemic. You look at the death, the self-induced deaths from drugs, from suicide, from alcoholism, and so forth. You look at the breakdown in cities like Flint, Michigan, the breakdown in places like certain counties of West Virginia that were once booming coal towns. There's no reflection in the United States of reality. Now, what's reality? Look at the leadership coming from Asia, particularly from China. Look at the kinds of optimistic developments, the progress for humanity, that's coming from the leadership of China and their space program; and in their commitment to development projects which are beginning to take hold and take place all across Eurasia. That's reality. There's no reflection of this yet inside the United States. And so when



we look around, it's not just that the U. S. economy has disappeared. The United States has disappeared. There's no sense

of a unified purpose. There's no sense of a unified mission for

the existence of the United States as a nation, and there's no sense within our people of what {we}, as a nation, will organize

ourselves to contribute to the purposes of mankind.

Now you contrast that with the U.S. sense of purpose and mission as under John F. Kennedy and his Presidency, and his leadership within the United States, and his dedication to the space program. Now, as anyone who truthfully remembers – and most especially, those people who were directly involved – can tell you, this wasn't just a mission for the United States. This

was a real mission for all of mankind. And this was reflected in

some anecdotes in the event last Saturday from some of the attendees, who themselves were engineers or otherwise employed in

NASA during the Apollo missions.

One anecdote that was told by someone saying that he disagreed with Werner von Braun that we should be sharing some of

our technology with the Russians, and his mind was changed by von

Braun. There was another former NASA employee who said that at first in the 1990s, he disagreed with President Clinton's sharing

of U.S. space technology with the former Soviet Union – with Russia. And he said once he started working with Russian engineers, he realized that our mission is mankind; it's unified;

it's the same. And this was reflected throughout the entire event: the sense that our work during the space program was contributing fundamental developments and contributions, not

to  
the progress of the United States, but to the progress of man  
as  
a whole.

Now, why? What is the space program? What happened during  
the space program in the United States?

Well, not only was the common, the general citizen,  
transformed. Not only were there innumerable and immeasurable  
benefits from the economic spin-offs. But most importantly,  
the

people were transformed. The astronauts were fundamentally  
transformed. The engineers working in a space program were  
fundamentally transformed, as we confronted problems in space,  
problems that forced us to overturn our assumptions about the  
principles which govern and control the Universe that we lived  
in. And each of these problems that we confronted, we were to  
conquer. And you see that in the accounts of the people who  
were

involved during that time in the space program: that we were  
able

to pull together around a common mission, thousands and  
thousands

of people across the country to confront these challenges in  
our

knowledge about the Universe, and to conquer them.

And in that way, in a very short period of time, man began  
to rapidly transform and change into a more powerful species.  
We

began to progress into a species with more power and control  
over

the processes in the Universe, so much to the point that we  
were

able to land people on the surface of the Moon, which  
fundamentally transformed our ideas and our knowledge of what  
the

Moon itself is, of what potential the Moon holds for a new  
platform of development for man, which was completely unknown

until the accomplishments of Apollo.

Now this is what the Chinese are doing today with their space program. In 2018, just two years from now, the Chinese plan

to land on the far side of the Moon. This has never been done before. The far side of the Moon has been imaged with satellites,

it's been seen by human eyes in the American astronauts who travelled there. But nobody has ever landed on the far side of the Moon.

Now, people may say, "Well, we know what the Moon is; we've looked at it. We've taken pictures." But the fact is, the far side of the Moon is a completely unknown quantity to us. When we

land there, for example, what do we think the far side can teach

us? When we land there, we'll have a chance to confront our fundamental notions about the formation of the Moon, the formation of the Earth, and possibly other planets in the Solar

System with the unique geological investigations that we'll be able to perform there.

When we land there, and when we're able to set up astronomical observatories in the very low radio frequency range,

which is a band of the electromagnetic spectrum which is impossible to look at the Solar System in from anywhere attainable to us besides the far side of the Moon; when we are able to look at the Solar System in this new range, we're very likely going to discover that the planets, the interstellar medium, distant galaxies, different stars, could exhibit processes to us which were completely invisible before.

It's this kind of potential for mankind to transform our powers, to transform our relationship to the Solar System itself,

that's being offered by the Chinese actions today. And it's this

sense of meaning, this sense of mobilization and commitment to progress for all of mankind, which is what we, down in Texas, are reminding people of. What Kesha is reminding people of – even people who participated in these great accomplishments 40 or 50 years ago, and who might have encountered now a sense of demoralization with the actions since that time. We're drawing people back out to a commitment of this mission. And Kesha is showing once again that the United States can, and must, commit itself to this kind of purpose for all of mankind. So I can just conclude by reporting that the beginnings of these developments that we're seeing coming out of Texas, is that people down there still associate themselves with reality, and are now playing a leading role, with Kesha, in being moved toward recognizing that this is the viable option for the United States.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Megan. And like I said, if you haven't gotten a chance to see the recording of the event that occurred down in Texas last Saturday, it is archived on the larouchepac youtube channel, and I would encourage you to watch it. It was a very uplifting event, and we can expect to hear much, much more from Kesha Rogers, obviously. Now, the second item on our agenda tonight is something which you may have heard Mr. LaRouche emphasize during the discussion with the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee this past Monday. Towards the end of that show, you might have caught Mr. LaRouche's reference to a series of very significant articles that were published in the {New York Times} over the weekend. They were titled: "Hillary Clinton, Smart Power, and a Dictator's

Fall: The Role of Hillary Clinton in the ouster and killing of Colonel Muammar Qaddafi That Left Libya a Failed State and a Terrorist Haven.” This article, or series of articles, which were

based on a number of interviews from people who were right on the

inside of the entire decision-making process that led into the decision to overthrow Qaddafi, and to ultimately have him killing, very vividly paints the picture of the months leading up

into that decision, and Hillary Clinton’s central role in making

that decision on the inside of the Obama White House.

And this, despite dire warnings from intelligence experts, and military experts, as to what the aftermath of that decision

would be, and also even overtures of peace that were coming from

Libya itself, and the Libyan government – overtures for a peaceful transition, which were directly and decisively ignored

by the Clinton State Department and the Obama White House.

These actions, this regime-change operation in Libya, as we know now very well, directly led to Libya becoming a failed state, and creating the vacuum in which Libya could be the staging ground for what has now come to be called ISIS today – these radical jihadist terrorist who in many parts are using the

weapons that were channeled into Libya at that time by the Hillary Clinton-Obama operation, in order to overthrow Qaddafi.

They are now using those weapons to take over large swaths of territory in Northern Africa, and in the Middle East. Obviously,

this is the context for the tragic events that unfolded on Sept.

11 in Benghazi in which Ambassador Stevens and three other

Americans were killed. However, I think this point to the more important discussion that should be being had: What was Hillary

Clinton's role? What was Barack Obama's role in the decision for

regime change in Libya, and what will be the outcome if we allow

this same regime-change operation to continue to take place in Syria and in many other countries?

One note I would say just before inviting Jeff up to the podium to discuss this more in detail, is the importance of the

coincidence of the publication of these series of articles in the

{New York Times} with Congresswoman Tulsi Gabbard's surprise announcement that she was resigning as vice-chair of the DNC in

order to more aggressively campaign against Hillary Clinton, explicitly because of Hillary Clinton's identity as a strong and

vocal advocate of the policy of regime change what Tulsi Gabbard

has said she personally witnessed the tragic and disastrous consequences of on the ground in Iraq, after the decision to have

regime change against Saddam Hussein. Tulsi Gabbard was active service military. And we saw the decision again in the case of Libya, and now we are confronting directly head-on whether or not

that decision will be made in Syria.

This also obviously has a lot to do with the context of Secretary of State John Kerry's efforts to create the framework

for a ceasefire, along with Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov in Syria.

Now, what I would like to ask Jeff to discuss at the podium is what Mr. LaRouche's take has been on the significance of

these

articles, and also the very precise timing of these articles being published right now, during this Presidential campaign season, and what the implications of this should be seen in terms

of the ongoing fight behind the scenes continuing to this day in

the Obama Administration.

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Thanks, Matt. Well, the two-part series, lengthy articles that were published late last week, early this

week, in the New York Times bring back into stark relief and memory, the fact that the decision to overthrow and execute Qaddafi was not only a turning point in recent history. It unleashed a flood of instability. Massive amounts of weapons flooded out of Libya. All across Africa a structure was set up for laundering those weapons into Syria, where they ultimately wound up in the hands of both the al-Qaeda, and later the Islamic

State forces. This has been a source of mass death, grave instability, throughout the entire Africa and Middle East region,

and beyond.

Now, what the {New York Times} articles make clear is something that was well-known to us and which Mr. LaRouche commented on exhaustively as these events were playing out.

But

from the standpoint of the current elections and things related

to the ongoing war danger, now at the threshold of the danger of

a general war, a nuclear war, it's very important to reflect back

on this.

Effectively, as the result of Hillary Clinton joining the White House, joining President Obama, joining Samantha Power,

joining Susan Rice and Valerie Jarrett, in pressing for the violent overthrow of the Qaddafi government, the assassination of Qaddafi, and effectively the installation of the Muslim Brotherhood and al-Qaeda into power in Libya, this meant that Hillary Clinton had completely capitulated to Obama. Prior to that point, during the Obama administration, despite the fact that it was a grave political mistake on the part of Hillary Clinton to have become a part of the Obama Administration in the first place, the fact is that she had generally aligned herself with Defense Secretary Gates, with General Dempsey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and had been a barrier to the worst kinds of British policies coming out of Obama, Jarrett, Rice, Power, and the others grouped around this President. Obama is a British agent, plain and simple, and that was one of the first points that Mr. LaRouche emphasized in our discussion earlier today. And he said, Look, Hillary Clinton was terrified into playing the role that she played in Libya. She was not the only person pushing for regime change; she was, in the words of Roberts Gates, "the tilt factor". The decisive vote in a very close 51-49 vote, where Gates himself, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, were opposed to launching the no-fly zone. Launching what was being mislabelled a humanitarian intervention, when from the very outset it was always about regime change. You've got to remember that the characteristic of the Obama Presidency is to be found in those Tuesday kill sessions; where the President sits down with a group of national security advisors, Cabinet



members,  
representatives of the military and intelligence community,  
and  
makes life-or-death arbitrary decisions to add people's names  
to  
the kill lists. In some cases – we know in at least four  
instances – people were put on that kill list who were  
American  
citizens; who were deprived of any day in court, any due  
process,  
and were summarily assassinated. Whether by special forces,  
whether by drone attacks, or combinations of both.  
So, that's the character of the Obama administration. And  
with the 2011 decision to overthrow Qaddafi, Hillary Clinton –  
out of absolute fear – remember, you're dealing with a  
President  
who relishes the idea of coming up with weekly lists of  
targets  
for assassination. With that Libya decision, with Clinton's  
decision to side with her own worst enemies, going all the way  
back to the 2008 campaign when she campaigned against Barack  
Obama; when Samantha Power publicly went out on the stump  
calling  
her a witch. When she capitulated and sided with those  
British  
forces in the Libya operation, she not only participated in  
the  
unleashing of absolute Hell across much of Africa and the  
Middle  
East region; but she caved in to people who, at an earlier  
point,  
she knew were absolutely despicable and were her avowed  
enemies.  
That capitulation is something that she will live with  
forever.  
Now, recently, in the course of reviewing the Africa events,  
the Libya events, some additional information has come out

that  
even puts a further punctuation point on the fact that there  
was  
a top-down decision in which Secretary Clinton participated,  
along with President Obama, to overthrow Qaddafi; no questions  
asked, no second thoughts. There's a very precise timeline  
that  
has been provided by a retired US Navy Rear Admiral named  
Charles  
Kubic, who was retired from the Navy and was a business man  
working in Libya – also a trained engineer. And when the  
United  
Nations Security Council passed the resolution to establish a  
no-fly zone and a “humanitarian corridor” around Benghazi –  
this  
was on March 19, 2011 – on that very day, Rear Admiral Kubic  
was  
contacted by people in the inner circle of Qaddafi; and they  
said, “Let's talk.” Let's not go with diplomatic  
formulations.  
Let's immediately convene a battlefield 72-hour truce. And  
during that time, let's discuss an orderly procedure for  
standing  
down the Libyan forces that were moving on Benghazi, and on an  
orderly transition of power. Qaddafi was prepared to leave  
Libya, to go into exile; to arrange a negotiated government to  
follow from him, and to basically stand down the Libyan forces  
that were, in fact, battling al-Qaeda and other jihadist  
networks  
in the area around Benghazi and Misurata inside Libya.  
Admiral  
Kubic conveyed immediately the approach that he had gotten  
from  
the head of Qaddafi's personal security. He conveyed it to  
Stuttgart, Germany; it was reported to General Carter Ham, the  
head of the Africa Command, and General Ham responded  
favorably.

Details were being worked out the very next day to convene exactly this kind of battlefield truce and negotiating process;

either in Tripoli, or right off the shores of Libya on a designated US military ship. And in fact, there was a halt on the part of Qaddafi of the military movement toward Benghazi and

Misurata. So, in other words, everything was there within the first 24 hours of when the bombing began of Libya, for the conflict to stop right there; for Qaddafi's departure; for none

of the death and destruction that followed to actually take place. On the evening of March 20, 2011, General Carter Ham issued a statement saying that the United States had no interest

in targetting Qaddafi. That was the return signal that the Libyans were looking for, coming from AFRICOM, that the negotiations could begin perhaps as early as the next morning. However that entire situation was cancelled; Admiral Kubic was ordered to stand down, to drop the contact. AFRICOM was ordered

to stand down and abandon any plans for any such negotiation for

Qaddafi's departure. Because the decision had been made "higher

up in the administration" that there would be no turning back; that this was a regime change operation, and in fact, a part of

that was the fact that the British – who had agents inside the inner circle of Qaddafi's own personal security detail – were the ones who fingered his location and set up his assassination

later that year.

So, in other words, the destruction of Libya, the destruction of Africa, that came in part as a measure of Hillary

Clinton's capitulation to President Obama, and above all else,

to  
the British; could have been at least short-circuited and the  
worst damage prevented. The death of Ambassador Stephens and  
the  
three other American officials a year and later probably could  
have been averted. But none of that happened, because there  
was  
a willful decision; undoubtedly the decision was made in  
London,  
was passed in through Obama. And rather than fighting against  
that, Hillary Clinton capitulated; and it was out of a fear of  
Obama, out of a fear that this was a killer President. There  
were a number of opportunities where she had the possibility  
to  
resign and put the spotlight where it properly belonged; but  
none  
of those things happened.

And as the result of that, all of the African continent is  
now one extended battle zone. As the result of that, we have  
the  
existence of the Islamic State; because Turkey, Saudi Arabia,  
Qatar flooded Syria and Iraq with the kinds of weapons that  
had  
been derived from what was at one point a secured Qaddafi  
arsenal  
of all kinds of weapons. And those weapons have now spread  
chaos, death, and destruction across that entire swath of  
North  
Africa and the Middle East. That's the legacy, that's the  
consequence of the fact that, as Secretary of State, Hillary  
Clinton failed to uphold her responsibilities; capitulated to  
her  
own worst avowed enemies in the Obama administration, and  
unfortunately, the rest is history.

Mr. LaRouche, at the time, pointedly said, from the moment  
that he heard that Qaddafi had been assassinated, that the  
real

targets were Russia and China; and that these events in 2011 were the beginning of a process that would now accelerate towards the general warfare – potentially thermonuclear warfare – involving the United States, Russia, and China. So, look back with a certain degree of hindsight, and understand the consequences of what happened in that critical moment of March of 2011; and see how all of the events that have followed from that, and why we are on the verge of a potential thermonuclear war of annihilation of mankind. Understand how critical decisions in critical moments, shape events for long periods of time to come.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Jeff. Now, in the context of what Jeff just said about the overarching policy that has emanated from this Obama administration against Russia and against China, you've seen obvious economic warfare also that's taken place from the United States against both of those countries. The next question pertains to one of those aspects; and I know that it will also give Jeff an opportunity to discuss a little bit about what Mr. LaRouche's views are on the necessity of a massive mobilization inside the United States to rebuild our economy, spearheaded by Kesha Rogers' efforts in Texas to revive the legacy of the NASA space program. So, the question reads as follows: "Mr. LaRouche, the US Department of Commerce has imposed a 265% tariff on Chinese cold-rolled steel. The Department of Commerce stated that the

tariffs are meant to punish China for dumping cold-rolled steel onto the market; which is used to make auto parts, appliances, and shipping containers. In your view, will these imposed tariffs help the US steel industry? And if not, what measures do you recommend to revitalize our steel industry?"

STEINBERG: Well, the first thing that Mr. LaRouche said was, if you want to revitalize the US economy, then you've got to start out by shutting down Wall Street; because Wall Street right now is about the only steel sector left in the United States – they steal everything that's available to be stolen. Now, I think that this move by the Commerce Department came as the result of pressure from a number of members of Congress; most of whom are simply desperate and misguided and are not even among the worst people in the US Congress. The idea that somehow or other, putting prohibitive tariffs on the importing of Chinese steel at this stage of the game, when the entire real economy of the United States is in a state of absolute collapse, is the ultimate folly. Now, let's just look at some of the basic facts of what's been going on inside the US economy; and particularly, let's look at the steel sector. We don't have the data for all of 2015, but we know that between 2014 and 2015 there was actually a 26% decline in the amount of steel imported from China. And the reason for that is because there was an even greater decline in the overall steel utilization inside the US

economy; because the US economy is in a state of physical, economic collapse. One of the areas where you had substantial use of steel, not on a gigantic scale, but on a significant scale, was in the shale oil and gas sector; which we know is in a state of collapse right now. And the fact that it was that sector that was a major source of steel use in the US economy, just tells you how far down the scale of real economic development that we have fallen.

Now, the fact of the matter is, that on a global scale centered in the trans-Atlantic region, you have a significant collapse in physical economic output. Real production in the United States has collapsed; we've gone through 15 consecutive months of a decline in industrial output. The shale oil and gas sector collapse is a small piece at the tail end of a 40-year process of economic collapse, disintegration, out-sourcing of what little real economic activity was going on. So the idea that a tariff, at this point, is going to protect a domestic industry that collapsed over the past 40 years, is an act of desperation; when in fact, we need real creative thinking.

Now, {Executive Intelligence Review} has recently – we've talked about it on this show before – produced a supplement to the World Land-Bridge report, called "The United States Must Join the World Land-Bridge"; and it lays out a clear game plan for a genuine economic revival of the United States. It starts by shutting down Wall Street; they're hopelessly bankrupt. And the bankruptcy of Wall Street is now in the process of advancing the disintegration of the real economy of the United States; and the real economy of the United States means the American people. When we were discussing earlier today with Mr. LaRouche, he said,

“Look, what’s the most chilling indication of the real rate of collapse of the US economy? It’s the exponential increase in the number of people dying of heroin overdoses; it’s the number of people, the exponential rise in the number of people committing suicide in other ways, as well. It’s the desperation and demoralization of a population that was once inspired, that was once the most productive population in the world; and is now fallen into a state of complete collapse.” In 2005, we saw the takedown of the auto sector; and what that meant was the machine tool design sector associated with the US auto sector was wiped out. Under President Obama, there has been a conscious and systematic policy of shutting down our space program; and it’s only through that space exploration, as Megan just emphasized, that you have any prospect of a genuine future for mankind. The good news is that the report coming out of Texas is that some of the leading circles historically associated with NASA, current and former NASA employees, have reached the point where they realize: 1) that it’s all over for the United States if there’s not a real fight to revive the space program. They see certain glimmers of reflection of what was once a driving force in the growth of real productivity in the American economy; namely, the space program, centered in NASA Houston. You had the return to Earth of Scott Kelly, who spent a year up in space; an exciting development, it’s a glimmer. It’s a sort of smell or fragrance of the fact that NASA can be revived; that we can have



a resurgence of the kind of optimism that we had during the Kennedy Presidency, before he was assassinated. Where the Apollo program was the centerpiece for the whole development of the real US economy. You've got NASA people now beginning to say, "Yes, we're ready for a real fight." The fight is on; and you've got reflections of that that you'll see emerging as a tendency in other parts of the country. Southern California used to be a major center of our space program; you had the Jet Propulsion Lab in the Los Angeles area, a crucial component. And you, of course, had the Lawrence Livermore Lab up in the Bay area. These are centers that can be revived; but only if we get a core revival of that NASA mission. The mission to join with China, with Russia, with India, with other nations, in exploring and developing the universe as part of man's extraterrestrial mission.

So, if you think about the steel issue again, from that standpoint, how much steel would be required for the kind of nationwide high-speed rail system that is part of the "US joins the World Land-Bridge"? How much steel will be required for a proliferation of nuclear power plants throughout the United States? The modernization of the existing plants, and they're replacement where appropriate, by fourth generation nuclear power plants. What would be the requirements once we've actually completed the process of successfully commercializing fusion? These are the issues for the future; but these fights have to won today. And if you want to understand the biggest mass kill factor with President Obama, it has been his killing of the NASA

space program; because that is a mass execution of the future. And so, these issues are all very much inextricably tied together. Unless we get a revolutionary change in policy, which means a return to the kind of Hamiltonian principles that we last saw on display in the Franklin Roosevelt Presidency overall, and in the Kennedy Apollo program in particular. These ideas are there; and we're getting now, coming from the Houston vicinity, from the NASA center there, a rumbling. The start of a real fight to basically bring the United States back into space; as part of a collaborative mission for all of mankind. And as I say, once that happens, the issue of steel, the issue of dumping; all of this becomes meaningless. Because the actual physical requirements will be so enormous, the return to optimism and the benefits of that – particularly for a lost generation of young people, who represent a high percentage of those who are going off as heroin addicts, who are committing suicide, who have no sense of future. We've got to restore the future; and that starts with a fight to revive NASA. And the good news is that that fight is now beginning; it's in its early moments, but it's a fight that is winnable. And the future of the United States hangs in the balance.

OGDEN: Thank you very much. Because Jeff mentioned it, I would just encourage our viewers to revisit the pamphlet; which is both available in print form, and in digital form: "The United States Must Join the New Silk Road; A Hamiltonian Vision for an Economic Renaissance"; which features much of what Jeff just discussed in terms of a national high-speed rail program,

a  
Bering Straits tunnel or bridge project to connect us to Eurasia.  
To the phenomenal developments that are happening now in China;  
but it also has an entire section on a science-driver development mission, which includes much of the cutting edge work that needs to be done with a revived space program – not just in the United States, but also collaboration that we must begin to cooperate with China's and Russia's space programs. And have what Mr. LaRouche has so aptly termed the common aims of mankind; that is the truest form of a war avoidance program for a durable piece.  
So, with that said, I would like to thank Jeff; and I would also like to thank Megan Beets for joining us here this evening.  
And I would encourage you to stay tuned to [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com).  
Thank you very much.

---

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 3.  
marts 2016:  
Schiller Instituttet har  
foretræde for Folketingets**

**Udenrigsudvalg:**

**Syrisk våbenhvile er en  
chance for fred gennem  
økonomisk udvikling//**

**Helga Zepp-LaRouche i Indien:**

**Forlæng Silkevejen til  
Mellemøsten**

**Sagen om Nykredit/Totalcredit**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

---

**Økonomisk udvikling:**

**Kina vil bygge 30  
atomkraftværker langs  
Silkevejen**

*3. marts 2016* – Kina har sat sig et mål om at bygge omkring 30 atomkraftværker i lande langs med ruterne i Bælt-og-Vej-programmet frem til 2030, iflg. Sun Qin, præsident for Kinas Nationale Atomkraftselskab, CNNC, rapporterer *China Daily* i dag.

Sun sagde, at 70 lande i alt allerede er i gang med at

planlægge eller udvikle deres egne projekter for atomkraftværker, og man skønner, at flere end 130 atomkraftværker vil være bygget frem til 2020.

»Men vi står også over for meget stærk konkurrence på det internationale atommarked«, sagde han. »Lande som Rusland, Sydkorea, Japan og USA udforsker alle aggressivt det globale marked for atomkraft.«

CNNC er en af Kinas tre store atomkraftgiganter. Selskabet håber at kunne bruge sin nationale erfaring som en løftestang for at øge sin eksport af atomteknologi, sagde *China Daily*. Det har allerede bilaterale aftaler om samarbejde om atomkraft med lande, der omfatter Argentina, Brasilien, Egypten, Storbritannien, Frankrig og Jordan, sagde Sun.

CNNC har allerede eksporteret seks atomkraftreaktorer – fem miniature neutron source reaktorer (MNSR), to atomforskningsfaciliteter og en eksperimentalreaktor.

*Foto: Atomkraftreaktorer under konstruktion i Sanmen, Zhejiang-provinsen, Kina. (Xinhua).*

---

**Vores mission: »Vi må være helliget til kreativ opdagelse«**

*28. februar 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – Alle dele af planeten konfronteres nu med valget mellem to konkurrerende*

stemmer. »Spørgsmålet drejer sig om krisen«, erklærede **Lyndon LaRouche skarpt under sin dialog med Manhattan-projektet den 27. feb.** »Vil du dø, eller vil du leve? Det er de to stemmer.«

Halvdelen af menneskeheden – BRIKS og de hermed allierede lande, under anførsel af Rusland og Kina – har allerede valgt at leve og tilbyder at være med til at redde resten af planeten. Den transatlantiske sektor har indtil videre valgt at dø. Hvilken anden betydning kunne det have, fortsat at tolerere Wall Street og tillade den onde dræber Obamas tilstedeværelse i Det Hvide Hus? Hvilken anden betydning kunne det have, fortsat at tolerere den aktuelle farce omkring valg af præsidentkandidater, og tillade, at tidligere produktive arbejdere dræber sig selv i rekordstort antal, med narko, alkohol og direkte selvmord? Hvad med ødelæggelsen af NASA og den kreative, missionsorienterede anskuelse, det repræsenterede?

Den russiske præsident Putins intervention med en flankoperation i Syrien og den bredere, regionale situation, med begyndelse i september 2015, har på dramatisk vis omformet hele geometrien i de globale anliggender. Obama er mod sin vilje blevet banket ind i et samarbejde med Rusland om den aktuelle våbenhvile i Syrien, der fortsat holder under det amerikanske og russiske militærs voksende koordination. Dramatiske, positive forandringer finder sted i Iran, Egypten og andre nationer, der har valgt at alliere sig med BRIKS-udviklingen. Og befolkningen i USA – på trods af en årtier lang, britisk fordømmelsesproces ind i pragmatisme, og som nu er ved at kvæles af et valgcirkus – responderer med uvant optimisme til LaRouche-bevægelsens mobilisering, der på enestående vis resonerer med det aktuelle, politiske fremstød fra både Putin og Xi Jinpings kinesiske regering. Når alt kommer til alt, så blev meget af deres politik, og mest eftertrykkeligt den Nye Silkevej, oprindeligt udtænkt og promoveret af Lyndon og Helga LaRouche.

Som et eksempel på denne begyndende renæssance står den

særdeles succesfulde **Schiller Institut konference, der blev afholdt den 27. feb. »i skyggen af Johnson Space Center«** i Texas, med medlem af LPAC Policy Committee og tidligere demokratisk kandidat til Kongressen, Kesha Rogers, der genaktiverede og på ny gav liv til NASA-veteraner og andre omkring vores nødvendige mission: at mennesket sluttelig er en fornuftsart baseret i rummet, som Rogers understregede det. På samme måde var en *forandring* i modtagelighed åbenlyst til stede ved den nylige konference i Seattle, med Helga Zepp-LaRouche som hovedtaler; ved et arrangement på Georgetown University, hvor Matthew Ogden holdt hovedtalen; ved LaRouche-bevægelsens Verdenslandbro-konferencer i Hermosillo (Mexico) og i Lima (Peru), samt andre steder.

Det er LaRouche-organisationens enestående »helligelse til kreativ opdagelse«, som LaRouche beskrev det under sin diskussion med Manhattan-projektet, og udelukkende dette, der sætter os i en position, hvor vi kan forme den globale udvikling i retning af det gode. Men det pålægger os også strenge, interne betingelser, der kræver, at vi gør det klart, når organisationer *ikke* er en del af denne forpligtelse og således i stedet bliver forhindringer for vore bestræbelser succes.

*»Hele formålet med menneskeheden er dens evne til at gøre opdagelser, som den, der gjorde opdagelsen, aldrig selv helt vil høste frugten af«,*

erklærede LaRouche til publikum ved Manhattan-projektet.

*»Men kun personer, der er i deres adfærd er besjælet af denne ånd, vil være i stand til at levere et eksempel på det, som er nødvendigt for menneskehedens fremtid.«*

*Foto: Forberedelse til yderligere udforskning af rummet, det naturlige, næste trin i menneskehedens udvikling. Her arbejder ingeniører fra NASA og Lockheed Martin på NASA's Orion-*

*rumfartøj, der efter planen skal opsendes i december måned.*

---

# **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 Ehrlicke'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 Ehrlicke'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 Ehrlicke'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.

---

# **Spørgsmål og Svar Special den 25. februar 2016 om LaRouches fysiske økonomi**

P.g.a. en fejl blev programmet desværre ikke optaget, men her er kildematerialet. Michelle Rasmussens indlægsnotater på dansk vil blive udlagt senere.

Vi diskuterede nøglepunkterne i kapitler 1 og 2 af Lyndon LaRouches lærebog "So, you wish to learn all about economics?":

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Her er LaRouches video om emnet, som var lavet i forbindelse med bogen:

---

## **7000 argentinske forskere advarer: Neoliberalisme og sand videnskab kan ikke eksistere**

# side om side

22. februar 2016 – Syv tusinde argentinske videnskabsfolk, der repræsenterer flere forskellige institutioner, har underskrevet et dokument, der skarpt angriber præsident Mauricio Macri og advarer om, at, som det i fortiden er blevet demonstreret, så er monetarisme skadelig for sand videnskabelig udvikling og kreativitet, rapporterede *Página 12* den 21. februar. Argentina er nu, lyder erklæringen, i en »konservativ genrejsnings« kvælergreb.

Neoliberalisme og videnskab »er en modsigelse«, sagde Dora Barrancos, chef for Det Nationale Råd for Videnskabelig og Teknologisk Forskning (Conicet). »Vi har én gang før gennemlevet dette med [José] Martinez de Hoz«, sagde hun med reference til City of London-agenten, der tjente som Argentinas finansminister i militærdiktaturet 1976-83, og som forsøgte at virkeliggøre den britiske imperiedrøm om et Argentina, der snarere var en »landlig idyl« end et industrialiseret land. Dengang blev industri og videnskab lagt på huggeblokken, og der er uro i videnskabelige kredse over, at Macri vil standse finansiering af videnskabelig forskning, sagde Barrancos.

Dr. Eduardo Dvorkin, leder af det Nationale Akademi for Eksakte Fysiske og Naturlige Videnskaber, sagde til *Página 12*, at videnskabsfolk er bekymrede, »fordi en politik, der er imod national udvikling, og som sætter individuelle rettigheder på spil, er blevet påtvunget landet ... På kun to måneder er landet gået fra at være en model på autonom udvikling, med universiteter, forskningscentre og små og mellemstore selskaber som basis for vækst, til at være et land, der er baseret på multinationale selskaber, der, i stedet for at udvikle landet, importerer alting, fyrer arbejdere, og som har modtaget en enorm overførsel af finansielle ressourcer.«

En anden underskriver, Daniel Filmus, understregede, at »vi

videnskabsfolk lever ikke i en anden verden – der er en forbindelse mellem en udviklingsmodel og videnskabelig aktivitet. Hvis der ikke er nogen interesse for at udvikle industri og suverænitet, er der ingen plads til videnskabelig udvikling.«

*Foto: Dora Barrancos*

---

# DET SKER I VERDEN – Infrastruktur, Videnskab & Teknologi – nr. 7

Korte artikler fra hele verden. Indeholder bl.a.:

- Der er også en fremtid for Tyskland – med fusionsenergi! –
- Kinas Beidou satellit-system skal bidrage med en vigtig egenskab til "Rumsilkevejen" –
- Der er helium-3 på Månen, men meget mere på Uranus –
- O.m.a.

*Titelfoto: En kunstners gengivelse af NASA-ISRO NISAR satellitten, der skal opsendes i 2020, og som skal overvåge naturkatastrofer og miljø.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

# Tyskland: 'Fysik for flygtninge' – At vække forskningsens ånd og give håb for skabelsen af fremtiden

22. februar 2016 – Sidste december stod det Tyske Selskab for Fysik (DPG) og Georg-August Universitet i Göttingen i spidsen for et projekt, »Fysik for Flygtninge«, der var henvendt til børn og unge i henved 20 flygtningelokaliteter i hele Tyskland. Hver uge udførte 500 frivillige et fysikeksperiment, der blev gentaget af de unge, på disse steder. De opfandt også en internet-baseret »kalender for kommende fysik«, hvor eksperimenter præsenteredes via YouTube uden at give svaret. Med hjælp fra frivillige blev disse eksperimenter gentaget og løsningerne indsendt.

Projektet har fået støtte fra regeringen og vil fortsætte i en anden form i 2016. Hovedformålet er at give børn mulighed for at koncentrere sig om noget andet end den umiddelbare virkelighed i flygtningecentrene, at vise dem, at de er meget velkomne, og at opmuntre dem til at blive involveret i at udføre fysikeksperimenter på en legende måde. Deres webside siger: »Fysiske fænomener er universelle og globale. For at udføre eksperimenter behøver man ikke et bestemt sprog, en bestemt religion eller et bestemt sted. Det samme gælder for alle mennesker på Jorden, uanset, hvor man er, hvilket sprog, man taler, eller hvilken religion, man tilhører. Fysik er spændende, sjovt og lærerigt – og at udføre eksperimenter skaber selvtillid. Fysik er sjovt – og det er overalt!«  
<https://www.dpg-physik.de/pff/index.html>



DPG forpligter gennem sin forfatning sig selv og sine medlemmer »til at stå for frihed, tolerance, sandfærdighed og værdighed og at være sig bevidst, at de personer, der er aktive inden for fysik, i en meget speciel, høj grad er ansvarlige for dannelsen af menneskeligt liv som helhed. Vi besluttede derfor, i denne aktuelle, akutte situation, at tilbyde Fysik for Flygtninge for at engagere særligt børn og unge efter deres lange flugt, gennem at kombinere lærerig og spændende underholdning.«

Frivillige rapporterer, hvordan udførelse af eksperimenter »vækker forskningens ånd«, og at sprogbarrierer meget let overvindes. Projektets særlige virkning er »læringseffekten – på begge sider!«

*Foto: Flygtningebørn i Friedland oplever 'Physik im Advent' med frivillige hjælpere.*

---

**LaRouchePAC Internationale  
Fredags-webcast, 19. februar  
2016:**

**USA og Europa må samarbejde  
med Rusland og Kina for at**

# undgå krig

*Faren for en massiv, endnu større strøm af flygtninge, der kommer fra Afrika og ind i Europa, så vel som også den fortsatte krise centreret omkring Mellemøsten, betyder således, at Europa er absolut dømt til undergang, med mindre der finder et fundamentalt skifte i politikken sted. Og dette betyder, at USA og Europa indledningsvis må række hånden frem mod Rusland og Kina.*

Engelsk Udskrift.

## **US & EUROPE MUST REACH OUT TO RUSSIA & CHINA TO AVOID WAR**

International LaRouche PAC Webcast  
Friday, February 19, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening. It's February 19, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden and you're joining us for our weekly, Friday evening broadcast here from [larouchepac .com](http://larouchepac.com)

I'm joined in the studio tonight by Jason Ross from the LaRouche PAC science team, and we're joined via video, from a remote location, by Jeffrey Steinberg of Executive Intelligence

Review. The three of us, along with several others, had a chance

to have a discussion earlier today with both Lyndon and Helga Zepp-LaRouche, so what you're about to hear will be informed by

that discussion.

Now, I'm going to just start right off the bat with a discussion of the very dire threat of an international conflict

arising, especially from the powderkeg of Syria, Northern Africa,

and the Middle East. The area of Syria, where, despite the efforts of Secretary John Kerry to find common ground with



Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, Obama's refusal to tell Saudi Arabia and Turkey to stand down is threatening to blow this entire thing sky high. A very accurate discussion of this was published earlier today in a piece on Consortium News by Robert Parry, the editor of that publication, in which he says the risk that the multi-sided Syrian war could spark World War III, continues, as Turkey and U.S. neo-cons seek an invasion that could kill Russian troops, and possibly escalate the Syrian crisis into a nuclear showdown.

What Robert Parry says in this article is that Barack Obama took questions from reporters on Tuesday, but he did not take the one that needed to be asked: which was whether he had forbidden Turkey and Saudi Arabia to invade Syria, because on that question could hinge whether the ugly Syrian civil war could spin off into World War III and possibly a nuclear showdown.

Now, this was part of our discussion earlier today with Mr. LaRouche and what I know Jeff will elaborate much more on, was LaRouche's analysis. But in short, what Mr. LaRouche had to say is that what Putin is doing in this situation, and overall in a strategic manner, defines the point of action, defines the point of reference, for action. Everything else is bluff.

So, let me hand it over to Jeff, and he'll elaborate many more of the details, and then we'll come back to our institutional question for this evening, which Jeff will also answer. So, Jeff?

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Thank you, Matt. Well, as we were going through the discussion with Mr. LaRouche earlier today, he actually drew a distinction between the bluff, and what he said much more accurately is the folly of what Turkey and Saudi Arabia are up to. It's folly because they are caught in their own madness, and don't even realize the consequences of what they're doing in the real world. They don't have the capability to carry out the kind of provocations that they are threatening, and the danger, of course, is that that does not mean that they're not going to try to do it.

Putin stepped into the Syria situation at a critical moment last September, and the entire situation has shifted radically since that point. The Russian intention is {not} to simply accomplish a military victory on behalf of the forces of President Assad. They're creating the conditions to force the intransigents, in this case Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, some of the other Gulf states, and always lurking in the background when you're dealing with Saudi Arabia and the Muslim Brotherhood is the British. So, Putin has established a clear sense of control over the situation. Undoubtedly part of Putin's configuration is that Obama has been greatly weakened by the actions of Russia; on the economic sphere, the actions of China; and there are sane military forces in the United States who recognize the folly of what Turkey and Saudi Arabia are doing.

This has been described by Parry, whose article you mentioned, and by others, as the danger of a Sarajevo 1914

flash

point, along the Syria-Turkey border, but what Mr. LaRouche emphasized today is that Putin has a very clear sense of the military correlation in this situation, and has also a very clear

sense that Turkey and Saudi Arabia are acting on the basis of their own irrationality. And he is luring them in to the kind of

trap that could be basically enclosed on them at any moment. It's

a gravely dangerous situation, but you have at least one key player, namely Russian President Putin, who knows what he's doing, and who is steering these events in a way that conforms to

an appropriate strategic analysis, and to an understanding of how

to basically defeat these forces that have been trying to destroy

Syria for the last five years, and in so doing, to deprive Russia

of one of its own critical access points in the Mediterranean region.

Now, what Mr. LaRouche really emphasized, and I think that this is the crucial point to take away from this issue, is that

the center of gravity of world affairs has dramatically shifted

to where the Asia-Eurasia region, anchored in the cooperation between China and Russia and India, with other countries grouping

around that, is really where the strategic center of the world economy has now been shifted. And if you look at the situation in

Europe, in particular, from one end to the other you see nothing

but bankruptcy and political failure. The United States is on the

verge of the same kind of bankruptcy. And so the only place where you have growth and stability by any measure, and of course Asia and Russia and Eurasia are not devoid of problems, but relative to the state of absolute bankruptcy that we see in Europe and in the United States, we see a disintegration of the political and economic conditions in much of South America, as well. Of course, Africa has been on the target list of the British and other European colonial, imperial powers for the longest time. But in Asia, you not only have a much more stable and growing situation, but you have a commitment to an abandonment of geopolitics in favor of what Chinese President Xi Jinping has called the "win-win" strategy. And if you look at the crisis in Europe right now, leaving aside the fact that the entire European financial system is bankrupt – hopelessly, irreversibly bankrupt under the present conditions and terms of thinking that dominate Europe – if you look at the refugee crisis, you're beginning to see a glimmer of sanity, driven by desperation, by certain of the people who are responsible for creating the European fiasco in the first place. So, you've got people like Wolfgang Schäuble, the finance minister of Germany, who was one of the monsters behind the destruction of Europe, including the German economy itself, now saying there must be a Marshall Plan to rebuild Syria, to

rebuild

other parts of the Middle East, and only on the basis of a Marshall Plan, which gives people a clear incentive to go back to

their homes, to rebuild their country, only under those circumstances, and those circumstances alone, can the refugee crisis in Europe be remotely solved. And of course, what applies

to the Middle East applies doubly for Africa, where the U.S.-British-French overthrow of Qaddafi unleashed absolute hell

throughout the African continent.

And so the danger of a massive, even larger flow of refugees coming out of Africa into Europe, as well as the continuing crisis centered in the Middle East, means that Europe is absolutely doomed unless there is a fundamental change in policy.

And for starters, that change means that the United States and Europe must reach out to Russia and China. You had the recent visit by President Xi Jinping of China to Saudi Arabia, to Iran,

and to Egypt, and what Xi Jinping made very clear is that China

is prepared to move towards the building of the Silk Road infrastructure, the New Silk Road land route, the Maritime Silk

Route, which will come up through the newly expanded Suez Canal

– China will do that. In fact, just this week, the first freight

train from Eastern China arrived in Iran, and this is part of the

entire European system of not just transportation corridors, but

development corridors that have been put forward by China as the

cornerstone of their foreign policy.

So, they're presenting a win-win alternative. And in the case of Europe, there is no alternative. Europe is so politically and psychologically bankrupt – the leadership of Europe is so bankrupt that China, through this Middle East development portion of the One Belt, One Road policy, offers the only viable basis for this Marshall Plan idea to actually be put into practice. And were it not for the Putin intervention, beginning last September, we couldn't even be contemplating the possibility of that kind of solution to this seemingly intractable problem in the Middle East.

Now, Mr. LaRouche emphasized in this context that Europe is completely gone; it's completely bankrupt, and there are solutions, but the present leadership is unprepared to consider that kind of level of rethinking. In the United States, we're very close to the edge, but the United States {can} be saved and the solution to the problems in the United States begins with removing President Barack Obama from office immediately, and moving to wipe out the thoroughly bankrupt Wall Street system. Because until that system is put through basically a bankruptcy shutdown, then none of the viable and available solutions are going to be there. But, if you were to get rid of Obama, if you were to wipe out Wall Street,—and, for example, immediately passage of Glass-Steagall would be one critical element for that process to happen almost overnight – then we have a history in the United States. We had Alexander Hamilton. We had Franklin Roosevelt. We had glimmers of the same policy with John F. Kennedy. You go back to a credit system, a government credit

system that kick-starts production, that trains a young generation that's right now completely unqualified to serve in a real economy.

All of that means the United States coming into alignment with what we see going on with China, with Russia, with India, with others. In other words, the United States becomes part of a genuine trans-Pacific collaboration, and under those circumstances, Europe itself would have no choice but to get on with the program.

So, what we're seeing from Turkey, from Saudi Arabia, and as I said, always watch for the British lurking in the background with those two countries – you have clinical insanity and folly,

which holds the danger of war. But Mr. LaRouche again emphasized,

Putin knows this. He sees all of this, and he is on top of the situation, and is prepared to take the appropriate and necessary

actions. And there are some people who are not completely out of

their minds on the U.S. side, within the military-intelligence community, who understand that partnering with Russia is the only

way to solve this problem.

OGDEN: Thank you, Jeff. Now, just really on the subject that you ended on here, the bankruptcy of Wall Street and the extended

Wall Street system, and the relationship of that to the conditions in Europe; that brings us to our institutional question for this evening, which reads as follows: "Mr. LaRouche. The heat is turning up on British Prime Minister David

Cameron, who's trying to get the upper hand over a referendum

that could result in the UK leaving the European Union. The potential break-up of the European Union, which is called 'Brexit', has elicited warnings about the impact on the UK economy should voters say that they want out of the EU. A recent poll showed that 42% of UK voters would opt to leave the EU; compared to 38% who say that they would vote to stay. This week will be the first major test as to whether Cameron's done enough to secure an agreement to change some terms of the UK's relationship with the European bloc. Cameron says that he will campaign to stick with the EU, if a deal can be reached. This Thursday and Friday will be the first time that all 28 EU countries will discuss a package of proposals recently released by the EU, aimed at addressing the UK's economic concerns. Cameron negotiated the proposals with the EU leaders and Donald Tusk, President of the European Council – the EU's main decision-making body. What is your view of a possible 'Brexit'?"

STEINBERG: Well, you know, you've got "Brexit" that was preceded by "Grexit", and probably we're going to have a much larger lexicon; that all comes down to the fact that people have the sense that the European Union, particularly the European Monetary Union, is a sinking ship. And therefore, if the ship is sinking, or the movie theatre is on fire, you get to the exit as fast as possible. But the reality is, that the European Union – and within that, the European Monetary Union – are the problem. So, therefore, unless you address the more underlying issue,



which is that Europe is financially and economically bankrupt; then it really is almost of secondary significance whether Britain stays in or leaves. If Britain leaves the European Union, then that's virtually it for the European Union. Other officials in Europe, even including Schäuble at the Davos Conference earlier this month, said that if the Schengen agreement, the open borders agreement in Europe is broken, then the European Union will cease to exist. And already in Poland, in Hungary, in other countries on the edge of Europe but within the European Union, they're already building those walls. So in effect, the European Union, as it's presently constituted, is a dead letter; it really doesn't exist. And the countries of Europe, either collectively or individually, are going to have to come to face the reality that their banking system is thoroughly bankrupt; they've lost so much productive capacity that Europe from a physical standpoint is no longer capable of self-reliance, self-preservation. So, the whole thing is going under; and of course, there's a certain irony in the British threatening to leave the European Union, since the bankruptcy of the entire trans-Atlantic system is largely the result of policies that were created in London, and were then spread about Europe and the United States. You could almost say that Europe was doomed from the moment that Margaret Thatcher launched the Big Bang in 1985, and turned London into a safe haven for speculative gambling operations, drug-money

laundering, anything other than investment in the real economy.

So now, we're 30 years into that process, and Europe is finished. So, the issues that are being negotiated between Cameron and Tusk and the others on the European Commission, are

tiddlywinks; they're not the real issues. Unless Europe comes up

with its own version of shutting down the City of London and Wall

Street, a genuine full-scale Glass-Steagall separation of legitimate commercial banking activity from all of the gambling,

then Europe is completely doomed. And the only hope that they will have is that some sane future leaders, who emerge out of this political rubble, recognize before it's perhaps too late that aligning with China and Russia – which is exactly the opposite of the policies that are being pursued in Europe right

now – is the only answer. So, I think that that's the context in

which the question can be answered; and so the issue is merely that Europe in its present circumstance is doomed. And whether Britain leaves the European Union or stays in, they are part of

that system of doom that's going to have to be changed in a much

more fundamental – I'd say "revolutionary" – way. And the opportunities are there; they're presented there because Europe

is at the western end of Eurasia; and the Chinese have already established the rail links between central China and Germany. There are opportunities galore under the umbrella of the "One Belt-One Road" policy; but the first step is that the European leaders are going to have abandon their folly. And that's a difficult proposition to conceive of, given who the current European leadership is.

OGDEN: Absolutely. And, let me just elaborate a little bit what Mrs. Helga Zepp-LaRouche emphasized, which is that if you just look at the refugee crisis, for example, and the absolute breakdown of Europe to even absorb and handle this under the current economic conditions. This has pushed people to begin to

discuss the possibility of what the LaRouche movement has been advocating for quite a long time; which is a new Marshall Plan, a

new program of economic development for the Middle East and North

Africa. It is what was published by the Schiller Institute and {Executive Intelligence Review} in a major book-length publication a number of years back, called "A New Marshall Plan

for Southern Europe and the Mediterranean". What Helga LaRouche

emphasized is that at the point that the EU is really detonating

underneath people's noses, there is no solution within the current geometry.

The only solution is to go with this kind of Marshall Plan, and to work with China and the BRICS and other countries, to extend the Silk Road project into this region and to develop the

Middle East and North Africa in order to have an incentive for millions and tens of millions of refugees not to leave to seek a

better condition. And Helga LaRouche's emphasis was that this is

a very substantial example of what Xi Jinping has called the "win-win" paradigm; the "win-win" system. It is a win for everybody, for Europe and the United States to work with China and Russia to develop the Middle East and North Africa along the

Silk Road routes. This kind of cooperation between China and the

rest of the world is what China is seeking in inviting the rest of the world to engage in; and this is the only way to solve the crises and shift the geometry overall which is creating the existential threat which is now being faced by Europe. Now, this new paradigm; this is exactly what we have been talking about for quite a while, but I think the foundation for a new paradigm cannot be seen as merely some sort of extension of former or present geopolitical ideas about how the world works.

This is not merely a rearrangement of political and economic and strategic alliances between countries that would still be dominated by the same axiomatic world view which is what has brought us to this crisis point to begin with. Rather, there needs to be a true renaissance; a new calibration, a re-examination of what our view of mankind is. What our view of man as a species is, and what mankind's role within this galaxy and his relationship to the entire universe; and indeed, what his responsibility is as a uniquely creative species in this universe must be.

So, on that subject, Jason Ross is joining us from the LaRouche PAC Science Team, and I think we're going to have a somewhat exciting discussion of what are the implications of the really profound work that Albert Einstein engaged in over a century ago; and which is now grabbing the headlines again in the form of this experiment that has revealed the affirmation of Einstein's hypothesis concerning the shape of space-time.

JASON ROSS: Thanks. As I imagine everyone has heard by now, on September 14th of last year, a gravitational wave was detected by the interferometer experiments that we had set up in Washington state and in Louisiana. Over a few months, that signal was studied to make sure that that really was what had occurred; and a paper was submitted in January and published in February announcing the news that a gravitational wave phenomenon representing the merging of two black holes had been detected. This meant that a change in space-time had been experienced in that detector; where maybe we don't know how the experiment worked.

Very briefly, two tracks at right angles to each other, allowed light to move up and down those tracks. Those tracks reach 4 kilometers long. Due to some very clever engineering, the effect of length was 100 times that; and by the motion of these gravity waves – meaning a change in the shape of space due to a varying intensity of gravity due to these two black holes spinning around each other – the length of the two tracks varied by an amount that was about 1/10 the diameter of a proton over a track length of 4 kilometers. This is equivalent to the star nearest to us getting closer and further away by the width of a hair. It's amazing that was actually able to be measured; that's an astonishingly tiny change.

And it says something about the difficulties and why it's been – as Matt said – it's been a century since Einstein had proposed the existence of these gravity waves; and now they've been detected. So, the recent upgrades to these detectors here

in  
the US made this possible; there are other detectors around  
the  
world. Some of them are being upgraded; new ones are being  
brought on line. There is a proposal for a space-based  
interferometry experiment – the Lisa experiment; which NASA  
had  
been a part of, and has now left it to the European Space  
Agency,  
currently scheduled to launch in 2034. Perhaps it'll be sent  
sooner than that, based on this news.

But what does all of this mean? What does it tell us about  
– what are the implications? Well for one thing, this means we  
really have an entirely new tool for looking at the universe  
that

we live in. All of our knowledge about the heavens beyond us,  
comes from sight, or various forms of sight. You can't smell a  
star, you can't taste it; you can't hear it, you can't feel  
it.

You can see it. So various forms of seeing are the way we  
learn

more about our surroundings. From simple observations with the  
eyes here on Earth, which were all that were available to  
Kepler

when he determined how the planets moved; the use of  
telescopes

in the optical range – simple telescopes that could be seen  
with

the eye – into more complex telescopes, including ones that  
see

what we wouldn't typically call light; radio telescopes.

Telescopes in Earth orbit, looking in other wavelengths of the  
electromagnetic spectrum; infrared telescopes, ultra-violet  
telescopes, x-ray telescopes. We've got a lot of ways of

side of the Moon, where China is going to be within just a

few years sending a lander. The potential to do long wavelength

radio telescope work from that location; this represents something new.

But what we've got with this successful detection based on the change in space-time with the LIGO [Laser Interferometer Gravitational-Wave Observatory] experiments, this is something totally different. This is like bringing in a new sense all together. We've been seeing the universe; now we can probably hear it would be the best analogy. It represents a vibration, like the sound vibrations our ears are able to pick up. Only this

time, it's incredibly faint, and it's about space itself vibrating; that really is what it is. So, that's tremendously important.

On the history of this, it's important to keep in mind people are very excited about this; there's good reason to be, it's quite a development. But this can only indirectly be called

a scientific breakthrough; the science behind this – Einstein proposed this in 1916. He had some more thoughts and wrote another paper in 1918; some more discussion about it.

Hypotheses

about black holes, breakthroughs in computing ability to try to

model these types of things; all of that took place. But what could be called the fundamentally scientific change occurred 100

years ago with Einstein's theory of relativity; with gravity waves being one of the implications. Being able to detect them is

wonderful; it's an amazing technological advancement. It shows that we are capable of precision that was totally undreamed of in

Einstein's time, certainly, or even a few decades ago. The development that we've made has been tremendous.

But I think it's fair to say this was not a scientific

breakthrough in the real sense of science. It is a new sensation;

it is a new technology. It is a whole new way of looking at things; and that is tremendously important. I think that if we look back at what Einstein did that made his hypothesis possible,

we can compare it to the really awful influence of Bertrand Russell.

So, first on Einstein. We've got to recall that what Einstein did in laying out his revolutionary theories was not something that he derived; it wasn't something that he proved. It

wasn't something that he showed was true based on what was already known. What Einstein said about the universe contradicted

the Newtonian view of space and time that had become dominant. Einstein said that that simplistic view of space and time, which

went along somewhat intuitively with our senses, was in fact untrue; and that basic concepts like simultaneity, or knowing that two events happen at the same time, such a basic concept as

that. That there's one time that applies everywhere; Einstein showed that was untrue. That's a very unintuitive thought. The idea that space could have a shape to it; that's a very unintuitive thought. It's not suggested by appearances.

But what Einstein was doing was implementing a world outlook that goes back to Cusa – although I'm not going to talk about him right now – but to Leibniz and to Bernhard Riemann. If we consider the work of Leibniz, 1646-1716, the founder of physical

economy; there's plenty to say about him, and plenty will be said

on this website. One of the specific things that he looked at was

in the world of physics, Leibniz's demonstration that there was



no absolute space; that there was no absolute time. This was contrary to Descartes, Newton, and others. Leibniz said there's

no distinction between rest and motion, for example. If there's

no absolute space, you can't say that anything is at absolute rest; that was a concept used by Descartes. Absolute space was a

concept used by Newton. But Leibniz was in a fight about this, saying that space was a relation between concurrently existing things; but it didn't exist on its own. In a debate that he had

with a top Newtonian – Samuel Clarke – this seemingly physical discrepancy about is space absolute or not, turned into very directly a political one. That, both of these two – Leibniz and

Clarke – used their concept of space to make a point about God,

and implicitly also about government; about the basis of the legitimacy of a ruler.

Clarke, the Newtonian, said that because everything could have been created anywhere in space once God decided to do the Creation, that showed that God made a choice without any necessity; that it was just because God felt like doing then and

felt like doing it where he did, because he felt like doing that.

Sort of like a dog deciding to his business wherever he feels like it. Leibniz said that if God had to do something without a

good reason, that God would be only all-powerful, but not good or

wise. And Leibniz said that that conception of God has to include

those perfections as well; goodness, wisdom, and power.

Now between the lines, what these two were also saying was a view of government and a view of society. Implicit in this is

Leibniz's view that the legitimacy of a ruler or of government is

not simply from having gathered power; but from using it in a wise way to achieve good ends. That may seem a little bit far afield, but it's true; and this is part of the background on this

concept. That from the necessity for goodness came the nonexistence of absolute space; that's how Leibniz showed that.

He was right.

Bernhard Riemann, in 1854, delivered a presentation, wrote a paper on the shape of space. And Riemann said that since the time

of Euclid up to his time, no one had ever really taken on in a realistic way, what the basis of the shape of space is. That Euclid said things like the sum of the angles in a triangle are

180; Riemann said that may or may not be true. On a curved space,

for example, it's not true. The most important aspect is that Riemann didn't propose replacing Euclid with a similar geometry;

it's that he said that the basis of our understanding of space has to be the physical causes that make things occur within space. He was right; that was Einstein's approach. With relativity, he said that our understanding of space can't start

from a box; it has to start from physical principles that give rise to the effects in space, and to the relationship of objects

in space. So light, gravitation, these became the basis of space

for Einstein; and those concepts lie outside of space. They aren't geometrical concepts in the way Euclid's concepts were geometrical. Light is a real thing; gravity is a real principle.

So, Einstein, in following on this and implementing it, and

developing his theories, developing his breakthroughs of relativity, created something that contradicted; he made a new hypothesis. To contrast that, let's look at the past 100 years.

We've now affirmed something that Einstein had proposed 100 years

ago; but where are the new Einsteins? Where are the new theories

that contradict? Where are the new concepts that don't follow from what we already know, but introduce fundamentally new principles? And more importantly, why is that not understood as

what science really is?

To say just a little bit about Bertrand Russell's role in all of that, LaRouche has called Russell the most evil man of the

20th Century; and we have given ample demonstrations of that.

Some of the more straightforward evidence of it is his views about keeping the world population down; especially dark-skinned

racess, who Russell particularly was upset about there being more

of. Proposing a scientific dictatorship, using murder to eliminate people who became intelligent and opposed the ruling class, keeping science secret from the majority of people; this

is some of the nice outlook that Russell had on things. He also,

in his own work as a "professional" you might say, worked on destroying the concept of science and turning it into mathematics. He did this before and after the year 1900; this is

somewhat earlier in his life, where he wanted to throw away what

Einstein ended up doing, which was creating a new concept that contradicted the past. And say instead, that every thought in the

future, will have to derive from thoughts in the past; that we can replace creativity with logic.

Russell really put that into practice. Many people who are familiar with Russell might think of him as being an anti-war demonstrator, as being a peace-loving activist. Somebody who was

opposed to war, to conflict; especially to nuclear weapons. And,

included in that, technology itself; the concept that science is

dangerous, that perhaps science should be held back, because these technologies allow us to exterminate ourselves. The idea that the appropriate response to that would be to eliminate technologies, rather than to have a productive, future-oriented

basis for relations among nations. This really sprung up in a major way around anti-nuclear activism, of which Russell was a major proponent.

So, I think what we can reflect on, what we can take from the excitement around these gravitational findings, is that:

1)

it's an opportunity to really go back and really develop and understanding of who Einstein was. How did he think? Who was this

man, who a century ago, put forth the hypothesis that was detected in this way only this year. Who was Riemann? How did he

actually think? We can reflect on the opportunities that we have

for the use of these kinds of instruments to provide us an entirely new window to understanding the universe around us. Not

only are we seeing things in a different band, we're using a different sense all together. We're hearing the universe; we're

able to listen in on a completely different kind of physical process than the electromagnetic ones that are the basis of

all

astronomy otherwise. Using light, radio waves, x-rays and that sort of thing. And I think it also demonstrates that the ability

to develop new technologies, to rise to a challenge, certainly exists. And we saw this in the Apollo program, which similarly,

going to the Moon itself did not involve as much new science as

it did new technologies, new social organizations to implement those technologies. Which we saw with some of the breakthroughs

of the truly amazing apparatus used to detect these gravitational

waves. But we have to have grand objectives. I mentioned the LISA

experiment; a space-based interferometry experiment, similar to

ones which did this recent detection, which NASA had been a major

player in and then pulled back on, as part of the Obama destruction of a national mission, a natural future. NASA, as the

leading representative of that future orientation of the nation.

So, we have to have human objectives for the nation, for ourselves. We have to, as a nation, have objectives like what China's doing now; as represented by China's moves towards the Moon from the Helium-3 standpoint. From the sheer excitement of

the population of China being asked to put forward proposals for

experiments to take up to the Moon. This is something that people

are actually thinking about as citizens of this nation. "Wow! What are we going to send up there?" "What are we going to take

to the Moon for the next trip?"

We've got a lot of objectives that have been defined that we have just been sitting on for decades. And if we eliminate the source of this culturally, the frankly unscientific view of science, this anti-human view of humanity, we can do great things. And we can do it by removing Obama and giving this nation

a future-oriented mission again.

OGDEN: Well thank you very much, Jason. I think that's certainly exciting; the idea to be able to directly perceive changes in space-time itself. So, I'd like to thank Jason for his

presentation, and I'd like to thank Jeff for joining us remotely

today. And I'd like to thank all of you for joining us; and please stay tuned to [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com). Good night.

---

## **Det Romerske Imperiums fald – du står midt i det!**

*Som Lyndon LaRouche omhyggeligt har påpeget, så var en side af denne britisk anførte fordærvelse og ødelæggelse af det 20. og 21. århundredes USA, det diktatur over videnskab, og dernæst som en konsekvens over tænkning generelt, som blev udøvet af Storbritanniens Lord Bertrand Russell. Russell dekreterede, at al fysisk videnskab måtte reduceres til blot og bar matematik, og han forfulgte aggressivt Albert Einstein som det geni, der erklærede sig uenig og aldrig ville acceptere dette diktat. Russell havde held med sig – et besøg til et hvilket som helst såkaldt »videnskabeligt« klasseværelse burde overbevise dig om det. Som Russell forstod, at den ville, har denne afskrælning*

*af videnskab fremtvunget en fordummelse af al tænkning. Amerikanere er blevet gennemgribende bedøvede netop sådan, som vores tidligere store geni Edgar Allan Poe havde forudset disse virkninger. Dette er grunden til, at han kæmpede til sit sidste åndedrag imod det, han fordømte som matematisk tankegang, og imod hele den imperiekultur, der udstrålede fra London.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

# **POLITISK ORIENTERING 18. februar 2016: Rusland tager strategisk lederskab/ Bail-in ikke holdbart/ Gennembrud for Fusionskraft**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

---

# En løsning på Wall Streets panik – uden Obamas Verdenskrig

*15. februar 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC)* – Den transatlantiske finansielle panik, der nu er ved at udvikle sig, er værre end den i 2008; den har bragt os helt ud på randen af et sammenbrud i økonomi og civilisation.

Selv om Wall Street insisterer voldsomt på, at »det kun er de europæiske banker«, så er dette en løgn, der afsløres af deres eget bjerg af dårlige værdipapirer, der løber op i billioner af dollar, og med deres derivater, der nu begynder at nedsmelte. Vi afventer det første krak af en storbank, måske så tidligt som i denne måned, eller i denne uge. Men den virkelige panik bliver det, der følger efter. En billiard dollar stor derivatmængde binder alle disse storbanker sammen, siden man afskaffede Glass-Steagall. De har allerede reduceret de transatlantiske og japanske økonomier til under nulvækst; deres kollaps vil tilintetgøre disse økonomier.

Vi kan redde USA fra bankerot og kollaps. Kongressen kan vedtage nødforholdsregler. Med en Glass/Steagall-reform kan Kongressen lukke Wall Street ned, og dernæst begynde at skabe statskreditter til investeringer i reel produktivitet i den amerikanske økonomi – for første gang i et halvt århundrede. Dette vil kræve en mission med en videnskabelig drivkraft, med et fuldt ud genoplivet amerikansk NASA-program, i samarbejde med især Kinas, Indiens og Ruslands rumprogrammer.

At redde USA fra bankerot vil kræve mere end Wall Streets betingelsesløse overgivelse; det vil også kræve, at Kongressen fjerner Barack Obama fra magten, eller også kunne Wall Streets panik ende med Obamas verdenskrig.

Vi står på randen af en invasion af Syrien fra tyrkisk-saudisk



hold, der handler efter planer, som er lagt med Obamas forsvarsminister Ashton Carter, og som direkte sætter en krig med Rusland på spil.

Dette træk, som nu kunne komme over os, giver ingen mening. Det er vanvittigt for et i stigende grad bankerot og miskrediteret Saudi Arabien, samt et allerede destabiliseret Tyrkiet, at iscenesætte en illegal invasion og sætte planeten på randen af verdenskrig. Den russiske præsident Putins intervention siden september 2015 skabte ikke alene alternativet til ISIS/al-Qaeda's overtagelse af hele Syrien; dette alternativ har også succesfuldt bevæget krigen tæt på en våbenhvile.

Disse truende angribere er irrelevante. Krigsfaktoren er Obama, og de britiske bankierer og kongelige, der kontrollerer ham. Hvis Obama åbenlyst går ind for tyrkiske og saudiske skakbrikker, der truer med en krig, der kan ødelægge civilisationen, så kunne denne handling give bagslag i form af at forårsage hans fjernelse fra præsidentembedet ved at anvende det 25. forfatningstillæg.

Den større krigsfaktor er det nu hastigt fremadskridende kollaps af Europas og USA's banksystemer og økonomier. Virkeligheden er Wall Streets panik. Vi skal holde os til jobbet med at lukke det ned omgående. Hvis vi gør det, har vi – sammen med Rusland og dets allierede Kina – midlerne til at forhindre Obamas verdenskrig.

*Billede: Han venter og håber på virkelig forandring. FDR-mindesmærke, Washington, D.C. Krediteret Norman Maddeaux.*

*(Skulpturen henviser til præsident Franklin Roosevelts ugentlige søndags-radioudsendelser, kaldet 'Fireside Chats', hvor han talte direkte til det amerikanske folk om den politik, han havde til hensigt at gennemføre.*

*Forslag til fordybelse: et udvalg af FDR's vigtigste 'Fireside Chats' kan læses her: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/fireside.php> -red.)*

---

# **RADIO SCHILLER den 15. februar 2016: Hvornår krakker den første storbank i Europa? Tyrkiet og Saudi Arabien på vej ind i Syrien? Gravitationsbølger**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

---

## **I disse dage træffes der skæbnesvangre beslutninger**

*11. februar 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – De store strateger, såsom William Shakespeare, om hvem Lyndon LaRouche gennemførte skelsættende studier i januar 2014, forstod, at det nye gennembrud, der var nødvendigt for menneskehedens overlevelse, krævede, og man begav sig ud på veje, hvor intet menneske før*

havde gået; ja, på veje, hvis blotte eksistens ingen hidtil havde anet. Det var, hvad Douglas MacArthur gjorde i Stillehavskrigen under Anden Verdenskrig: han udtænkte en helt ny dimension for handling, ingen før havde forestillet sig, og som hidtil ikke havde været mulig, og som gav hans underlegne styrker mulighed for hele tiden at overvinde overlegne styrker.

Dette ændrede historien for altid, men det var kun et enkelt af flere sådanne gennembrud, som MacArthur skabte. Det samme er sandt for Lyndon LaRouche.

I hvert enkelt tilfælde gjaldt de beslutninger, de traf, ikke kun for en dag eller et år, men for hele fremtiden. I denne henseende var de alle et ekko af Prometheus' skæbnesvangre beslutning, der blev taget én gang for alle tider, længe før historisk tid. Den gik ud på, at han ville skærme menneskeheden mod at lide udslettelsens skæbne, som Zeus havde dekretet for vores art. Lige som præsident John F. Kennedys beslutning, der blev annonceret for Kongressen den 25. maj 1961:

*»Det er min overbevisning, at denne nation bør forpligte sig til, før dette årti rinder ud, at opfylde det mål at landsætte en mand på Månen og bringe ham sikkert tilbage til Jorden.«*

I dag må vi atter træffe en sådan beslutning; det er denne kamp, som anføres af LaRouchePAC-leder Kesha Rogers fra Houston, Texas.

I sit webcast mandag, den 8. februar med LaRouchePAC Policy Committee sammenlignede LaRouche USA's intellektuelle anskuelse i dag med Det romerske Imperiums nedgang og fald og omtalte Det britiske Imperiums indtrængen lige fra USA's første begyndelse:

*»Det skete omgående, i og med USA's begyndelse som en nation. Ødelæggelsen var massiv: de fleste af USA's præsidenter var i realiteten fjender af USA; det var de fleste af dem! Og det er*

derfor, problemet bliver ved med at dukke op. Og fortsat gør det: Dette er Det romerske Imperium, modellen for Det romerske Imperium.

Nu har man den eurasiske model, Kinas genoplivning; og det, som Putin på sin side har gjort. Denne ting inspirerede ham. Husk, som jeg har nævnt ved et par lejligheder, så kom Putins familie fra et område, der var en koncentration af død, på grund af de kampe, der fandt sted dér. Og Putin er lykkedes med at være en faktor, der har skabt en styrkelse af både Kina og Rusland, for at redde Rusland. Og hvad implikationerne er; det, jeg har set i de områder, hvor jeg tidligere har befundet mig, I ved, Indien osv., områder, hvor jeg arbejdede.

Det, vi ser, er, at dette område, dette eurasiske område i sig har elementer, der danner grundlag for at skabe eller genskabe et nyt system for menneskeheden. Og hvad resultatet vil blive, de karakteristika, der er indbygget i denne ting, denne karakteristika er rumprogrammet.

Hvad mener vi med rumprogrammet? Jamen, det er ikke rumprogrammet sådan, som tåben tænker på rumprogrammet, men det er derimod rumprogrammet som en refleksion af, at menneskeheden er ved at opnå forstand på den virkelighed, at menneskeheden på Jorden ikke er den magt, der hersker over Jorden; men snarere, at der findes en magt ud over dette, der kontrollerer realiseringen af rummet, og det betyder, at mennesket er et væsen, der lever i rummet. Og det er i dette område, dette domæne, og dette domænes aktiviteter og udvikling, at menneskehedens fremtid ligger.

Det vigtige her er lige at tage et lille, kort trip og tænke over det. Hvad betyder dette? Og det her med Månen lige nu, det nye Måneprojekt, er sandsynligvis nøglen til at bringe denne idé til ikke alene det, der foregår i Kina netop nu, men hvad det betyder for hele den menneskelige art. Men vi har kurs mod en ændring af, hvad der har været karakteristisk for vores art, fra det, der har været traditionelt og til det, der

*nu vil vokse frem, fra denne nye forandring.*

*Ideen er derfor, hvis man vil gøre noget godt, så se på dette. Spørg ikke, hvad en eller anden siger, 'jamen, jeg tror, det er dette; jeg tror, det er hint '. Det duer ikke! Problemet er, at menneskeheden har været en fiasko, men hvorfor har menneskeheden været en fiasko? Ikke på grund af menneskehedens iboende natur, men på grund af dens fordærvelse.»*

I andre diskussioner i løbet af de seneste dage har LaRouche påpeget sine kontroversielle studier af Shakespeare i 2014, som der netop henvises til, hvor han fastslog den pointe, blandt andre, at den stort set universelle opfattelse af menneskets historie er et falsum. At historien i realiteten består af disse former for dristige, hidtil ukendte opdagelser, som vi netop har diskuteret ovenfor. Disse opdagelser udgør menneskets natur. Se på den fremragende og radikale opfindelse af fysisk rum-tid, der går i en bue fra Kepler til Leibniz, via Gauss og dernæst til Planck og Einstein.

LaRouches webcast fra 8. februar indeholdt flere forskellige, konvergerende tankerækker, der alle lå på linje med det presserende behov for handling. Her følger konklusionen på en af disse tankerækker:

*»Så spørgsmålet om kreativitet betyder, at hele systemet med Solsystemet og videre endnu grundlæggende set beherskes af disse begivenheder, de samme begivenheder, som er de begivenheder, der karakteriseres af systemet som helhed. Det er der! Spørgsmålet er, hvad ønsker man? Man ønsker at skabe mennesker, der er kreative, skabende. Man ønsker at kunne skabe spædbørn, der selv er skabende på en original måde. Man ser dette: Einstein var f.eks. et godt eksempel på dette. Hvis man tager det, vi ved om hans historie, at menneskelig kreativitet er en enestående ting; det er det, der i realiteten bør dominere og kontrollere menneskehedens historie.»*

*Titelbillede: Prometheus bringer ilden til menneskene, oliemaleri af Heinrich von Füger, 1817.*

---

# **Vi må genoptage denne søgen efter menneskets rolle i universet, og skabe fremtidige generationer af genier**

*Så her står vi. Husk på billedet af John og Robert Kennedy; og husk, at vi atter kan genoptage denne søgen efter menneskets rolle i universet, og skabe fremtidige generationer af genier. For det er menneskehedens natur; og det er en synd, hver gang, et barn nægtes evnen til at blive et sådant geni, som gør en opdagelse, der har indflydelse på hele menneskeheden.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

*Titelfoto: Neil Armstrong, første mand på Månen, 1930-2012.*

---

# Om Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz; Grundlaget for økonomi er, hvilket menneskesyn, du har!

*Lyndon LaRouche har været meget udtrykkelig omkring det faktum, at vi ikke blot taler om praktiske »vi fikser det«-tiltag, som vil gøre det muligt for os at redde civilisationen, men at det, der er behov for, er et radikalt skifte i de mest aksiomatisk fundamentale principper, på hvilke det menneskelige samfunds adfærd i dag er baseret. Dette er noget, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche måske bedst har udtrykt som et nyt paradigme for menneskeheden. Det er det, som Kinas præsident Xi Jinping har kaldt en win-win-strategi, på hvilken hele ideen om den Nye Silkevej er baseret. Og det er ligeledes det samme, som dr. Martin Luther King stillede krav om i denne tale, jeg tidligere har henvist til, i Riverside Church, da han sagde, det valg, civilisationen i dag konfronteres med, er valget mellem ikkevoldelig sam-eksistens modsat voldelig sam-udslettelse.*

*Fra webcast den 15. januar 2016, fremlæggelse ved Jason Ross fra LaRouchePAC Videnskabsteam.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

## LaRouchePAC Internationale Fredags-webcast, 12. februar

# 2016:

## Genopliv USA's rumprogram!

## Genopliv en vision for fremtiden!

*Dette fredags-webcast vil fokusere på LaRouches nødmobilisering for at genoprette det amerikanske rumprogram og gøre Barack Obamas ødelæggelse af rumprogrammet til det mest fremtrædende tema i spørgsmålet om nødvendigheden af at stille ham for en rigsret som præsident for USA. Engelsk udskrift.*

This Friday's LaRouchePAC webcast will focus on LaRouche's emergency mobilization to restore the American space program and make its destruction by Barack Obama the most prominent feature of his necessary impeachment as President of the United States.

**Transcript-**MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening! My name is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us for our weekly Friday evening broadcast, here, from [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com). This is our webcast for February 12, 2016. Today is Abraham Lincoln's birthday. I'm joined in the studio today by Jeffrey Steinberg from *Executive Intelligence Review* magazine, as well as Megan Beets and Ben Deniston from the LaRouche PAC science team. I'm also joined, via video, by a special guest again this week – Kesha Rogers, joining us from Houston, Texas.

We have all just come from a discussion that we had with both Mr. LaRouche and Mrs. Helga Zepp-LaRouche. I think the content of the presentation that you'll hear tonight is directly informed by the tenor of that discussion. It's very clear that there are immediate problems, an immediate crisis, which must be addressed and must be resolved, that are right in front of



us as we speak. However, that will be the subject of the answer to our institutional question, which we have decided to leave to the end of tonight's broadcast.

To begin with, we have the responsibility to take a step back and look at the much bigger picture. We have a responsibility of leadership, as an organization, and as a movement which involves the viewers of this webcast tonight. That responsibility of leadership requires us to go far beyond these immediate challenges, to look into the future, and to imagine what mankind can be, what mankind must be, and to take the necessary action to bring that future into being.

The recent attention to the incomparable genius of Albert Einstein that has been forced upon us by a very interesting outcome of an experimental investigation that has just had results that were reported yesterday, forces us to consider, however, not just the outcome of that experiment, but forces us to consider what mankind as a species is capable of, and what the identity of mankind as a species must become in a self-conscious way.

This is something that we're going to take up in much more detail a little bit later in the broadcast tonight, but what we begin to consider, is that the space program as we knew it from President John F. Kennedy and others, is the necessary ingredient of a mission of any civilization which is worthy of representing mankind as a species on this planet. Mankind must not be a creature of the Earth. Man is not an Earthling. Mankind must be a creature of the stars! He must learn, both physically and mentally, how to navigate that wide ocean which is outer space. He must come to know what he does not know. He must come to understand the inner workings of the galaxy which he is an integral part of, and also other galactic systems. And, he must come to know his role as a species within that complex of galactic systems which comprise the Universe as we know it today.

In doing so, man affirms his nature as a species completely unique from all other species. Mr. LaRouche was emphatic that the insights of Vladimir Vernadsky and his understanding of the noösphere, and the uniqueness of the human mind and the human species as a whole, setting mankind apart from the animals, is something which very few people understand today, but was a very crucial investigation into the nature of the human race. Coincidentally, Vladimir Vernadsky and Albert Einstein were direct contemporaries.

We made great leaps, giant leaps, in this direction of man as a galactic species, not an earthbound species, with our landing of men on the Moon during the Apollo project of the 1960s and 1970s, and other great accomplishments of that era. To a certain extent, the legacy of that era has continued along certain trajectories. But since that time, when the mission of man leaving this planet was a professed mission of the United States government itself under the figure of John F. Kennedy, since that time, our progress in that direction has been moving backwards, compared to where we should have been, where we should have come by now, had we continued that directionality, and especially compared to what other countries, most notably China, have now accomplished and are committed to accomplishing further in the very near future ahead.

As President John F. Kennedy was wont to say in several speeches that he made, where he quoted Scripture: "Where there is no vision, the people perish." And that is absolutely true today. That is what the last 50 years of a "backwards progress" has brought us, as an American people – as we've presented repeatedly over the past several weeks in this webcast – and as a trans-Atlantic system, where face an absolutely dire crisis – economic, social, and military crisis today.

Our job here this evening, is to take the necessary steps to restoring that vision, and there's nobody more qualified to

that, in my opinion, than my good friend Kesha Rogers. Following the remarks that Kesha makes, we will have follow-up remarks from Megan Beets, who will elaborate much more on what China is doing in their ambitious space program and where that's come from in the recent years, and where that's going towards. Ben Deniston will follow up immediately after her, to elaborate a little bit more of what the necessary *insight* into the genius of Albert Einstein and Vladimir Vernadsky must be, from the perspective of this recent experiment that affirmed many of Einstein's hypotheses that he made nearly a century ago.

For those of you who may not know, or may need to be reminded, Kesha Rogers was the Democratic nominee for Congress in Texas's 22nd District *two years in a row* – the 2010 elections and the elections in 2012, which, I'm sure, was a real thorn in the side of the political hacks in that area. She established her campaign based on the idea that we must revive NASA, restore NASA, despite the attempts by the Obama administration to destroy what NASA was committed to doing.

In 2014, Kesha expanded on her successes as an electoral candidate in the previous two elections, and declared a state-wide race for United States Senate, which, despite the fact that she was massively outspent by the Democratic Party establishment and by their chosen candidate, she came so close in the preliminary primary elections, that she forced those primaries into a runoff election, and received not just national prominence, but international prominence as a very significant political figure.

So, without more said about Kesha's unique role in this mission to restore the vision to the American people, I'd like to introduce to you, Kesha Rogers.

KESHA ROGERS: Thank you, Matthew! Well, I think what you've laid out, and also in the discussions we had from Mr. LaRouche, one thing that's important to point out is, this is

the level of discussion which is absolutely critical to revive the educational and human commitment that has been lost in our society. The real question is, when we're dealing with the space program – and this is what's not being discussed in any of the political debates or amongst the space community itself – is this question of what is the nature of man; what is the responsibility to the understanding of the mind of man as different from any other species, animal species, out there.

I've gone to a number of events in the NASA community with certain representatives of the space community. You have this discussion where people want to talk about innovation or something of that nature; but what's missing right now, is that there's no real discussion on the principle of true discovery, on the principle of true creativity. If you're going to get back to the foundation of what our space program truly represents, then that has to be the focal point of what is understood and what we're fighting for. Looking at the space program, one of the things that is extremely important right now, is that what has been a dividing line, is this very question of what is the nature of man. It's not about money, or it's not about what projects are more reasonable or will actually work better; but more so it is what is the destiny of mankind to discover and to do what has never been done before.

I love the remarks from Mike Griffin, former NASA Administrator, who I believe made them in 2006, working under the [George W.] Bush Administration, who demonstrated the idea that mankind has always committed itself to doing that which is going to leave something behind for the children, grandchildren, next generations – the building of great cathedrals. We think about Brunelleschi or Charlemagne, those individuals who played a significant role in creating something that they weren't going to be able to see themselves, that they may not be able to participate in; but knew that their responsibility was to actually create for the future. I think that's the ultimate question right now. What has been done in the

progress of the society of mankind has been with the intention of creating for the future.

When you take the conception of the future out, and that human beings have no ability to actually determine or act upon that future, that was the understanding of the fight between Zeus and Prometheus, [where] Prometheus had a higher conception that mankind can know, and not only know, can actually act on and create the future.

How do we do this? We do this through the basis of discovery. We do this through the basis of understanding that human beings don't have to live like their fathers and grandfathers before them, like the beavers, before them. We can create new discoveries! And that's what we're finding and which has been essential in understanding what the space program brings us, and the understanding of the new principles that were put forth in development of what you see in terms of the beautiful ideas that foster the creation of such wonderful and beautiful cathedrals; that mankind not only just enjoys, in terms of aesthetic beauty, but also which has created the ability for a mastery of science that had never been known before.

That's what the space program represents! The same idea is actually recognized, when you look at music, what great Classical composition truly represents. The fostering of our society has been, always, to take the discoveries of mankind to the next level, to a higher conception, to a higher principle of mankind. The space program represents not just a program itself, but is what is the destiny of mankind.

I want to reiterate the beautiful example, again, of Krafft-Ehrlicke, because I think this gets at the truly beautiful and fundamental idea of that conception, as to why we have to have a space program. It is only for those very reasons, on the conception of what is the destiny of mankind, what is our responsibility. This is what we should be addressing in our education systems; that, as [Krafft-]Ehrlicke explained, "The

concept of space travel carries with it enormous impact, because it challenges man on practically all fronts of his physical and spiritual existence. The idea of traveling to other celestial bodies reflects the highest degree, the independence and agility of the human mind. It lends ultimate dignity to man's technical and scientific endeavors. Above all, it touches on the philosophy of his very existence."

And what we have to address in terms of looking at what has been lost in the space program, is that very conception of touching on that which is human. And identifying that which only mankind has the ability, based on our creative powers based on the image of the Creator, to be able to actually participate in. And we have taken that away. We've taken it away through the actions of the last two administrations through a policy of capitulation to Wall Street and a bankrupt financial system. The idea that our mission, as China has clearly set forward, and the paradox in that is the fact that we have been denied access through the insanity of certain Congress members and people who have taken away the collaboration, for human beings to collaborate on discoveries that are going to impact all of mankind. By denying the access of NASA per se to work with China, this was known as a clear understanding that nations had to work together if we were going to actually address the problems on Earth facing mankind, that were going to be addressed through discoveries that were going to benefit all mankind.

So that's what we have to address right now. Can we get back to that understanding once again? What is going to be our direction? What type of future are we going to see – are we going to create, I should say, on the progress of where society and civilization are going. And I think what we are seeing coming down the pike in terms of a continued escalation toward war and chaos, we have a clear dividing line in front of us. And this is extremely important that the space program has – what it represents gives us a commitment again toward

restoring a new direction for mankind. And doing what it is that is our responsibility and intention to do.

OGDEN: Thank you, Kesha. Now let me ask Megan Beets to come to the podium.

MEGAN BEETS: So Kesha referenced German space pioneer Krafft-Ehrlicke. I'd like to reference another German space pioneer, who lived at the beginning of the 1600s – Johannes Kepler. And Kepler also identified the Moon as a very unique place, and a unique destination for mankind. In 1608, he authored a really beautiful, fanciful document called "The Dream"; in which he imagined a journey to the Moon, and described and unfolded in his imagination what astronomical observation would be like from the vantage point of the Moon. Taking man off of Earth, taking man's mind off of Earth and reconstructing the structure of the Solar System as seen from the vantage point of the Moon.

Now, very interestingly, he also discussed and imagined what the unique differences might be between the near side of the Moon – which we see every night when we look up into the sky and see the Moon – and what the differences would be with the far side of the Moon, and what those unique characteristics might be.

Now, 400 years after Kepler wrote this, man for the first time is finally planning to land on that far side of the Moon. Just a little over two years from today, China plans to send its Chang'e 4 lunar mission to go to the Moon, and for the first time in mankind's history, to perform a soft landing on the far side of the Moon. The far side of the Moon is a very unique place; it's unique in terms of the Moon itself. It presents geological characteristics which we believe to be quite different from the near side. It presents resources such as Helium-3, which might be in higher quantities than on the near side of the Moon. But it's also a very unique vantage point in terms of the Solar System itself; allowing us to

perform astronomical observations in wavelengths which we just simply can't see from anyplace near Earth or Earth's orbit.

So, as Kepler foresaw in a sense, the far side of the Moon is a beginning point for us to begin to exercise our creative play; and to begin to peer out into the Solar System and the galaxy beyond and reconsider the processes of that Solar System as something that might be different than anything we've known before. So this landing on the far side of the Moon will come precisely one year after China does something else; which is sending their Chang'e 5 mission as a sample return mission, to land on the surface of the Moon, sample lunar material, rendezvous with an orbiter, and send this lunar sample back to Earth. This is the first time this has occurred in over 40 years, and using entirely new and different technology. Now that 2017 sample return mission is coming roughly after three years after something which happened just one year ago; which was China's Chang'e 5T – for test – mission. Which sent an orbiter to the Moon which went around the back side of the Moon, sent back some beautiful images from its orbit around the Moon; sent a capsule from lunar orbit back to Earth orbit, which was able to make a successful re-entry onto Earth and be recovered by Chinese space scientists. Again, this is the first time anything like this has happened in over 40 years.

Now, an important element for China's space program is its quest for a very rare isotope for helium. Helium-3, which, as has been said by the father of the Chinese lunar program, Ouyang Ziyuan, is a unique fusion fuel which could power the Earth as far into the future as we could think. This is a fusion fuel which is very, very rare on Earth; but which exists in abundance on the Moon. Another promise of the Moon drawing mankind in to a higher level of power and a higher level of existence.

Those are the very recent and also immediate future plans and accomplishments of China in space. Going back to 2007, just



prior to the launch of the very first phase of their lunar program, the Chang'e 1, China's newspaper interviewed 10,000 Chinese youth. And of those 10,000 young Chinese, 99% were following the developments of the lunar mission; another 90% believed that they one day would travel to the Moon. This remarkable progress of China in their Moon program has been complemented by a very robust, in terms of the success of the accomplishments, manned space program – the Shenzhou program; which began in 1992, and is coupled with the Tiangong program, the space station program. So, it was in 2003 that China put its first man into space. It was five years after that that China put the first man into space to perform the first space walk of China; which was beamed back down to Earth in a live broadcast. In 2012, China sent a Shenzhou mission up into space to rendezvous and dock with the first component of their space station; the Tiangong I. The crew rendezvoused with the space station, opened the portal and entered the space station to beam photographs and video back down to Earth. Only one year after that, the next Shenzhou mission rendezvoused with the same component of the space station; the astronauts entered the space station, and one of the astronauts taught a simple physics class, performing simple physics experiments live to 60 million Chinese students in classrooms on Earth.

This year, 2016, the second phase of the space station, the Tiangong 2, will be sent up; shortly followed by the next manned mission to rendezvous with the space capsule. Now this is progress towards a full-size space station, which is expected to be launched in the early 2020s; which will permit long-term habitation and scientific work in space. Which is expected to be completed roughly at the same time as the International Space Station is decommissioned.

So, that's a very brief overview, but I want to make two points on this. Number one, the entire Chang'e lunar exploration program and the manned space program, including the space station, is vectored toward establishing mankind on

the Moon; not simply a mission to plant a flag and go home. The idea of China is to begin folding the Moon into mankind's sphere of influence; fold the Moon into the noösphere in the sense of Vladimir Vernadsky. But also, to allow the Moon to transform mankind; to allow the discoveries that we make and the secrets of the Moon to change and upgrade man's power in and over the universe. They also plan to use the Moon, very clearly, as a launch pad, a base for further expansion into deep space.

The second point to be made is, that while this progress is being made by China, these missions are being launched by China, this is an international program. This is not for the Chinese; and they've been very clear about that. China has nearly 100 agreements for space cooperation with over two dozen countries, which is part and parcel of their win-win cooperation vision for collaboration among all mankind.

Having said all of this, I think it's important to back up and look down on the whole thing. It's not the specifics of what China is doing here which are really the most important thing. What is important is the modality which China has committed itself to. The fact that the minds and the lives of the Chinese people are being engaged in the kind of creative play which we see in the manned space program, and the joy in the accomplishments of that. In the space station program. In their plans for the exploration of Mars and further out into deep space. And especially in their lunar program. This kind of creative play and progress is moving mankind as a species closer to what the German space pioneer Krafft-Ehrlicke called not homo sapiens, but "homo extraterrestris". Mankind becoming a new species which is not based on Earth, but which is based in the Solar System as a whole. It's in that sense that China today, with their commitment to their space program, with their commitment to involving people around to the world to participate in these kinds of accomplishments. It is in this sense that China today is leading the cause of humanity.

BENJAMIN DENISTON: Thanks, Megan and Kesha. Maybe just to pick up off directly what we were just presented with China's focus, I just wanted to highlight some of what Mr. LaRouche was emphasizing today on the importance of this for uplifting mankind to a new level. And as we discussed last week, we have some very important elements with the lunar far side, which Megan referenced. This is a unique capability mankind will have when accessing the far side of the Moon, to give us a completely new perspective on the universe. But I want to just – coming off of Mr. LaRouche's emphasis earlier today, and what Kesha was just bringing up, I want to emphasize that this is not just the ability to discover the currently unseen. We'll see new things, but the point is, this will give us the ability to discover what is currently unknown. What does that mean? What does the unknown mean? This requires a fundamental return to real science, is what Mr. LaRouche was emphasizing earlier today. A real, true scientific conception of mankind as a creative force in collaboration with a creative universe. And today, as was mentioned, we have the excellent standard of Einstein brought to us again today, with the confirmation of something he had forecast a century ago; which was the existence of so-called "gravitational waves", or waves in the space-time characteristics of the universe. This is getting all kinds of media headlines, media attention, coverage all over the place. I think it's a pretty remarkable thing to reflect upon; just the very conception of waves, changes in the structure of the very space-time fabric of the universe; which Einstein had forecast, and expected to be there. And we're finally with our technology, catching up to where Einstein had said we would be, over a century earlier; confirming what he had expected with his conception of gravity.

You can read plenty of media coverage about this particular confirmation of Einstein all over the place now. But take a look at Einstein himself; look at Einstein's conception of gravity as a curved space-time. And Einstein, as a scientific

thinker coming out of very specific scientific tradition, explicitly referencing back to the work of Riemann and Gauss. Riemann, somebody who overturned the entire chessboard of science, so to speak, with his calling for the ending of a priori notions of science, of geometry. Including conceptions about space and time, for example, which Einstein demonstrated. You see a direct reflection of orientation of this in Riemann's work, in Gauss' work earlier, who Riemann picked up on.

Look at this another way; what were they overturning? They were saying science, the process of mankind's understanding of the relation of the universe, that must completely rid itself of these a priori notions about space, time, geometry, or what became even worse, the mathematical approach pushed by Russell and his followers. That science must rid itself of these a priori conceptions. The kind of a priori sense perception, that type of a priori geometry of absolute space, absolute time, for example; which are really just a reflection of a sense perceptual reflection of the universe. That real science must rid itself of these conceptions.

What does that leave us with? If we are not going to base, premise science on these a priori notions – or I would say, sense perceptual notions, or you could maybe even say a kind of an animalistic notion, a biological notion of your interaction with the universe. Then what's the basis, what's the substance of mankind's ability to have science, to change his relationship with the fundamental nature of the universe? It's in human creativity; the human mind. The process of human discovery, is the substance of the ability of mankind to change his relationship to the universe; become a more powerful creative force in the universe. And that's what's primary; human creative thought is what tells something about the fundamental nature of the universe, because that's the basis of the ability of mankind to come into a higher degree of coherence with the fundamental organizing principles of

that universe. That it doesn't come from sense perception; it doesn't come from sense perceptual notions. It comes from a specific quality of the human mind, which we can define as human creativity; which is a non-logical, non-deductive process, a uniquely creative process which can't be explained away as a phenomenon of something else. It's its own capability, that Einstein knew; that Riemann knew. That this competent true current of scientific thought has been premised on the knowledge, the recognition, that this is the basis of science; this is the basis of our ability to understand the nature of the universe. This is the basis of the nature of the universe itself, if you invert it and understand it that way; that human creative thought is the key issue. Which means that mankind is a creative force in a creative universe. We're in a very real scientific sense, a co-creator in a process of creation.

And I think it's worth just highlighting another of Einstein's insights into this reality of the true nature of science, the true nature of mankind. Interestingly, this takes us away from the very large, as Riemann had discussed, into the very small. And if you look at Einstein's work on the very small, on the nature of atomic processes, sub-atomic processes; the activity in the very, very small, so-called quantum processes. And this was, as most people are familiar, this was the subject of a major scientific debate and fight at the time about what is the nature of causality? What is happening on these very small quantum scales? And Einstein was adamantly fighting against this hardcore reductionist approach that tried to just say everything on this level is purely statistical; there's no cause that can be known, it's just a statistical random process with no causality and no ability to know causality.

And people are probably more familiar with Einstein's famous quote that he doesn't think God plays dice; he doesn't think the universe is, in its essence, just organized around completely random randomness. That's the more well-known

quote. He clearly had more developed thoughts than just that. In another discussion, he had said, if we want to actually understand causality on this level, understand the nature of quantum processes, perhaps it's our own notion of causality which is what needs to be overthrown. It's not, is the quantum world, the very small, deterministic in the way we were thinking about deterministic causality before, vs. just statistically random; or is it that our idea of causality is too simple, is wrong? And he used the example of a Bach fugue, a musical composition; and he said, our current notion of causality is equivalent to a very beginner trying to play a Bach fugue on the piano by just going one note to one note to the next note to the next note, in a linear fashion. And he says, you ruin the piece that way; the conception doesn't come across, because a Bach fugue is not organized as a linear sequence of notes. There's a certain conception and intention governing the piece as a whole; and all of the individual components, the keys are organized in a completely different fashion than a linear causality.

So if you want to understand quantum processes, if you want to understand what's happening in the very small, we should reflect upon the ignorance of our own notions of causality; and look to insights to causality and organization which are coherent with the characteristics of human creative thought. That human creative thought and human creative discovery are what we know are the things that enable mankind to create higher states of organization; to make new fundamental scientific discoveries. And that is what therefore tells us something about the nature, the fundamental organization of the universe as a whole.

So, I think we look to the Moon, we look to mankind going into space; but we need to look to this prospective future from this proper standpoint of mankind having an obligation to be a fundamentally creative driving force in a fundamentally creative universe. That the only real science is a science of

mankind as a co-creator in a creative universe. And Einstein certainly understood that from his own perspective, and the future development of mankind requires the Einstein standard today to be applied.

OGDEN: Thank you very much. What we're going to do next is, I will read our institutional question for this evening; and Jeff Steinberg will deliver a more elaborated answer encapsulating some of Mr. LaRouche's responses to it. It reads as follows: "Mr. LaRouche: The World Health Organization has declared the Zika virus a global public health emergency. The National Institute of Health calls it 'a pandemic in progress'. The infection is suspected of leading to thousands of babies being born with under-developed brains. Some areas have declared a state of emergency; doctors have described it as a pandemic in process, and some are even advising women in affected countries to delay getting pregnant.

"Mr. LaRouche, in your view, could the Zika virus become a major global pandemic; and in your opinion, how can the spread of the virus be stopped?"

STEINBERG: Thanks, Matt. I'll refer people to an article that's published in the current issue of *Executive Intelligence Review*, the issue dated February 12, 2016, which takes up some technical questions which I'm not going to get into here. There are serious questions about whether or not a British company produced a genetically modified mosquito, ostensibly aimed at curbing the spread of Zika virus and other mosquito-borne viruses; and that there were poor controls over it. There were other factors that may have contributed to this now becoming a very dangerous global pandemic.

But I think we've got to step back and take a different perspective on this. As early as 1975, Lyndon LaRouche directed a biological holocaust task force with the question on the table of whether or not the conscious policies of the British monarchy and other allied institutions, such as the

International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, were creating the conditions willfully for a new biological holocaust by virtue of austerity policies. Literally genocide policies that would have the effect of breaking down the systems that had been built up over centuries for dealing with and avoiding the spread of the kinds of diseases than can create mass-kill pandemics of the sort that we saw in Europe in the 14th Century, where one-third of the population and half of the parishes of continental Europe were wiped out in a relatively small period of time. In other words, the question is, are we dealing with the consequences of what can justifiably and fairly be called a Satanic policy coming from certain leading British oligarchical circles with their co-thinkers and allies around the world?

That biological holocaust project, that was directed by Mr. LaRouche, came as the result of the ending of the Bretton Woods system, and the shift of the IMF and World Bank towards policies of promoting population reduction, the fraudulent concept which you should understand as the result of what we've discussed here this evening, of limits to growth. And in particular, from that period of early 1970s moment onward, the advent of a fundamental assault against basic science, taking the form of various Green policies that repudiate the very nature of man as a creative species; whose very existence is based on the idea that mankind will make discoveries that will give mankind a greater understanding of how the universe works. Knowing that those discoveries will lead future generations to make even greater discoveries.

And that basically, within that possibility, every child born on this planet, should have the ability – through proper nurturing, proper education – to be able to make the kinds of discoveries that were made by people like Einstein, like Kepler, and others. This is the nature of mankind. And to the extent that there are policies that are put forward that deter mankind from realizing its true nature as the only known



creative being in the universe; this is, in fact, indeed, a Satanic policy.

So, we're dealing with a situation where there will be concrete initiatives taken to come up with an understanding of how the Zika virus has been spread; an understanding of what emergency measures can be taken; plus, the development of protective measures like vaccines and things like that. But on a much larger scale, we've got to look at the massive crimes against humanity that are being committed by virtue of the conscious assault against the kind of scientific education that leads to more and more people being actually able to participate in what it means to be truly human.

So, if you want to talk about a deadly virus that has to be stopped, let's talk about President Obama's policy; which has been to systematically shut down the entire NASA space program. Remember that at the beginning of the Obama administration, there were plans under way to replace the Shuttle program with the Constellation, which was to be a new rocket system for delivering man into space exploration. In his very first budget, President Obama canceled the Constellation program; knowing full well that with the cancellation and ending of the Shuttle program and the ending of Constellation, that there would be wide gap in the ability of the United States to even engage in any kind of manned space activity without hitching a ride from China or Russia, or one of the other nations that was going ahead with these programs.

Now we find that the rationale that President Obama used for canceling Constellation was that there was another rocket program called the Orion, which offered better prospects than Constellation. Well, what's happened systematically over the course of the Obama Presidency, is once Constellation was canceled and literally shut down, you had the cancellation through attrition of budgeting, to where now the Orion program has been canceled as well. Major projects for the kind of

exploration that Megan described; developing windows into the universe through the back side of the Moon have been shut down, and stripped or greatly reduced from the NASA budget in favor of "Earth science". Which means the spreading of the false propaganda about the causes of global warming.

These are the policies that kill. That's why the term "Satanic" can be appropriately used. If you take what's happened under the last 15 years, particularly under the last 7 years of the Obama administration; the take down and destruction of America's ability to participate as a qualified partner with nations like China, like Russia, like India in exploring mankind's next discoveries of the universe; you realize that the United States has been done a terrible injustice – it is literally a crime against every citizen of this nation, both current and future citizens – that this has been done, that these programs have been shut down. We know that President Obama, every Tuesday, relishes the idea that he holds a kill session, and comes up with a target list of people to be executed during that next 60-day period; but when you consider the killing of the space program, you've got to consider that this is an act of mass genocide, not just against the present generation, but against future as yet unborn generations that will be dependent on making these kinds of discoveries, branching out deeper into the universe.

And if you take that idea, that understanding of what has been done to us, particularly over this last 7-year period under Obama, and go back and remember; have a clear image in your mind of President John F Kennedy announcing the Apollo program, and announcing that we are going to do this because it represents the challenge to mankind to make great leaps of discovery and to better understand man's position in the universe. And if you consider that his brother, Robert Kennedy, would have revived and continued exactly that program; had Robert Kennedy not been assassinated, had John Kennedy not been assassinated, where would the United States

be today? Would there have been anyone who dared to shut down our space program, our scientific research?

So, this is where we are. Remember the image of John and Robert Kennedy; and remember that we can once again resume that quest for mankind's role in the universe, and to create future generations of geniuses. Because that's the nature of mankind; and it's a sin every time an individual child is denied the capacity to be that kind of creative individual who makes a discovery that impacts on mankind as a whole.

OGDEN: Thank you very much to everybody who participated tonight: Jeff, Megan, Ben, and especially Kesha. Mr. LaRouche, of course, has been very emphatic, as many of you heard him even in the discussion last night during the national activists' call – the Fireside Chat – that Kesha has a very special role to play in her ability to mobilize the American people to restore that vision of the future once again. So, I'd like thank Kesha very much for joining us here tonight. Please stay tuned to [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com), and good night.

---

**Uden et rumprogram er der  
ingen menneskehed –  
»Houston, vi har et problem:  
Det er Obama«**

*LaRouchePAC havde følgende lederartikler den 9. og 10. februar:*

# Uden et rumprogram er der ingen menneskehed

9. februar 2016 – Af alle præsident Obamas forbrydelser, fra den økonomiske redning af et bankerot Wall Street til permanent krigsførelse, der er i færd med at drive verden hen mod Tredje Verdenskrig, så er den mest modbydelige forbrydelse af alle den at ødelægge det engang så strålende amerikanske rumprogram. Rumprogrammet, især siden John F. Kennedys præsidentskab, var ikke alene en videnskabelig drivkraft for hele verdens økonomi, men også hele en vision for hele menneskeheden, der frembragte sand kreativitet i ethvert barn og flyttede mænds og kvinders intellekt ind i fremtiden, hvor kreativitet er. Ødelæggelsen af rumprogrammet ikke alene standsede menneskets fremskridt, men tvang det tilbage. Det omstødte historien.

Kravet om at genoprette rumprogrammet, og vores fremtid, for menneskeheden vil være temaet for LaRouchePAC's fredags-webcast den 12. februar. Lyndon LaRouche talte om det i dag som den handling, der kræves for »det menneskelige intellekts genfødsel«. Den 10. februar er Kesha Rogers særlig gæst på LPAC's videnskabelige udsendelse »New Paradigm«; hun fører an i den politiske indsats for et rumprogram i USA. Med dette perspektiv deltog hun i dag i NASA's »åbent hus« i Johnson Space Center i Texas.

En ting er nødvendigt for at bane vejen, og det er at konfrontere det faktum, at Wall Street er bankerot. Gør en ende på bail-out (statslige redningspakker), bail-in (ekspropriering af bankindeståender/-indskud), forbrydelser, svindel og mord.

Se på sagaen om Deutsche Bank – verdens største indehaver af derivater. I mandags faldt bankens aktier mere end 10 procent i forhold til den foregående fredag, og har således oplevet et fald i aktiernes værdi på 40 procent hidtil i år. Midt i

mandagens fald udstedte banken en erklæring, hvor den forsikrede om, at den har midlerne til at honorere sine forfaldne økonomiske forpligtelser. Tirsdag faldt bankens aktier så endnu mere. Så udstedte bankens meddirektør John Cryan en erklæring om, at banken er »bundsolid«. Dernæst sagde ingen anden end den tyske finansminister Wolfgang Schäuble, der var i Paris til en afslappet snak blandt finansminister, til medierne, at han ikke er bekymret for Deutsche Bank.

I realiteten viser Deutsche Banks kvaler og det voksende, finansielle kaos, at selve systemet er dødt og befinder sig i forrådnelsesstadiet.

I den amerikanske Kongres findes midlerne, i form af fremstillede lovforslag om en genindførelse af Glass-Steagall, til at påbegynde en udrensning af alt rodet og bane vejen for sund, økonomisk aktivitet, der kan give kraft til fremtiden, men handling er gået i stå. Ironisk nok vil der finde »reality-udstillinger« sted på Capitol Hill i denne uge: flere senatorer fremviser filmen »The Big Short« – om Wall Streets kriminalitet, den 10. februar; og den 11. februar vil der være en briefing i Senatet om den kendsgerning, at amerikanske landbrugs indkomster er faldet med 50 procent. Vil de, der har øjne, se?

Hvis vi er villige til at se virkeligheden i øjnene, understregede Lyndon LaRouche i dag, »så er ideen om, at man må gøre noget for at være med til at redde bankerne det rene ævl!«

Det haster også med at applikere kravet om den »bydende nødvendige virkelighed« på at se og handle imod den umiddelbare fare for atomkrig. Netop nu mødes NATO's forsvarsministre i Bruxelles, hvor de følger en linje med at satse på mere konfrontation med Rusland og truer med et totalt, atomart Armageddon. Det geopolitiske fremstød fra briterne og Det Hvide Hus går frem for fuld kraft.

I Rusland blev ved daggry den 8. februar en overraskelsesøvelse med militære styrker annonceret i det Sydlige Militærdistrikt, der strækker sig til Sortehavet og det Kaspiske Hav. Med involvering også af det Centrale Militærdistrikts kommando- og kontrolelementer har den fejende aktion tests om mobilitet, der strækker sig over 3.000 kilometer via jernbane, med flåde- og flytransport. Snap-mobiliseringen involverer 8.500 tropper, 900 stk. militært hårdt isenkram, 50 krigsskibe og på til 200 fly.

## **»Houston, vi har et problem: Det er Obama«**

*10. februar 2016* – Som præsident har Barack Obama drevet USA hen imod krig med Rusland og Kina og berøvet USA for dets videnskabelige identitet ved helt at skrotte den amerikanske rumforskningsmission.

LaRouchePAC's kandidat for det Demokratiske Parti, Kesha Rogers, Texas, erklærede i dag en ny, national mobilisering for at omstøde Obamas ødelæggelse af det amerikanske rumprogram. I 2010 og 2012 vandt Rogers demokraternes nomineringsvalg til Kongressen (Repræsentanternes Hus) med udgangspunkt i banneret, »Red NASA; Stil Obama for en rigsret«.

I et webcast i dag sagde Rogers: »Obamas plan, der går helt tilbage til nedtagningen af rumprogrammet i 2010, er baseret på det faktum, at man fuldstændig har iturevet det, der under præsident John F. Kennedy var et visionært lederskabsperspektiv, som blev nedtaget under Obamaregeringen – og hvor planen var at fremme en nulvækst-politik.

*»I går deltog jeg i et arrangement ved navn »NASA's tilstand«.* Mange mennesker så denne begivenhed, som blev transmitteret *live med NASA's direktør, Charlie Bolden, såvel som også andre*

personer.

»Det, som simpelt hen forbløffede mig, var det faktum, at præsidenten skærer ned på hele budgettet, fortsætter med at skære ned på budgettet for Orion-missionen, den bemandede mission, fortsætter med at nedtage Månemissionen – faktisk er der ikke længere nogen Månemission; og samtidig skærer han ned på alle fusionsprogrammer, skærer ned på programmerne på visse universiteter, såsom Rice Universitetet her i Texas. Præsident John F. Kennedy fremlagde en vision, 'Vi rejser til Månen, og vi gør disse ting, ikke, fordi det er let, men fordi det er svært.' Og hvor man havde en reel vision, en inspiration for hele befolkningen.«

»Direktøren for rumprogrammet fremlægger, at 'Vi er nærmere end nogensinde til at komme til den Røde Planet'. Dette finder jeg paradoksalt ud fra det standpunkt, at vi har afskaffet alle missioner om at komme tilbage til og industrialisere og faktisk udvikle Månen.

Vi må gå tilbage og se på historien med hensyn til, at et visionært lederskab begyndte med de personer, der havde en idé om det menneskelige intellekt, der rakte langt frem i vores Solsystems bestemmelse. Og det var ikke blot en profitmekanisme, eller det drejede sig ikke blot om budgetter og om budgetnedskæringer eller om at forsøge at rejse ud i rummet på et 'discount'-program.

Men, vi gjorde det, der var nødvendigt – fiasko var ikke en valgmulighed – for at sikre, at menneskets fremskridt i rummet var prioritet nummer ét. Og et visionært lederskab er således det ultimative spørgsmål her, og det er, hvad vi faktisk diskuterer her. Det er det, der er blevet fuldstændigt forladt af vores samfund; det, der ikke længere eksisterer.

Jeg vil gerne her give et ægte eksempel på et visionært lederskab:

**Krafft Ehrickes store ånd og intellekt**, en pioner inden for

rumflyvning, raketvidenskab og ingeniørvidenskab; og Krafft Ehricke arbejdede sammen med, og var en student, der udviklede von Brauns ideer og det, der virkelig skabte vores rumprogram og den vision, der bragte os til Månen, med Apollo 11 og frem til Saturn V-raketten.

Men igen, han var udtryk for noget, der tilhørte en højere orden med hensyn til filosofien og tankegangen i det, som han forstod, var grundlaget for rumprogrammet, og som igen var forsvaret for det menneskelige intellekt, og dette menneskelige intellekts kreativitet. Men han siger det smukkere selv. I Krafft Ehrickes 'Anthropology of Astronautics' fremlægger han disse tre, fundamentale love:

1. Ingen og intet under dette univers' naturlige love kan påtvinge mennesket nogen begrænsninger, undtagen mennesket selv.
2. Ikke alene Jorden, men hele Solsystemet, og lige så meget af universet, som mennesket kan nå ud til under naturens love, er menneskets retmæssige aktivitetsfelt.
3. Ved at gå ud i hele universet, opfylder mennesket sin bestemmelse som et element i livet, der er skænket fornuftens evne og den moralske lovs visdom inde i ham selv.'

»Som jeg sagde før, så advarede Krafft Ehricke om, at et samfund, der vendte sig imod ægte fremskridt og vedtog en kurs for nulvækst, grænser for vækst, der er i modstrid med det, han siger i sin første, fundamentale lov, at 'Ingen og intet under dette univers' naturlige love kan påtvinge mennesket nogen begrænsninger, undtagen menneskets selv', så ville man få et samfund at se, der var ophørt med at anerkende sit sande, menneskelige potentiale.«

Ehricke skrev: »Begrebet om rumrejser bærer med sig en enorm indvirkning, fordi det udfordrer mennesket på stort set alle fronter af dets fysiske og spirituelle eksistens. Ideen om at rejse til andre himmellegemer reflekterer den højeste grad af



*det menneskelige intellekts uafhængighed og adræthed. Det giver menneskets tekniske og videnskabelige bestræbelser ultimativ værdighed. Frem for alt drejer det sig om filosofien for enhver eksistens. Som resultat ignorerer begrebet om rumrejser nationale grænser, afviser at anerkende forskelle af historisk eller etnologisk oprindelse, og gennemtrænger ens sociologiske eller politiske overbevisnings struktur lige så hurtigt som den næste.»*

*»Og i betragtning af de omstændigheder, som samfundet netop nu befinder sig i, med den fortsatte optrapning af konflikt og spænding mellem nationer, med det, vi ser med det fortsatte fremstød for krig eller optrapningen imod Rusland, imod Kina; det er et angreb på selve dette begreb om det menneskelige intellekt.»*

Kesha Rogers har her sat fingeren på *forbrydelsen*, som Obama som præsident har begået: Berøvelsen af USA's mission, og derfor også af dets borgeres intellektuelle evner. Hendes kampagne har til formål at genoprette denne mission.

*Titelfoto: Præsident Obama, Michelle Obama og vicepræsident Biden ser på NASA's Lunar Electric Rover under indvielsesparaden i 2009. Af NASA/Bill Ingalls.*

## **DOKUMENTATION:**

### **Obama tilintetgør USA's fremtid i rummet**

*10. februar 2016* – Barack Obamas budgetanmodning for NASA for budgetåret 2017 markerer første gang, NASA nogensinde er blevet skåret ned til under 0,5 % af statsbudgettet – under årene med JFK's Apollo-program var dets andel af budgettet nær ved 5 %.

Ved at anmode om 19 mia. dollar til NASA skar Obama

Kongressens bevilling til rumagenturet ned med 300 mio. dollar. Men han krævede endnu dybere nedskæringer inden for udforskning af »det ydre rum« og »planeter«, det område af NASA's arbejde, hvorfra nationale missioner i fremtiden kunne vokse frem. Disse nedskæringer tilsammen var i størrelsesordenen 1 mia. dollar iflg. en gennemgang i *USA Today*.

I 2006 var NASA, på trods af års nedgang i ressourcerne, stadig i gang med at udarbejde planer for en Månebase med en fremtid med videnskabelig observation af universet og forberedelser til at udnytte Månen, inklusive som en potentiel fremskudt base for rejser til Mars. I nogle versioner af NASA's planer skulle Månebasen ligge på bagsiden.

Dette skrottede Obama i 2009-10 ved at aflive Constellation-programmet og således gøre Månen utilgængelig på ubegrænset tid, og med en formel afvisning af det som mål.

Nu er Kina og Rusland de nationer, der planlægger robot- og menneskelig landing på Månen – muligvis som et samarbejde – anført af Kinas netop bebudede plan om at starte en base på Månens bagside i 2018-20.

Da Obama aflivede Constellation, hævdede han, at USA i en eller anden fremtid kunne rejse direkte til Mars med et nyt Space Launch System (SLS) og »Orion«-program. Nu, i FY2017-budgettet, afliver han dem i realiteten; han ville have gjort det allerede, hvis ikke Kongressen havde insisteret på at investere omkring 10 mia. dollar i SLS/Orion siden FY2011.

For SLS, f.eks., var Kongressens bevilling i FY2016 omkring 2 mia. dollar; Obama anmoder om 1,3 mia. dollar i FY2017.

Det, som Obama ønsker at øge i NASA's budget, er »videnskaber om Jorden« – detektering af klimaforandringer, i hans syge grønne hjerne, til gavn for at drive menneskelig videnskab og teknologi tilbage til fortiden. Som *EIR*'s stiftende redaktør, Lyndon LaRouche, beskrev det, »Ved at annullere rumprogrammet,

skruer du [Obama] historien tilbage i tiden.«

Formanden for Repræsentanternes Hus' Videnskabskomite, Lamar Smith (R-TX), fordømte omgående Obamas budget i en udtalelse til *Ars Technica*, som et »ubalanceret forslag, der fortsat binder vore astronauters fødder til jorden og gør en Marsmission stort set umulig.«

Men den virkelige kamp vil komme, ikke fra nedskæringsforvirrede Republikanere, men fra aktivister med ledere som LaRouche-demokraten Kesha Rogers fra Texas, der to gange vandt primærvalgene til Kongressen med planen: »Red NASA: stil Obama for en rigsret.«

---

**SPØRGSMÅL OG SVAR med formand  
Tom Gillesberg den 11.  
februar 2016:  
Deutsche Bank i krise//Kampen  
om Aleppo**

---

# Genialitet er i universet, og det er stærkere end det onde, vi er oppe imod

*Det tilkommer jer, det amerikanske folk, at forstå og handle på den moralske fordel, der nu er blevet fremlagt gennem Kinas og Ruslands handlinger, især Kinas, og som repræsenterer en ny fremtid for menneskeheden i rummet og gennem en »win-win«-strategi om samarbejde mellem alle nationer. Den vision, som Kina og dets rumprogram har fremlagt, om at udforske Månens bagside, blive de første til at lande der og gøre, hvad ingen nation hidtil har gjort, vil ikke alene være en stor sejr for Kina, men for hele menneskeheden.*

*Det var den samme vision, som USA repræsenterede gennem præsident John F. Kennedys vision og lederskab, da han i 1961 for nationen og hele verden fremlagde forpligtelsen til at landsætte en mand på Månen og bringe ham sikkert tilbage til Jorden.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)