

# DET SKER I VERDEN – Infrastruktur, Videnskab & Teknologi, nr. 9

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

- Rusland opmuntrer nye lande til udvikling af atomkraft
- Planetforsvar: Ruslands storareal-opstilling af et rumteleskop vil finde relativt små og nærtliggende rumobjekter
- Tiden er inde til at ophæve forbuddet mod DDT for at bekæmpe Zika

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

## Hvordan nationer vinder: Ikke med NATO, men med NASA!

*21. juni 2016 (Leder)* – Samtidig med, at Obamaregeringen og NATO er kommet tættere på at fremprovokere militære opgør, der ikke efterlader overlevende, med Rusland og Kina, så er et skarpt brud med dette opgør opstået i Europa i særdeleshed, og i Japan, og det er på vej i USA.

EIR og LaRouche-bevægelsen har stået i centrum for dette skift, bort fra randen af en ukontrollerbar krig, siden vi for en måned siden lancerede den internationale appel, »Warszawa-topmødet forbereder krig; Tiden er inde til at forlade NATO

nu!«, som tusinder af tænkende mennesker og ledende personer i mange lande har underskrevet; dette har skabt »den fremskudte front«, bag hvilken det politiske skift er i færd med at bryde ud imod det militære opgør med Rusland, som Obama og briterne tydeligvis ønsker skal blive resultatet af dette NATO-topmøde i begyndelsen af juli. Den stadig voksende splittelse, der nu er i Tysklands regeringskoalition, med krav om at stop NATO's 50.000 mand stærke øvelser på Ruslands grænser; Den japanske beslutning om at trodse Obama med to Abe-Putin topmøder; de stærke skift over mod økonomisk udvikling og samarbejde i Italien og Frankrig – alt dette udgør et oprør mod Obamas og briternes krigspolitik, der var i færd med at åbne døren på vid gab for en endegyldig katastrofe for menneskeheden.

Dette oprør kan blive til en virkelig revolution for en sand, menneskelig fremtid. For dem, der ønsker at undfly en atomar konfrontation med Rusland og Kina, samt de transatlantiske økonomiers stadigt forværrende kollaps, findes alternativet allerede. Og USA – med Obama ude – må bringes til sin egen interesse, hvor det tilslutter sig dette nye paradigme snarere end at detonere en krig, der ikke har nogen overlevende.

Dersom den menneskelige art skal have en lysende fremtid – på den anden side af selve randen af fremprovokeret krig mellem atomare supermagter, hvor vi i øjeblikket befinder os – så vil det blive bestemt af nationer, der har et langsigtet perspektiv med gensidig økonomisk udvikling og udforskning af rummet. Og det vil nu sige Kina og Rusland (samt Indien). Disse to nationer vil i den kommende weekend afholde et økonomisk topmøde, hvor det centrale fokus vil ligge på et samarbejde om udforskning af rummet: »samarbejde omkring skabelsen af en tung raket og etableringen af interaktion inden for området med rumstationer og langdistance-rumrejser, som vil være til gavn for menneskeheden i sin helhed snarere end blot for de deltagende stater.«

Et amerikanske rumprograms hele ånd udgjorde Amerikas »en håbets bavn« for hele menneskeheden. Det er blevet skåret

tilbage i årtier, og menneskers rejser ud i rummet er nu grundlæggende set blevet annulleret under Obama. Men indbydelsen til en storslået genoplivelse af NASA's opdagelsesrejser for hele menneskeheden ligger på bordet. Det er vores opgave at gribe den og virkeliggøre den; og at gøre en ende på det nuværende, globale krigsopgør, før det er for sent.

(se også: »Ingen overlevende«, video fra LaRouchePAC med danske undertekster.)

---

## Verden har valget mellem to systemer

*21. juni 2016 (Leder) – »Formålet med øvelsen er klar«, sagde den polske præsident Andrzej Duda. »Vi forbereder et angreb.«*

USA's befolkning er ubevidst om de to mest betydningsfulde, geopolitiske faktorer på planeten. På den ene side finder vi de igangværende tiltag hen imod en global, generel atomkrig, og på den anden finder vi potentialet til at udløse den største periode med global, økonomisk vækst i menneskehedens historie. Ovenstående udtalelse fra den polske præsident, mht. den nylige, 50.000 mand stærke NATO-øvelse, »Anakonda 16«, der simulerer en invasion af Rusland, er en demonstration af desperationen på Wall Street og i [City of] London, der gør fremstød for at fremprovokere en udslettelseskrig med Rusland og Kina.

Der er en udviklingsvej for en fremtid med menneskelig fremgang – men denne vej fastlægges uden for USA – i takt med, og vores politiske proces fortsat befinder sig i Wall Streets fallerede, monetære systems kvælergreb, samt den pomp, der

omgiver dette cirkus for folket og de etablerede medier. I kontrast hertil var det nyligt afsluttede Skt. Petersborg Økonomiske Forum i Rusland, som Obama forsøgte at sabotere, en total succes, der indbragte \$12 mia. store økonomiske aftaler blandt 40 lande, og hvor højtplacerede europæiske ledere, der krævede en afslutning af sanktionerne mod Rusland og krigsprovokationerne, deltog. Den tidligere franske præsident Nicolas Sarkozy udtalte på konferencen:

*»Vi har mange andre problemer, og vi har ikke råd til at lide pga. disse kunstigt skabte problemer. Og den stærkeste bør strække hånden frem, for den stærkeste spiller er Rusland, repræsenteret af præsident Putin.«*

Det, som en stor del af verden allerede har erkendt, er, at nationens interesse ikke er bygget på militær aggression eller økonomisk krigsførelse, men derimod bygger på fremskaffelsen af en fremtid for ens egen befolkning, inklusive gennem internationalt samarbejde, for at skabe højere levestandard og bedre teknologier således, som nye indsigter i universet kan give os. Af fundamental betydning for denne udviklingsproces er rumprogrammet.

Lyndon LaRouche har peget på rumforskningspioneren Krafft Ehrlicke som den person, der »har skabt selve ideen om et rumprogram«. Ehrlicke var forpligtende engageret over for princippet om fremskridt og fordømte nejsigernes ikke-forandring, og udtalte:

*»en filosofi med anti-vækst, der af menneskene forlanger, at de skal leve med mindre af alting, kan sætte os tilbage til Middelalderen, fordi en hund-æder-hund-kamp med sikkerhed vil bryde ud under sådanne omstændigheder ... Livet viser os, at teknologiske fremskridt er vejen ad hvilken. Men, baseret på disse teknologiske fremskridt, må vores art og vores civilisation ligeledes gøre fremskridt. Så kan vi gå videre.«*

Rusland, Kina, Indien og andre har erkendt det uundgåelige,

elendige resultat af »nul-vækst«-geopolitik og har afvist det og vist, at de er forpligtet over for økonomiske projekter og rumteknologi, der vil fremme menneskehedens fysiske økonomi og lykke. Kra-kanalen i Thailand, den forbedrede Suezkanal i Egypten, udviklingen omkring Mekongfloden, nye jernbanelinjer i Pakistan og Afghanistan og Chabahar-havnen i Iran er blot nogle få af disse. For nylig har Kina inviteret til internationalt samarbejde omkring sin fremtidige rumstation. Vicedirektøren for Kinas bemandede rumprogram, fr. Wu Pung, sagde for nylig til FN's Komite for den fredelige anvendelse af det ydre rum, i forbindelse med aftaler om nye rumstationer:

*»Udforskning af rummet er menneskehedens fælles drøm og ønske. Vi er overbevist om, at implementeringen af aftalerne afgjort vil fremme det internationale samarbejde om udforskning af rummet og skabe muligheder for FN's medlemsstater, i særdeleshed udviklingslande, til at deltage i, og drage fordel af, anvendelsen af Kinas rumstation.«*

Rusland og Kina har også for nylig annonceret et fuldt ud omfattende samarbejde omkring rummet. Ruslands ambassadør til Kina Andrey Denisov forklarede i et nyligt interview:

*»Jeg ville lægge vægt på samarbejde omkring aktivitet i det ydre rum som et hele, snarere end en specifik leverance af et parti varer. Pointen er ikke at levere specifikt udstyr, men at organisere langsigtet, gensidigt fordelagtigt samarbejde mellem alle siderne, der objektivt set har tætte forbindelser ud fra et standpunkt om teknisk og teknologisk kompatibilitet.«*

Dette er vejen til fremtiden. Mens USA plages af selvmord, narkotikamisbrug, masseskyderier og økonomisk disintegration, så går et flertal af menneskeheden videre til det næste niveau. London-Wall Street-finanssystemet er dødt. Vi har kun ét valg. Valget mellem krig, terror og økonomisk fortvivlelse på den ene side, kontra, at vi dumper Obama og alt, hvad han

står for, og kræver en fremtid, der passer sig for menneskeheden.

*Billede: »Anakonda 16«-vejen til Anakonda – NATO's mere og mere virkelige »march mod Moskva«. Truslen om Tredje Verdenskrig har aldrig været større.  
([www.eur.army.mil/Anakonda](http://www.eur.army.mil/Anakonda))*

---

**“Vi må atter blive sande amerikanere”.**

**LaRouchePAC Internationale  
Fredags-webcast, 10. juni  
2016**

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

*militærkøretøjer, flådemanoøvrer osv.*

*Engelsk udskrift.*

## **WE MUST BECOME TRUE AMERICANS AGAIN!**

LaRouche PAC Friday Webcast; June 10, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good Evening! It's June 10th, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden, and you joining us for our weekly Friday evening webcast here from [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com). As you'll notice, we're taking a little bit of a different format than customary today. We have a roundtable format, joined in the studio by Megan Beets and Ben Deniston, from the LaRouche PAC basement science team; and also Kesha Rogers and Mike Steger are both joining us from the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee via video. So, we're going to have a little bit of a freer kind of roundtable discussion here.

I'd like to begin our discussion by just pointing out, what I think has been said very, very clearly in the recent days by Mr. LaRouche, that we're in an extraordinarily dangerous period of world history. This couldn't be made more clear than seeing these military maneuvers which are happening on the eastern border of Europe (the western border of Russia). These combined NATO maneuvers which are happening all the way up and down the border of Russia, from the Baltic States, into Poland, and then south from there. This is a combination of four different, supposedly independent, war games, but it involves live troop maneuvers, the largest of which is called "Anaconda 2016." That

one involves 30,000 troops from 24 different countries, including 14,000 Americans, 12,000 Polish soldiers, 1,000 paratroopers, the actual crossing of the key river there, the Vistula River; and the exercise of nighttime assaults, military hardware, 35 helicopters, 3,000 military vehicles, naval maneuvers, and so forth.

If you take that, together with the three other maneuvers that are happening right now, you have approximately 60,000 troops that are engaged in military maneuvers all along the border of Russia. As Helga LaRouche pointed out, this the greatest troop and military hardware maneuver that you've had on Russia's border since World War II – the mobilization by Hitler of the Nazi forces prior to the invasion of what was then the Soviet Union. Obviously, this many troops engaged in live military maneuvers, not only creates a very strong possibility for some accident occurring, which could trigger a rapid escalation towards a very hot war, which could escalate very quickly; but also it's very clearly a provocation, which is being taken by NATO with Obama in the leadership, directly towards Russia. And it's being seen as such in the context of other things, by the Russian President and other leading members of the Russian military. It's also being recognized as such by various forces within Europe. {Der Spiegel}, one of the leading news magazines in Germany, put out a story on Wednesday, saying these war maneuvers along the Russian borders, are "going too far", and "are playing at real war". Clearly, any war that were to break out between NATO and Russia would very quickly lead to not a



limited, not a tactical, but an all-out strategic, thermonuclear war.

If you combine this with Obama's upcoming trip to attend the NATO Heads of State Summit in Warsaw, Poland, while these war games are actively taking place, along with his refusal to sit down with President Putin to discuss the deployment of these AEGIS anti-missile systems along the Russian border, which have been characterized as a "Cuban Missile Crisis in Reverse," along with the trillion dollar allocation that Obama has recently signed off on, to modernize the U.S. military arsenal, including these B61-12 nuclear warheads, and the long-range LRSO [Long Range Standoff] cruise missiles; all of these, taken together, along with the simultaneous provocations that are happening by U.S. forces against China in the South China Sea.

Any sane person should be asking themselves, "Why are we driving the world towards the point of a war of extinction, when we could be taking up Chinese President Xi Jinping's offer to engage in a new strategic and economic architecture for the planet, based on win-win cooperation?" This danger, and also the very real possibility of a paradigm shift, were both put on the table at a very significant seminar sponsored by the Schiller Institute that occurred on Wednesday in San Francisco, California. Both Kesha and Mike were participants. It was titled, "Will the U.S. Join the New Silk Road? Global Scientific Development, or Nuclear War?" Mrs. Helga LaRouche gave an extensive and very thorough overview of this war danger in her

keynote address; and Mr. LaRouche, in his remarks, said very clearly – this is the very beginning of what Mr. LaRouche said,

"The key thing I'm concerned about, is the threats to the existence of the human species in the total area right now; because right now, at this time, the existence of the entire human species continues to be on the edge of jeopardy. And therefore we have to attune ourselves to understanding what the

problems are that are involved in this, and what are the remedies

for which we can get an escape for humanity in general. Humanity

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I think the starkness of this statement, combined with

what

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

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

water projects.

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

short – approximately 10 minute – excerpt from the keynote speech that Mrs. Helga LaRouche gave. This is the concluding excerpt of her remarks. She asked two questions: (1) How did we

get here?; and (2) What is the solution to the crisis we now face? I just want to underscore, what you'll hear Mrs. LaRouche

say in this excerpt, is what Mr. LaRouche reiterated, and I think

is the subject that we have to pay attention to here today: that

both the LaRouche movement in general, and Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche

as individuals, {have played the crucial, central, historical role} in not only creating the possibility for a solution to this

crisis, going all the way back to their proposal for the Eurasian

Land-Bridge: the New Silk Road, in the aftermath of the collapse

of the Soviet Union; but also continued to play the crucial role

in providing the possibility for humanity to escape this crisis.

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

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Okay, now, let me introduce the third [subject I want to talk about]. The solution to all of this would be a piece of cake. It is already there! A New Silk Road is integrated. We called it at that time, first, the Productive Triangle; in 1991 we called it the Eurasian Land-Bridge: the New Silk Road, which was the idea that when the Iron Curtain had fallen, [to integrate] the populations in the industrial centers of Europe with those of Asia, through development corridors. This New Silk Road program would have changed the world in the direction of a peace order already in '91, but, unfortunately, you had Bush, Sr., you had Margaret Thatcher, you had François Mitterrand, who all had completely different ideas. They [wanted to reduce Russia] from a superpower into a Third World, raw-material-producing country, and they imposed the "shock therapy" in the Yeltsin period. They dismantled the Russian potential in three years , and they had no intention to allow Germany to have any kind of economic relation with Russia. So it did not happen.

You had the '90s, which were genocide against Russia. You had all of the consequences of the Bush period. You had the eight years of Clinton, which was a certain interruption; but then with

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

Fortunately, in 2013, President Xi Jinping announced a New Silk Road to be {the} strategic objective of China. In the almost three years which have passed since, this idea to end geopolitics, to establish in the tradition of the ancient Silk Road, a win-win cooperation among all nations on the planet, is progressing extremely quickly. Remember, the ancient Silk Road was a fantastic cooperation in terms of exchange of culture, goods, paper, technology, porcelain, silk, silk-producing, and many other cultural manifestations. It led to a tremendous benefit for all the countries which participated, from Asia to Europe.

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

Contrary to what you read and hear in the mass media, China is not doing badly. They are shifting their economic orientation from an export orientation, because the export markets in the trans-Atlantic sector are shrinking. They are now going more in infrastructure investment in many countries in the world, and to develop the inner region of China. [To raise the] consumer [to

a]  
higher standard of their own population, since they have  
lifted  
600 million people out of poverty, [into a] decent living  
standard in China. This is indeed the absolute correct policy,  
to  
say we will uplift the remaining people who are still poor,  
and  
also make them participate in the Chinese economic miracle.

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

The United States also needs a Silk Road. If you look  
at the  
figures of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, productivity  
has

collapsed over seven years in a row. All the indexes are going down. The United States population is in a terrible condition, or at least in the poorer parts; while the rich become more rich and Wall Street is having a heyday with cocaine parties and plotting destruction for the rest of the world.

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

So, for the United States to build its own Silk Road, to connect with the global development perspective is a question of its own best self-interest. We have to get the United States off this confrontation course, and simply say, we have to shift this policy and all this trillion-dollar investment in modernization of nuclear arsenals and the largest military budget in the world, trying to maintain an empire which is collapsing anyway. Rather, shift, get rid of Wall Street, impose Glass-Steagall, get back

to

a policy of Alexander Hamilton, a credit policy; invest in infrastructure and go in the direction of a win-win cooperation

with the other nations of the world – with Russia, China, European nations, India; build up Latin America, build up Africa and Southwest Asia.

This is really the choice before the United States. I know

this is very difficult for you to think how this should be done,

but you know, think about Kennedy; think about the kind of optimistic country the United States used to be. Think about the

idea that America was built to be "a beacon of hope and a temple

of liberty," where people from the whole world would go and try

to be free. The U.S. singing the National Anthem, "the land of the free." Is the United States the land of the free today? I don't think anybody who is in their right mind would say that today.

Go back to the values of the American Republic, as it was

founded by people like Benjamin Franklin, or George Washington;

go back to the policies of Alexander Hamilton, Franklin D.

Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King. I think if the United States could mobilize itself to bring back that nation, the whole world would love to be friends of the United States again. Right now, I can tell you, the rest of the world has almost given up on the United States, and when they look at

the election process, the choice between a very, very irrational

Donald Trump and unfortunately a very, very predictable



Hillary

Clinton, given her statements about confrontation against Russia

and China. I think you have to really mobilize now. And I think

the 28 pages, Glass-Steagall – these are flanks which can derail

the situation long before this election is going to take place.

We have to have a completely new world. Remember, mankind is

not a beast, and mankind is not bound to do what seems to be inevitable. Mankind is the only species capable of reason, capable of free will, of defining and designing a beautiful future, and then going to implement that. The last time was with

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

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

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

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

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

from Helga.

MICHAEL STEGER: Sure, thanks Matt. One of the most interesting, one of the key aspects of this whole process and what our organization does, was demonstrated at the discussion

process in San Francisco on Wednesday. You have key people in their areas: Obviously, Senator Mike Gravel represents what is a true American political tradition; to recognize that you fight for what's true, you go against popular opinion and peer pressure. And he was very clear on that question; you don't go along to get along. As Lyndon LaRouche often says, "You can't fight politically and go along with the popular opinion."

Dr. Howard Chang is a leading civil engineer; obviously the Consul-General of Russia was someone who spoke on behalf of his country. But the key question is that the standards our organization represents in this existential crisis is something unique; it gives these individuals an opportunity to wage a political fight at the level necessary that inspires them towards what mankind can accomplish, and also addresses the real crisis in the world today. It's far too often that people who want to address the economic crisis, people who want to address the increasing and escalating war danger, fall far short of the necessary to want to work with us. And two, to recognize the quality of method which is necessary to address these problems.

These problems are of great scope and magnitude; it's not fixing a pothole, although we have many potholes to fix as Helga points out. And apparently, the Chinese won't even be allowed to build – they wanted to build a small segment of high-speed rail between Los Angeles and Las Vegas; very easy. Actually, east of

Los Angeles in the desert. And I guess apparently they won't even be allowed to build that in the United States. So, we can't build any high-speed rail; it's just been outlawed basically. This just came out.

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

leadership in the United States, we need leadership in Europe today. The problem can be solved so easily.

The New Silk Road, the Eurasian development projects are so extensive, they're ongoing; there are collaborations between China, India, and Russia. And then the nations of central Asia, of Southeast Asia; the strategic intervention in the war domain in Southwest Asia; all of these are now being addressed in a fundamentally different way than they were by the United States and NATO for the last 15 years since the 9/11 attacks. Which has just been ongoing war and destruction.

So, there's a comprehensive picture that the United States and Europe could participate in. So, why aren't we? Why don't we take those steps? Simply raising red flags that we're near nuclear war, or simply complaining and trying to figure out which of the lesser evils you vote for, are just obviously insufficient. So, why does that remain the discussion? The discussion has to take on a higher standard; and I think that's what Lyn has already recognized over these 50 years. Because if you think of it, 50 years ago, there was a quality of leadership of this nature. John Kennedy recognized that the way you uplift and strengthen a country is to set out on a mission that's never been accomplished before; but it wasn't just the Moon. It was the largest water projects, and the development of Africa. John

Kennedy's view of the world and of the Universe had a great scope and magnitude to it, to help uplift the population; it wasn't a practical campaign. Someone like Martin Luther King had a similar outlook; and you saw that inspire people like Bobby Kennedy and Malcolm X, but there was a resonance. You saw the same thing from the great scientists like Krafft Ehricke; the visionaries in the space program didn't look at it as kind of fun engineering projects. They saw it as something of a cultural advancement of the human species. And there was a resonance with this quality of leadership politically, that unfortunately, I think what was made clear by the seminar, is that many people are attracted, they gravitate towards this quality of leadership if they have a sense of honesty; but that the ability to demonstrate this method, to act upon that quality of the human mind and human creativity is a challenge for much of the population in the United States and Europe today. And the standard that they have to come up to, is not just acknowledging the dangers, but a standard of operating to embolden and strengthen the population to solve these problems and to move our civilization upwards.

And I think that really was the culminating nature of the discussion on Wednesday at the seminar; and it really is to bring more people into this quality of an organization. Of what we are as a political organization, but that we are must become what the

nation is. And that requires our population must become better;  
they must become more courageous, more intelligent, and more beautiful if we're actually going to address these problems. Because they're not going to be addressed from any simple mechanisms; and I think that really was the fight we waged here  
for the seminar, and I think the only way to deal with the current crisis you presented at the beginning.

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

During the presentation, I had an opportunity to actually  
work with Michael and others there for the conference that was just held in San Francisco. And I presented on the unique role  
of Krafft Ehricke, the German space pioneer; and what he represented from the standpoint of putting forth the epistemology  
and the philosophy on human nature's identity in terms of creating an open world system. Which was this idea that you

reject the Club of Rome meadows and foresters limits to growth population reduction; the Malthusian policy that human beings are

nothing more than small lily pads, mindless beings. That they have no conception of advancing human creativity. And this is what was the unique role defining Krafft Ehrlicke from the standpoint that he knew that it was not just a matter of promoting technological advancements; but what do these technological advances do to improve upon the conditions of human

life and the progress of mankind overall.

And this has been something that Mr. LaRouche understood is

crucial in his science of physical economy, from the standpoint

that you're not just looking at technological advancement from speaking of just one leap. But you're talking about a succession

of leaps in economic progress in society. And during the relationship that Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche developed with the identity and role of Krafft Ehrlicke as a scientist and genius of

his time, is really exemplified in what Mr. LaRouche continued to

develop around his policy for a Moon-Mars colonization program. I

think that people who have not actually studied the significance

of Mr. LaRouche and why he became a threat to this zero-growth policy, because he continued to push the limits, push mankind beyond the so-called limitations that have been put on mankind;

just as Krafft Ehrlicke understood that our extraterrestrial imperative was to actually remove all limitations and barriers from the progress of mankind. And the best way to do this was through the advancement of man into the colonization of space.

And I think it's important to note, that some people

start

to put themselves into this smallness of thinking, in this mindless thinking. "Well, how are we going to travel into space

if we can't actually solve the problems here on Earth?" And Mr.

LaRouche made it a priority to actually organize an understanding

of what real technological advancement is; this was exactly the

thinking of John F Kennedy in the progress of the commitment of

the Moon landing, of sending a man to the Moon and bringing him

safely back to Earth. That this was going to lead to technological advancements that would pay themselves off several

times over; but what was going to be essential for it, is that you had to have breakthroughs as Mr. LaRouche called for, in several categories of technology that was actually going to be essential for bringing about an increase in the productivity of

society. You take the example; you look at this massive undertaking of what Krafft Ehricke did in the design and development of what took men to the Moon, in terms of the Saturn

V rocket. It wasn't something that was just thrown together on

the cheap; you couldn't have just Wall Street and Elon Musk going

in there and saying, "OK, let us just throw a spacecraft up."

This took some real engineering; it was a total transformation in

terms of the economic conditions of society. Thousands, millions

of people were put to work; the spin-off technologies that went



into it. Mr. LaRouche called for the advancement of four categories of technology, in thermonuclear fusion and related plasma technologies; or development of electromagnetic radiation

of high energy density. Basically promoting new synthetic materials or the production of the colonization of Mars; that you

were going to actually have to have flotillas in developing low-Earth orbit. And putting materials on the Moon to actually

lead to the colonization of Mars. How are we going to get there?

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

The technical considerations are all laid out very prominently, but I think what it really represents is a transformation of the human species; and that's what Mr. LaRouche

was very crucial in, saying that you had to actually have a different identity of who we are as human beings. That we are actually distinct from the animal species; and that no limitations can be put on mankind to keep them in a state of bestiality. And the question of technological advancement is, are these advancements being made in a so-called barbaric society

that wants to keep human beings down and keep them enslaved; and

promote a policy of limitations on growth and population reduction so these policies would not be advanced. Or, are we talking about a cultural Renaissance, where these advancements are made as Krafft Ehrlicke understood, from the standpoint of a

new conception of mankind. This is what has really brought together the minds, and why Mr. LaRouche sees Krafft Ehrlicke as

extremely fundamental to how we overcome the threats facing us today in society.

OGDEN: Well, I think that's something that certainly you elaborated very clearly in your speech at the conference, and I think as we had a discussion with Mr. LaRouche yesterday; everybody who is on this show was engaged in that discussion. Mr. LaRouche put a very emphatic emphasis on the personality of Krafft Ehrlicke and his courage in fighting for a vision which was not a popular vision even among the people in the space community. And Mr. LaRouche asked that more research be done on this; and I know that both you, Ben, and Megan have been immersed in this a little bit in the recent few days and weeks. So, maybe you want to give people a broader idea of some of this.

MEGAN BEETS: Well, I can say something briefly. I was just looking back at comments that were made by both Helga LaRouche and Lyndon LaRouche at the memorial conference that was held in honor of Krafft Ehrlicke in 1985, following his death in 1984. And both Lyndon and Helga LaRouche reflect something which I think really does go to the essence of the importance of the personality of Krafft Ehrlicke in what we were able to achieve in the space program. And what they both reflected was the fact that his life made a contribution to moving the species as a whole forward; but why? It's exactly because he was not motivated by the kinds of practical considerations that were impinging on most of the population at the time; and both Lyn and Helga reflected the fact that Krafft Ehrlicke was motivated by a

total cultural optimism. That not only was it necessary, but it was also possible to move mankind forward into the Age of Reason; to move man into a paradigm where we completely left the cultural vestiges of the beast behind us. And if you look at Krafft Ehricke's work, which ranges from extremely technical papers on the use of liquid hydrogen fuel to fictional stories which are envisioning the first manned mission to Mars; but all of them I think are motivated by this passion and vision for a better mankind as a whole. And he came to the conclusion himself as a young man, that the way to realize that had to be space travel; had to be space colonization.

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

Schiller would call beautiful souls?

BENJAMIN DENISTON: I think highlighting the fight for that; he fought for that. He went against the opposition even within the scientific community for that kind of idea; and I think that also goes back to something that Michael was saying about what's needed today. It's people like that; it's people who are going to fight for what's true. Not because they think it's what their neighbors will like, or because they think it's what will make them popular; it's because they have an internal drive that they know that's what's needed. You pulled up this quote – it's just one thing among many – I just thought it was indicative; this quote of Krafft testifying in Congress in, I believe it was in 1960, the early '60s. And really emphatically pushing the need for nuclear power for space; he said, the Universe runs on nuclear power. The stars are run by nuclear power; this nuclear power is an inherent part of the Universe and mankind is going to be obsolete in his attempt to be part of the Universe more broadly – go beyond Earth, fulfill this extraterrestrial imperative – if we reject nuclear power. That's one thing. Already in the early '60s, he said, if we don't do this by the end of the decade, we're going to be obsolete in terms of our space efforts. Nuclear power is one issue; one critical issue, obviously, for mankind as a whole, for space development. But you see this visionary quality of fighting against the

opposition

to these breakthroughs; and being the force that says, "No, this

is what's needed," against massive opposition. The tragedy is that the opposition has taken over.

We had, under the leadership of Krafft Ehricke and people

working with him, we had a nuclear rocket pretty much built by the early '70s; it was basically a few steps away from being ready to go, and it was just cancelled. It was not found to be

too difficult; it was not found to be some failure; it was not found to be too expensive; it was just cancelled. And we've had

this zero-growth policy take over at that crucial pivot point —

the late '60s, early '70s — when Lyn really came on the scene and started to continue this fight. Obviously, Krafft resonated

with that, and came to work with the LaRouches directly based on

that; but you see the failure of departing from this visionary quality and this fight to move into the future. But I think he

exemplifies what's needed from the US population right now; you're not going to find solutions from the existing cultural, social framework. It's failed; that's expressing the failure of society.

We heard at the beginning, one of the things that strikes me

in discussing this whole war danger and the fact that we're taking steps towards nuclear war, which I think it's important,

it was stated clearly. There's no limited nuclear war; there's

no small nuclear war, you don't take small steps. If it

happens,  
everything's over; it's gone. But what's potentially even more  
striking than that actually being a reality on the table?  
Who's  
talking about it? We have a Presidential election; are these  
candidates raising this as an issue? Is there any discussion  
about this? I think it just underscores the importance of  
that  
quality of leadership needed; and exemplified by what was done  
in  
San Francisco. We're going to be having, coming out of the  
Schiller Institute conference in Germany coming up; and what  
really this movement represents in the United States.

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

Really, this is a time when we need escalation; we need  
increase;  
we need more support; we need more people to be these type of  
creative leaders like Krafft Ehricke, like Lyndon LaRouche.  
That's the only thing that's going to save the country at this  
point.

OGDEN: Yeah, Michael made a point which I thought was very  
significant. That, at a time like this, when it's very clear  
how  
huge the dangers are, you cannot allow yourself to be any less  
than the magnitude of the crisis challenges one to be. And  
the  
magnitude and scope of thinking which is necessary to solve a  
crisis of this sort, of a civilizational scale, must be huge  
in  
those terms. And I think one thing out of this discussion  
about  
Krafft Ehricke, that occurred to me is, when you're thinking  
about where the entire idea of the geopolitics of the last 70  
years has been rooted; it is rooted in the zero-growth

technology, no development kind of paradigm. The idea that there are limited resources that a growing population is fighting over, and these territories and so forth; that is the fundamental tenet of the geopolitics that has dominated this paradigm which has now failed. When you talk about a New Paradigm, when you talk about "win-win" as Xi Jinping says it, instead of winner take all, all are winners. That fundamentally requires, it begs a new attitude towards our concept of growth; that there is no idea of limits to growth, of fixed natural resources. But that you have an ever-expanding possibility of ever-increasing potentials of growth. I think as very demonstrated, China, in a certain way, does understand that in the way that Krafft Ehricke understood it; is a central element of their current policy, is not only the One Belt, One Road policy, but it is also this exploration of the Moon. Now just going to the Moon, as a sort of space race or setting your foot on a foreign body or something like that; but saying we're going to discover fundamentally new about the Universe. And as Mr. LaRouche has been emphasizing, this Chang'e mission to explore the far side of the Moon and everything that is there to be discovered. We don't even know; we don't know the extent to which we will discover brand new things about the structure of the Universe when we explore this new territory.

That, I think, speaks to this idea that the idea of a New Paradigm, a new "win-win" system, is rooted in overturning the last 70 years of this Malthusian concept of zero-growth, zero technological development, and fixed resources.

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

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



something stolen from him; it's that he had a whole class of people he was managing, that Prometheus then gave an ability to uplift and realize their own humanity. And for that, Zeus punished him.

It's the same fight today; but today, Zeus has thermonuclear arsenals at his fingertips. We're at a clear, and I think this was very well expressed even in the discussions back in the '80s that we're talking about, with the need to move to the Age of Reason. We're at the point where mankind has developed technologically to the point where if we allow that type of process to continue, you're talking about mankind annihilating himself; and that's what we're talking about right now, with these NATO deployments. It's complete insanity. But again, as we're saying, it's not going to be solved in the negative, by just saying, "Stop that. Don't do that." It's going to have to be resolved in the higher realization and actualization of the true nature of mankind as a Promethean force; as Krafft Ehricke represented. Today, as much as then, this need for an Age of Reason is the imperative; and space is emblematic of the Age of Reason, the age of mankind, really.

OGDEN: Well, I think it's important in the context of everything that we've discussed, also to note that we really are on the edge of a meltdown of the trans-Atlantic financial system. It was noted this week that now major European banks are beginning to cease their investment into the ECB, because of the ECB's negative interest policy. They said, why should we be putting

money into the ECB if they're just going to be charging us for putting our money there? So, Helga LaRouche said, there's a lot of European bankers who are sleeping with billions of dollars underneath their pillows in the current days. But this is, even without the instability of what could happen in the build up to the Brexit vote at the end of this month. I know our institutional question for this week, which we haven't addressed; was on the subject of the Brexit. And Mrs. LaRouche said, if this means that Ireland and Scotland are going to leave the UK, and the UK will break up; then sure, I welcome this. But in seriousness, we are on the verge of the meltdown of the trans-Atlantic financial system; the productivity of the United States is through the floor; unemployment in this country is unbelievable, especially youth unemployment. It's at levels that are unprecedented in the modern history of this country. And at the same time, you have the possibility of an entirely economic paradigm presenting itself in the form of the New Silk Road; everything that's coming out of the BRICS. We have the visit by Narendra Modi to the United States this week; he spoke to a joint session of Congress. There's a lot that could just happen; as Helga LaRouche said, it would be very easy. It would be a piece of cake for the United States to join this New Paradigm; and I think that's the ongoing of the LaRouche Movement internationally, is making that possibility very, very real. It

requires a policy revolution in the United States to bring that about; but as was clear from the seminar in San Francisco this week – and I think will continue to be clear in our interventions in New York City around the Manhattan Project that Mr. LaRouche has initiated; and then this upcoming conference that's being sponsored by the Schiller Institute in Europe in the coming weeks. The activities of the LaRouche Movement internationally are crucial; and it's very significant that we're at the breaking point in terms of several aspects of this.

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

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

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

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

ROGERS: Yeah. I think it's true; we are at the end of an era of representation of barbarism, war, and these limits to growth consequences that Krafft Ehricke was very well aware of. We're seeing the emergence of a new system of cooperation, a new collaboration and dialogue among civilizations that's being led by Russia and China. And I think the continued question being presented by our activity is, will people actually join with LaRouche and join with the nations who are representing this new direction for mankind? And that means doing what Krafft Ehricke did, and breaking with all practicality, and as you said Ben, popularity; and actually going out and doing that which is seemingly impossible. I think China gives us the light and the inspiration as to human beings; that is our mission, that is what we do. We do those things which seem almost impossible. And we do those things that actually help to bring about the solutions that are going to lead to a greater condition for mankind. So, I think that's what we're representing right now, and we're on the brink of a total breakthrough; unlike anything that's been seen. But also, as Mrs. LaRouche said in her opening remarks, this breakthrough is going to come with rejecting the absence of

any

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

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

---

**LaRouchePAC Internationale  
Fredags-webcast, 3. juni  
2016:**

**Vi må rejse ud i rummet og  
virkeliggøre vores fælles**

# bestemmelse

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

Engelsk udskrift.

## **WE MUST GO OUT INTO SPACE AND REALIZE OUR COMMON DESTINY**

Friday LaRouche PAC Webcast  
June 3, 2016

MEGAN BEETS: Hello! It's June 3rd, 2016. I'd like to welcome all of you to our regular Friday broadcast here at LaRouche PAC.

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

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

Committee members Kesha Rogers, joining me from Houston Texas and

Diane Sare, joining us from New Jersey and Manhattan.

To start things off tonight, I'm going to read the question

that came in to Mr. LaRouche from our institutional contact in Washington, and then turn it over to you, Diane, to deliver Mr.

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

The question reads: "Mr. LaRouche, the U.S. Senate passed a

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

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

I think this is extremely important with what I wanted to say, in terms of starting off the discussion this evening, which is that the American population is in somewhat of a quandary. They're in an unfair position because, thanks to our terribly controlled news media, they're operating without full knowledge of the situation that they're in. They're thinking that we're in a presidential election campaign where they have to choose between Hillary Clinton, who is nothing but a lying, killer clone of Barack Obama; maybe Bernie Sanders, who's really just a fraud,

and who has never met an anti-Russian policy that he has not supported; or Donald Trump, who is an FBI agent with a glorified toupee.

Actually, this is simply not the case. There's a much greater dynamic in the world right now, which is that the trans-Atlantic system is completely bankrupt. That means the British Royal Family and their Saudi and American puppets like Barack Obama, like the Bush family, are in a mad scramble to somehow maintain their grip, even as their system completely disintegrates. What Ben is about to present is the new dynamic of

the planet, which is absolutely huge. It involves over half of the world's population and it involves over half of the world's

population actually moving in a progressive, future-oriented, direction, which is something completely anomalous to most people

and most people's thinking in the United States today.

So, what I just wanted to give a sense of is (1) the danger,

in terms of the urgency of yanking down Obama by exposing his collusion with Saudi Arabia and Britain, the very people who committed the atrocities on September 11, 2001 in our country, so

that we don't have thermonuclear war; and (2) that the United States can be brought to join this greater paradigm, which is actually what's affecting everything inside the United States, not the local affairs as you see them.

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

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

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

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



against

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

Germany has sent 1,000 troops into Lithuania for these drills. NATO is erecting anti-ballistic missile systems. They have already been placed in Romania. Now we're talking about placing

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

security. Let me repeat, these are response measures, a response

only. We were not the first to take such steps. The same will be

done with regard to Poland. We will wait for certain actions to

be taken in Poland. We are not going to do anything until we see

missiles on the neighboring territory. And we have the necessary resources. You saw, the whole world saw our capabilities in term of our medium-range sea- and air-based missiles." He's referring to what Russia just did with regard to Syria, the phenomenal accuracy of missiles launched from the Mediterranean and elsewhere on wiping out ISIS targets. "We are not violating anything, but our ground-based Iskander missile systems have proven themselves as superb."

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

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

I'll just say that there was just this study that came out from a fellow at Dartmouth College, and the Bush School of Government at Texas A&M University. Secretary of State James Baker III, at the time when negotiations were being held with Gorbachev for the reunification of Germany, was {lying to Gorbachev at that time} [in 1990] – that the United States was already engaged in plans for expansion of NATO, even as we were telling Gorbachev that we were not, in terms of the conditions to reunify Germany.

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

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

I think part of what we're facing in the United States is people are not going to understand what's really going on unless they look at the global picture, and unless they look at the global picture from the right perspective. I think you're absolutely right. These elections are a joke unless you see them

in the context of where the world's actually going right now. Obviously, the United States plays a critical role, but you're not going to define what the United States does, or where the United States goes, from within the United States. People have to look at what's happening in the world, to know how to act here in the United States to actually achieve something.

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

What we've seen recently, over years, but also just in the recent days and weeks, is a real consolidation of other nations coming around that policy, coming around the idea of a win-win principle. Maybe different nations are approaching it in different terms, or they have different words for it, or different expressions, or maybe stated in different languages, but I think there's a clear unification around this principle – that we have to move beyond the idea that every nation is competing for some finite set of resources, and the gains of

another nation are somehow implicitly and inherently going to be a loss for your nation. In other terms, sometimes, this general "geopolitical view," as some people discuss it and think about it – the idea that the world is this big game being played and you have to ensure that you get the biggest slice of the pie, and any gains made by another nation are somehow going to be detrimental, because that's less potential gains for you.

You've seen a very clear and explicit break from this, not just in words, not just in statements, but in actual action from this new paradigm, centered around China, China's alliance with Russia, and increasingly, cooperation with India. And you're seeing a clear commitment to the idea that the future of mankind depends on cooperation in common progress, in common development – that progress and development in joint cooperation between nations benefits both parties and other parties involved in, in the nearby area: this idea of win-win cooperation. It's not win-loss cooperation. Just because you win doesn't mean the other guy loses. We need to rise to a real mature understanding of how mankind progresses, what the nature of progress is for the human species – that mankind creates wealth, creates progress, by creative development, and the only way we're going to have a stable, progressive, future-oriented world – or any world at

all, frankly, at this point, at the level of thermonuclear technologies – is a policy based on this principle, this recognition: that we can no longer tolerate the suppression or the denial of progress of other nations, and we must embark on policies that ensure cooperative development among nations.

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

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

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

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

Also earlier this week, you had a former Chinese ambassador to Russia travel to Moscow and speak about Russian-Chinese relations. And he just said quite frankly, bilateral relations between Russia and China are now at a 400-year high. You hear politicians in the United States, you're lucky if they talk about a 4-year perspective or a 4-year analysis; let alone a 400-year assessment. This former ambassador to Russia from China said there's obviously differences; anytime you have two major nations, you have differences. But he said, these are of a secondary level; and he said it's his assessment, as somebody who deals with top-level relations between these two nations, that the Presidents of the two nations – Xi and Putin – have a clear conceptual understanding, a clear conceptual agreement. So that's significant; again, reflecting this orientation.

Just this past Tuesday, the Premier of China was speaking to media editors and newspaper editors for various Asian publications; and then speaking to an Indian editor, he really emphasized that Chinese-Indian cooperation not only benefits China and India, but all of Asia. So again, here's the Premier of China, you had the President of India saying similar things; the Premier of China saying similar things. It's a reflection of Russia being a part of this. These are clear statements just in the recent period of this move towards this integration perspective. China's Premier also said – as an interesting note – that China welcomes India's leadership and role in this new development project linking India, Iran, and Afghanistan; we can see this on the next image here on the map [Fig. 2]; centered around Iran's Chabahar port. This new proposal for water transport, shipping, the development of this port; the development of the rail lines and related industry, and stretching up into Afghanistan. So, this is a new development project that India's partaking in; Iran's partaking in; and is going to bring critical development also into Afghanistan. And this is just typical; this kind of project – if you look at it in the old paradigm, maybe China could say this threatens our interests, because it's insuring other nations are gaining more power and that might be more threatening to our geopolitical role in the region. But no, this is a different paradigm; this is a new paradigm.

That kind of thinking applies in the US and London still; it still dominates the trans-Atlantic. But you go to Asia, and the



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

by direct rail connections through the whole heart of Asia into

Europe across Eurasia. You have the prospect of regular upgraded

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

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

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

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

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

I think also indicative of this whole New Paradigm

orientation, very interesting and illustrative of what we're talking about; you also have in the last two years, the creation and emergence of another economic development bloc – the Eurasian Economic Union – highlighted here in yellow. Of which Russia is the largest component of this economic agreement, this new economic zone which includes Russia, Kazakhstan, Belarus, Armenia, and Kyrgyzstan. So, this is kind of central north Asian bloc of economic development.

So again, if you're thinking like a British geopolitician, you might think this is a competition to China's One Belt, One Road program. Here you have Russia coming in, working with these other nations in the northern regions, trying to expand their economic development; while China is leading the way with their One Belt, One Road program. But in Asia, in the New Paradigm, in the way these leaders are thinking in a real sane, human fashion, they're not thinking about it in those terms. You had President Putin recently explicitly saying that they're looking towards integration and cooperation with the One Belt, One Road program explicitly. He said they're even working on specific projects as part of the Eurasian Economic Union, which will directly integrate into the New Silk Road, the One Belt, One Road program. It's not competition; it's not a geopolitical perspective. It's a perspective of win-win cooperation of development, or

progress;

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

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

You

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

decaying under Obama's cancellation of the manned space program

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

[Fig.3]

You have major water projects; massive south water north

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

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

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

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

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

But again, they're looking at positive developments for the

whole region; they've recently said that they're looking towards

helping the development of the Mekong River valley down in Southeast Asia. Where you have the Mekong River running through

Laos, Thailand, Cambodia, Vietnam – this region here – and

there's been recent droughts, major water shortages and difficulties; largely just from lack of development, lack of doing what the US did under Franklin Roosevelt with the TVA [Tennessee Valley Authority]. Lack of developing basic dams, irrigation reservoirs, water management systems to actually manage this river valley as a whole to insure regular, steady water supplies are available to the people. So, China's saying they want to look into helping to facilitate that process as a new project.

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

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

So, these are the kinds of things you see happening, in a win-win cooperative paradigm. And I want to end with just one last project; something very close to Mr. LaRouche specifically, because he's played a major role in supporting this. Which is

the

Kra Canal proposal; and this is a canal for water transport that's been proposed to cut through the Kra Isthmus in Thailand.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

the trade in this region, or one-fourth of the Asian trade.

One-fourth of all trade globally goes through this region.

I've

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

of total ships or one-fourth of tonnage, or one-fourth of value,

I'm not sure exactly. I've seen other estimates say that it's 40%

of global trade; I think it probably depends upon exactly how you

count. But this is a major chunk of all trade occurring on the whole entire planet; going through this one congested, some

parts

very shallow and narrow, region down around Singapore in the Malaccan Straits. And this has been known now for many years to

be major bottleneck constraining cheap, efficient, rapid trade between these sections of the world. So, in the '80s, Mr. LaRouche became very involved in this proposal to make a new canal through this relatively narrow passage; this narrow isthmus

in Thailand. And enable a dramatic increase in the volume; reduction of the cost; increase in the speed of trade through these regions. Despite having been fought for for many years, now

in this new paradigm, this is now being put on the table again.

You just had an official advisory board of the Thailand

government endorsing this program. China has made it clear it would like to do this program, and maybe even finance the whole

thing if it goes forward. You have official experts in the United

States recognizing the importance of this program as kind of a keystone; relieving this bottleneck, and another major component

of facilitating this vast expanse of economic growth, trade, and

development in this whole region.

So, this is a very exciting, singular project, but it's

emblematic and I think an example of the whole perspective we're

talking about. And again, I think the theme is win-win. You have

China, you have Russia, you have India; they've had conflicts, they've had wars, they've had tensions. But you have leaders now

in these nations – typified by Xi Jinping, typified by Putin, Modi's role in India. They're now saying, we as mankind, as nations, as participants in humanity, need to move beyond this geopolitical approach to our existence on this planet. We have to move to a policy where we recognize growth, development, progress; all these things we're talking about here are necessary for everybody. Not just for us. We can no longer tolerate the suppression of this kind of development for others; we have to go to a global system centered around this kind of development. And again, that's not just being talked out, as you saw here, as you see what's going on with these developments.

Again, this is just a sketch; you could spend weeks going through what's happening in the world. And by the time you got done, you'd have a whole other set of things to catch up on; because a lot would have happened since the time you started. But this is now the center of what's happening in the world; and this defines how we need to think about what's happening. This is what has these London-Wall Street imperial faction people freaked out. Because how have the British existed? Well, it existed on geopolitics; they've been the geo-politicians. They've been existing based upon looting; if there's nations they can't loot directly, I'm sure there's perpetual conflict between different regions. And especially under Obama, the United States has come under this geopolitical imperial orientation.

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

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

ROGERS: I think that what we're seeing going on in the world right now, and what you just laid out, really puts the perspective on the table of the decades-long fight of Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche now coming to fruition. I thought that it was important that you brought up Mr. LaRouche's fight around these development projects; around the Kra Canal in the '80s. And the



fact of the matter is, at that very time, he was also fighting for the development of space exploration; around the "Woman on Mars" Mars mission, and the importance of mankind in space.

Now, I think what we're seeing right now can really be characterized from the standpoint of what the German-American space pioneer Krafft Ehricke described as the emergence of mankind into a poly-global world. And I think when you think of

this conception of a poly-global world, where mankind is not confined to the limited resources of one globe, but moves out into the expansion of space; that's what we're seeing happen right now. What Russia and China represent is a move away from —

we're not just talking about one globe; we're talking about one

globe that has been dominated by a British Empire, a policy of murder. A population reduction, and defying this conception of the creative nature of human beings and the human mind. When you

think about Russia and China are doing to pull together over 50%

of the world, this is quite remarkable; and it can only be looked

at from the standpoint of a new species of mankind. It's a real

force of good versus evil; and the evil is completely being destroyed and losing. Because the drive right now for thermonuclear war being pushed and perpetuated continuously by the stooge Obama in the White House; who's been pushing the murderous policy to protect the British Empire, protect the Saudis. And to continue to push a policy that's going to lead to

not just a continuation of a confinement to one world; but a one

world where people are on the verge of being exterminated and blowing themselves up, unless we change our attitudes now. And I

think the matter is, is what Diane and you both presented;  
which  
is that we have a real clear choice and opportunity before us.  
I  
think it's very important as to the very important fight that  
our  
international organization is leading right now, that we have  
to  
put an end to Obama, to this drive for thermonuclear war, and  
to  
NATO and what it represents in terms of its escalations and  
provocations of war towards Russia and China.

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

As I was stating, you take the conception laid by the  
German  
space pioneer Krafft Ehrlicke; what he conceptualized was not  
something that was confined to one people or one nation. But  
that  
was going to be the intention that was going to unify all  
people  
in a common interest that our destiny and mission as mankind  
was  
to break with the confines of Earth that put limitations on  
man,  
and that bestialized human beings and pit human beings against  
each other; to find our common interest in the development of

space. And you're seeing more and more people starting to recognize this intention and this need for cooperation. It was just reported today that at an international air show in Germany,

the head of the European Space Agency, Johann-Dietrich Wörner, actually made the point of manned missions being indispensable for space and planetary research. He said because human astronauts can access and act independently – unlike robots. He

also talked about the need for building permanent lunar bases; and he called this a Moon Village. And he said that this Moon Village can be constructed with a lot of material already existing on the Moon; and that the Moon Village would be a stepping stone to reaching other planets such as Mars and so forth.

Now, I wanted to say in that context, that I attended an event last night, and the speaker was speaking on the Curiosity mission; which most people remember landed on Mars in 2012. What

I brought up at that time was that the excitement around the fact

that – as Mr. LaRouche conceptualized it – that the mind of man

and the extended sensorium of man had now been put on Mars; but

that there are limitations to that. And the speaker recognized those limitations and he said something to the effect of what Mr.

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

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

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

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

This is exactly what Krafft Ehrlicke recognized as he presented a principal work called {Lunar Industrialization and Settlement; Birth of Poly-Global Civilization}. In the work, he summarizes "the major aspects of lunar industrialization and settlement, and identifies that scientific and evolutionary facts leading to a definitive justification of why man must industrialize space. Changing our present closed world into a present world. He also establishes the philosophy of the extra-terrestrial imperative as a defense of justification for a long-term based on mankind's ability to transcend the limits of one small planet." And that is what Russia and China are representing; the transformation and transcendence of this one small planet being controlled by an imperial policy which is ready to be ended and to be destroyed, {if} we do the right thing and we take the right actions.

If you look at this from the standpoint of the continued aspect of what you presented, Ben, as the objective of what China put forward as a win-win strategy of cooperation. They're continuing to do that, as the Chinese space leaders have just put forth an additional perspective to that win-win strategy of cooperation, international collaboration on the future Moon missions. The first Chinese astronaut presented that a study is being conducted to justify the importance of lunar exploration; and Russia and the European Space Agency are already discussing

collaboration on lunar missions. The intention is that there would be astronauts sent to the Moon by China by 2036; and he presented this speaking at a conference on manned space exploration in Russia. I think that that is quite extraordinary, because when you look at the fact that Obama has continued to push a murderous policy against our space program, and to continue to drive and perpetuate an extermination war for mankind. The question is, why are the American people still stuck in a completely insane world of lies and fraud; thinking that an election actually has some real bearing on the future of mankind, when it doesn't?

What is going to determine the future is that the United States has to join with this perspective of a poly-global world, a world not confined by limitations; as Krafft Ehrlicke laid out. I think what we're going to witness – and Megan has presented this on many occasions – within the next two years with China's mission to the far side of the Moon, puts a real perspective on the development of space. And building the permanent colonies; but more importantly, it puts a perspective on that which is going to determine what the future of mankind is going to be. It's not going to be this election; it's not going to be this bankrupt British Empire and Wall Street system. It's going to be the emergence of a new human species that – as Mr. LaRouche has defined – is actually focusing on what type of future do we want to create and must we create for our children and

grandchildren.

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

SARE: Well, I think that's great. And to return to what was brought up at the very beginning, one of the flanks on this matter is the question of the Saudi role and Obama's protection of them in the 9/11 attacks. If you think about all of the wars that the United States has been engaged in since September 11, 2001, if that could be addressed in a sharp fashion; and if Obama were to be brought down, jailed, impeached, indicted. That obviously would have a dramatic impact on what the future of the United States looked like, and the potential for our nation to

be  
a welcome partner in this phenomenal change of direction for  
the  
world.

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

I was just looking back at Putin's statements  
recently; how  
he was referencing the threat Russia is being faced with in  
regards to this NATO advancement. And he again referenced the  
US  
pulling out of the ABM Treaty in 2002. What was the ostensible  
reason for us doing that? 9/11. Now are we worried about  
ballistic missiles coming from the mujahideen in Afghanistan?  
Is  
that why we had to pull out of the ABM Treaty; because we  
worried  
about Osama bin Laden out of some case we can't even find,

operating ballistic missiles? It's been the cover to really pursue this whole insane perpetual war policy; this police state policy in the United States. The things you hear – "It was Bush, not Obama. So, how are you blaming Obama?" Obama is actively covering up for the worst atrocity committed against Americans on American soil in American history; and he's protecting that. And he's protecting the continuation of that as a process to ensure that the United States continues to act in this post-9/11 mode.

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

BEETS: And on that, I think people are beginning to wake up to the war danger, which is becoming impossible to ignore especially in places like Europe. You had on Thursday night, a significant television segment on German TV which was titled "The Backers of 9/11; The Secret of the 28 Pages". Which centered on an interview with former Senator Bob Graham; going through exactly how the Bush and Obama governments have covered up what was clearly known to be Saudi government involvement in funding 9/11. And poses the question that not only do the past 15 years have to be re-examined and understood from a new perspective; but also raising the question of what this means for Germany. And I



think that's very important from the standpoint of what you just raised, Diane. What are the flanks; what are the things we can pull? And we have this petition featured on the LaRouche PAC site right now, which is beginning rapidly gain signatures internationally; which is called "The Warsaw Summit Prepares for War; It's Time to Leave NATO Now". And I would encourage everybody to get on the site, sign it, and circulate it. I do think this discussion has been very important, because it really does pose the question to the American people: Are we going to continue in this perpetual state of childhood, adolescence? Closing our eyes and sleepwalking into what would be the biggest disaster for mankind in all of history – complete extinction warfare – will we permit that? Or will we choose a more beautiful and better future? Which I think you laid out beautifully, Kesha. And it reminded me, I just finished the memoirs of the astronaut Michael Collins last night; the third, sometimes forgotten member of the Apollo 11 crew. And he says at the end of the book, I wish every member of government could get out into space and look down onto our planet; because borders completely disappear. And you begin to realize that the so-called "conflicts" between people on Earth amount to nothing and that we have a common destiny. So, I think what you laid out there, Kesha, really is what people need to be thinking about.

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

# Hvad er videnskab?

2. juni 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – Mennesket skriver historie lige for øjnene af os i dag, fra dag til dag og endda fra time til time i takt med, at alle de forskellige, gensidige forbindelser mellem Rusland, Kina og Indien bliver stadigt tættere og stadigt mere talrige, og som trækker 70 eller flere nationer tættere sammen, hvilket faktisk omfatter godt og vel halvdelen af menneskeheden – som **Helga Zepp-LaRouche sagde i sit interview med TASS den 31. maj.**

Det er som en ring af sammenkædede magneter, der trækker hinanden ind i en stadigt tættere kæde. Tænk på den **genoplivede interesse for Kra-kanalen**, der forbinder Det sydkinesiske Hav med Det indiske Ocean (via Den thailandske Golf og området omkring Andamanerne i Den bengalske Bugt).

I sin nuværende inkarnation er dette et projekt fra Lyndon LaRouche og Japan. Det vil forbinde Indien med Sydøstasien og Kina; det vil revolutionere disse farvande; Lyndon LaRouche har sagt, at det vil blive en af de største revolutioner i moderne historie.

Den 31. maj sagde den kinesiske premierminister Li Keqiang til asiatiske redaktører, at

*"Hvis Kina og Indien arbejder sammen og smeder synenergi, vil det kaste nytte af sig ikke alene for det kinesiske og indiske folk, men også til Asien og videre endnu."*

Med henvisning til Indiens nylige annoncering af en aftale om en handelskorridor med Iran og Afghanistan, via Irans Chabaharhavn, sagde Li, at Kina "hilser den velkommen".

Indien og Kina samarbejder for første gang omkring Tibet, hvor Kina tidligere har været særligt ømfindtlige mht. Indien i betragtning af Dalai Lamas tilstedeværelse i Indien, samt det derværende betragtelige, tibetanske samfund.

Ligeledes den 31. maj talte den forhenværende kinesiske ambassadør til Rusland, Li Fenglin, ved en todages konference i Moskva om de kinesisk-russiske relationer. Han sagde her, at den bilaterale relation stod på sit højeste i 400 år, men at Kina ønsker, at Rusland skal have større tiltro til den.

*"Det er min fornemmelse, at Putin og Xi har en begrebsmæssig forståelse af, hvordan vi bør samarbejde, men at der er forståelsesproblemer på mellemliderniveau",*

sagde ambassadør Li, der talte perfekt og idiomatisk russisk.

*"Det gør ingen ting, at vi har forskellige fremgangsmåder. Det er helt normalt for sådanne store og forskellige lande at have forskellige fremgangsmåder. Det væsentlige er, at disse ikke fører til modsigelser."*

Alt dette minder os om, hvorfor (den amerikanske) LaRouchePAC-leder Kesha Rogers fra Houston, Texas, så viseligt valgte afdøde tysk-amerikanske rumpionér, Krafft Ehrlicke, som den personlighed, der skulle være omdrejningspunkt for hendes kamp for at genoplive USA's rumprogram.

Krafft Ehrlickes fremgangsmåde er, i lighed med Lyndon LaRouches, ikke den mindste smule 'praktisk' (dvs. begrænset af, hvad der 'tilsyneladende' kun er muligt), men alligevel viser sig at være ekstremt virksom, som det er blevet demonstreret, så det er hævet over enhver tvivl. **Krafft Ehrlicke** var en af de ledere inden for udforskning af rummet, som også tidligere Konstantin Tsiolkovskij og Hermann Oberth var det, hvis mod og intellekt bragte mennesket til nye verdener, som endda overgik det, som Christoffer Columbus gjorde.

Krafft Ehrlicke var en forsker; men hans forskning udgør ægte videnskab, og ikke den afskyelige, matematiske erstatning for videnskab, der i dag undervises på vore skoler, og som repræsenteres af Obamas degenererede forsvarsminister, Ashton Carter. Ashton Carters falske version af videnskab gav os

F-35-flyet, til sandsynligvis \$200 mio. dollar stykket, og som ikke virker, og aldrig kommer til at virke.

Krafft Ehricke forudså derimod, blandt mange andre dristige, videnskabelige præstationer, med præcision Apollo 13-missionen i 1970 i en artikel, skrevet i 1948. Typisk for ham stod der i hans artikel fra 1948, at han havde skrevet den i 2400 med et tilbageblik over de seneste 350 år, til den første, bemandede Marsmission i 2050, med navnet "Ekspedition Ares". Terence Norton, lederen af denne mission, havde været nødsaget til at svare på den indvending, at de i 2050 til rådighed stående teknologiers begrænsninger – her hovedsageligt det forhold, at der kun var kemisk propulsion til rådighed for rumrejser – forøgede sandsynligheden af en "afvigelse fra den normale plan", og hermed også missionens fiasko, og endda missionsmandskabets død. Hvad var så hans svar? Var det at annullere missionen? I sin rapport til "Rumfartsstyrelsen" skrev han:

*"Når man betragter problemet fra et hvilket som helst standpunkt, rejser spørgsmålet sig: På hvilken måde kunne man imødegå udfordringen med afvigelse fra den normale plan, ved hjælp af de til rådighed stående ressourcer? Tilbyder en sådan ikke særlig sandsynlig situation ikke chancer for at vinde for sig, de storslåede resultater af menneskelig dristighed; eller, betyder en manglende evne til at kunne overkomme denne situation den visse død, et sted ude i rummet, for alle ombordværende?"*

*"En undersøgelse af de følgende sider vil vise, at den tekniske gruppe har øget sikkerhedsfaktoren til et tal, der er langt større end det tal, der ansås for at være maksimum, da projektet blev startet op. Resten kan overlades til gruppens karakter og åndrigheid. Det må åbenhjertigt indrømmes, at mulige farer, som ikke kan forudses, findes, men gruppen er fast overbevist om, at mod, ressourcefuldhed og opnåede præstationer hos de mennesker, der er blevet udvalgt til at foretage rejsen, med succes vil imødegå rumrejsens*

*udfordringer.”*

En anden faktor var virkelighedstro, grundig og omfattende træning, træning og atter træning – meget af den i selve rummet. Bemærk, at meget af den tekniske gentagelse, der var indbygget i "Ekspedition Ares", var identisk med den, der var at finde i Apollomissionerne: nemlig, en ophobning af forskellige moduler, der kunne overleve uafhængigt af hinanden, hvor hver af dem var skræddersyet til et specifikt formål, men samtidig til generelle formål.

Og, ligesom med Apollo 13, forekom der et uheld med "Ekspedition Ares" og en "afvigelse fra den normale plan". Ligesom Apollo 13 måtte missionen opgives, men ligesom med Apollo 13 blev hele besætningen reddet og kom tilbage til Jorden.

Kesha Rogers ved sandelig, hvad hun taler om.

---

**USA må gå sammen med Kina  
om at finde sin bestemmelse  
på Månens bagside.**

# **LaRouchePAC Internationale fredags-webcast, 27. maj 2016, med Lyndon LaRouche m.fl.**

*Dette er et øjeblik, i hvilket vi absolut må mobilisere, for verden ... har nået til et beslutningens øjeblik ... der vil afgøre menneskehedens retning for de næste 50, 100 eller flere år. Det er nu, vi må beslutte, hvorvidt vi aktuelt befinder os i en nedtælling til Tredje Verdenskrig mellem atommagter, som det ønskes af Obama og hans britiske 'controllers'; eller, om denne periode er begyndelsen til et absolut nyt, globalt system, baseret på et fuldstændig nyt princip, hvis standard er gensidigt samarbejde og gensidig gavn, til menneskehedens fremme som helhed.*

*Engelsk udskrift.*

**The United States Must Join China to find its Destiny on the Far Side of the Moon.**

Webcast, May 27, 2016:

MEGAN BEETS: Good evening. This is Friday, May 27, 2016.

And I'd like to welcome all of you to our regular Friday evening

broadcast here at LaRouche PAC. My name is Megan Beets; and I'm

joined in the studio today by Ben Deniston and by Lyndon LaRouche. We're joined via video by three members of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee: Michael Steger in San Francisco,

California; Kesha Rogers in Houston, Texas; and Diane Sare, currently in New Jersey, but joining us from our Manhattan Project.

This weekend in the United States is Memorial Day weekend; which is a holiday which was created after the Civil War to honor the sacrifice of our fallen soldiers, including those soldiers who fought in World War II and gave their lives to the defeat of fascism in the 20th Century. This is a moment in which we absolutely mobilize, because the world sits now, and has reached a point of decision – a {punctum saliens} which will determine the direction of humanity for the next 50, 100, or more years. It's now that we must decide whether we are currently going to be in a countdown to World War III between thermonuclear powers, as is the want of Obama and his British controllers; or whether this period is the beginning of an absolutely new global system, based upon a completely new principle. The standard of which is mutual cooperation, mutual benefit for the advancement of mankind as a whole.

If you take a step back, and you look at the world as a whole – which can sometimes be difficult for Americans, in particular, to do – if you look at the global situation as one, the tensions between these two potential futures couldn't be more clear. For example, on the one hand, you had an incredible development this week in Iran; on Monday, May 23, President



Rouhani of Iran declared May 23 to be Chabahar Day. This declaration was made to mark and to celebrate an historic agreement which was signed in Iran between the President of Iran, Prime Minister Modi of India, and the President of Afghanistan; who had gathered to sign agreements toward joint cooperation and collaboration, a \$20 billion investment to build up the port of Chabahar in southeast Iran, which opens up to the Arabian Sea.

This project is a great victory for the cause of the World

Land-Bridge, which Lyn, you and your wife Helga have organized for, for quite some time. And this crucial project will integrate India, Afghanistan, and Iran, and potential future partners like Pakistan and China; and it opens up new shipping routes, new trade routes, and new potentialities for the development of potentially the entire south Eurasian region, to

integrate it up into Europe. Just to add one more detail, very

importantly, this gives landlocked Afghanistan, which as we know

has been decimated by the policies of the Bush and Obama administrations, access to the Arabian Sea.

Aside from the details, more importantly, is this spirit of

cooperation which was expressed by President Rouhani at the signing celebration; where he said, about the Day of Chabahar, "This is a very important day for Iranians. And from now on, it

is going to be even more important; because today is going to mark the day of cooperation among the three of us – Iran, India,

and Afghanistan." He said, "Today's document is not just an economic document. It is actually a political and a regional

one, and its message is that countries need to utilize the opportunities provided by the region in order to develop, and also expand cooperation." And then, at the same ceremony, President Modi noted the long unified history of India and Iran.

At virtually the same time that Modi was in Iran, the President of India was in China on a four-day visit, where he spoke at Beijing University on the topic of "India-China Relations; 8 Steps to a People-Centric Partnership". He said, "India and China are poised to play a significant and constructive role in the 21st Century. When Indians and Chinese

come together to address global challenges and build on their shared interests, there will be no limits to what our two peoples

can jointly achieve." He also noted particularly that China and

India are young countries, full of young people. And he said that "Both sides should work with the aim of insuring that we do

not burden our coming generations by leaving unresolved problems

to them. Both India and China are young societies, and our youth

share common aspirations and perceptions."

Just to quickly add another part of the picture, are the

interesting and potentially very important actions of President

Abe of Japan; who in the recent period, has begun to move towards

agreements for cooperation both with President Putin in Russia,

and also with China, against the explicit orders of Obama and the

British, who demand that Japan maintain the historic geopolitical

conflict and enmity with both of those nations. So, this is a new world which is developing; but on the other hand, Obama is still in office in the United States, because the American people and the Congress have refused to throw him out. And Obama today is visiting Hiroshima; the first US President to make that visit since the completely unnecessary bombing of that city over 70 years ago. Leading into this visit, Obama not only refused to apologize for that bombing that killed over 100,000 people; but he also defended the actions of Harry Truman, saying that sometimes Presidents in warfare have to make tough decisions.

That characterizes exactly why [Obama's] in Asia; to attempt to drum up among the Asian nations against China. Now, this won't work, but it only fans the flames of any potential war and confrontation.

BENJAMIN DENISTON: Lyn, I don't know if you have any direct thoughts on that, but I think the immediate counterpoint to that, as you're saying, under Obama, is this build-up to the war danger as the direct threat. I think what we're seeing with these developments in central Asia, these agreements, is just another step in this new strategic bloc centered around really Russia's and China's leadership. As we were discussing earlier today, completely in tandem with that, is the escalation of the threat of war; Obama being kind of the face of it. But really coming from the British as an attempt to break down this threat to

their  
empire, centered around Russia and China. It's notable just  
to  
emphasize, we're going, in July is going to be this next NATO  
summit; where they're going to try and solidify the  
establishment  
of putting four new battalions, of about 1000 troops each, up  
in  
Eastern Europe right on the border of Russia. It's been noted  
that this is potentially the largest forward basing of a  
military  
presence on Russia's borders since when? Since the Nazis in  
World War II. So, you have this explicit clear escalation;  
and  
that's coming up in July. That's the intention for this. And  
that's in the context of the entire NATO policy perpetually to  
move closer and closer to Russia's borders; a policy that we,  
the  
United States, promised we wouldn't do. We made that promise  
to  
Russia as the Soviet Union began to collapse; and we've  
completely reneged on that, and pushed it further and further  
and  
further. And now this is really coming to a breaking point;  
and  
Lyn, your wife Helga, from her reading from Europe, she's been  
saying that she thinks there is a real growing recognition.  
We've been saying it; we know it's happening. You've been  
sounding the alarm on this; but she thought it was interesting  
that even conservative elements in Germany for example –  
elements that might not usually be so vocal on this – are  
coming  
out and warning that we're on the path to war under this  
current  
policy. Particularly, an article in {Die Welt} recently,  
which  
is generally one of the major conservative papers in Germany;

so

you wouldn't expect this concern over this war drive. But her assessment was that that being raised now was reflecting a kind

of breaking open of recognition and potential freak-out around the fact that this thing is heading towards a real potential conflict; and this is not something you walk away from. You're

talking about thermonuclear war; you're not talking about any kind of conflict mankind's ever had before.

LYNDON LAROUCHE: Well, the crucial issue here is not detail

as such; the crucial thing is what creates a higher standard of

performance of the human individual in society. Now, that thing

is not treated seriously in any ordinary sense; they don't recognize it. They don't recognize the need to change the productivity of the per capita personality of society; that is not recognized. What is recognized is, how cheap is the labor;

and no matter how poor the quality of performance of the labor,

how cheap is the labor. We see this in the United States as a trend; a backward trend. We see it very clearly; the United States is degenerated. It was degenerated; it was done under the

influence of the British. You had people like the Bushes and Obama; these people are a destructive force. Their very existence destroys the productive capabilities of the human population. So therefore, you have to get rid of these guys and

replace them with people who are competent; which has not been done. So what you see, the degeneration of the quality of labor

inside the United States is typical of this kind of phenomena.

So, this is something which is more British than it is American.

But it's been stuck in the United States. And therefore, all these ideas that you can measure things simply is wrong; it doesn't work that way. Mankind creates by mankind itself creates

a capability of creation; and that's what's important.

Now then, you have to support that which you have discovered; that's what the problem is. And the usual procedure

and interpretation is worthless and actually destructive.

DENISTON: You look at what gets presented as ostensible

value in economics discussion today, it's ridiculous.

Economic

value is a product of the human mind; resources are creations of

mankind that create wealth, that create value. It's not going out finding resources or exploiting labor forces, getting the cheapest labor; that's not the substance of what enables – in my

mind, the core issue is what is the science of mankind's relation

to the universe. It's kind of a general way to put it; and I think that maybe passes over a lot of people's heads. But you're

looking at how is it that mankind exists in the universe?

Mankind doesn't exist in a fixed way, mankind can intervene to change that relationship. If we're not looking at that, then we're not talking about mankind.

LAROUCHE: Well, mankind has to be changed; that's a necessary factor. And mankind is changed how? By being exposed

to responsibility for doing things which were not able to be done

by human beings at an earlier stage. And therefore, the question is the improvement of the quality of the personal individual in society is the crucial element. You find you have the people working for Wall Street; they're worthless.

DENISTON: That's a nice way to put it.

LAROUCHE: They are actually worthless people. And most of society in the United States today is full of worthless people; because they have been degenerated below the level of what humanity was capable of doing earlier. Now they go back to a lower level; you see the high death rates among employed people during the recent course of time. Therefore, the process of the government has become a force of destruction of the human individual. That's why the problem becomes apparent; because you recognize, "Wait a minute! You're saying that my existence is inferior?" "Yes." Why is that the case? Because society wants a lower standard of productivity; things like the space program are gone. The removal of the space program from the achievement of the original space program, which was done in Germany and in the United States –

DENISTON: Krafft Ehrlicke and all his allies, yeah.

LAROUCHE: Yeah. This thing is what was being crushed. So therefore, the human mind was being crushed; but the lesson is

that what were the technologies that we were introducing for practice were technologies which inherently had a higher value of productivity than anything else. And that's what's overlooked.

The idea of cheap labor; cheap labor is a disease. What you need is a higher standard of achievement of the human mind; leading to a higher standard of development of the human mind. That's what's important; that's the crucial issue.

BEETS: I think when we start to think about where in the US do you have a population that could be moved to restore the demand for such a human standard, you've put the emphasis on Manhattan. And I was wondering if Diane wanted to say a few things; because we have a conference coming up there this weekend that both you and Helga will be participating in.

LAROCHE: All you have to do to destroy the human power of creativity is to take California, southern California, the universities and several institutions in California, and go from what had been the case, to what was the case. And when you had a certain sexual maniac who took over southern California, you understand exactly what the problem is.

DENISTON: A pretty pathetic movie star; a Nazi, a Hitler admirer at that. Schwarzenegger, yeah. I mean, you talk about degeneration; you raised California. To me, the emblematic family is the Brown family. You look at Jerry Brown, you look at Pat Brown, his father, Edmund Pat Brown; he was one of the



last  
echoes, reverberations of the Franklin Roosevelt orientation.  
He  
built up the state – the water projects, the educational  
system,  
the schools. When I started going to school, you could go to  
a  
decent junior college for tens of dollars for a class. It was  
affordable; people could afford education. And it's just been  
completely destroyed. It was all built up under this  
Roosevelt-style administration of Pat Brown; then you look at  
Jerry Brown – "Governor Moon Beam" as he was called in his  
first  
term – a total degenerate. Now they're talking about –  
Michael  
Steger might have more to say on this – now they're talking  
about permanently shutting down large sections of the  
agricultural region in California because they're running out  
of  
water. The idiocy is astounding. They're sitting there, a  
huge  
coastline on the biggest ocean on the entire planet; and  
they're  
saying, "We can't find any water; we don't have any water. We  
have to just shut things down." And the fact that people go  
along with that, is just insane.

    You talk about degeneration; look at what we used to  
have  
under the leadership of Pat Brown. We had some things in  
between; we had this disgusting figure Schwarzenegger, who was  
a  
total British agent himself. And then this Jerry Brown thing  
is  
just emblematic of the degeneration and the Green policy  
takeover; what's happened to the population in the United  
States.

LAROUCHE: The lesson is, that there's a principle of organization of productivity in terms of the human individual; and that's what you have to focus on. That factor. Without that factor, you have no progress. As a matter of fact, mankind ceases to be mankind; mankind is reduced to something which is a pseudo mankind formula, but it's not actual. It's something which is mechanical; it's something which is simply constructed.

But the creative power of the individual, the creative power which is acquired by the individual in society, is the thing which makes it work. It's not just, "This will make it work. This will make it better." No. Mankind has to produce within the ranks of mankind itself, the ability to achieve degrees of productivity beyond anything beforehand; that has always been the policy. Since the beginning, shall we say so to speak; and it was always like that. When you lose that, then you lose your very characteristic of the human species.

DENISTON: Be fruitful and multiply.

LAROUCHE: Multiply, I don't know; they're kind of lazy these days.

DIANE SARE: I had one very specific comment on this, actually, which is very interesting, from our earlier discussion; and then when I heard what President Obama had to say in his speech in Hiroshima. Where he says, he talks about supposedly the development of mankind; and this is Obama's take on man. "Artifacts tell us that violent conflict appeared with the very first man. Our early ancestors, having learned to make blades from flint and spears from wood, used these tools not just for hunting, but against their own kind. On every continent, the

history of civilization is filled with war, whether driven by scarcity of grain or hunger for gold; compelled by nationalist fervor or religious zeal." Do you hear his stepfather and what

happened in Indonesia in that?

And I was very struck, because if you take two other great

American leaders, who also gave us their take on the arc of history, one is Martin Luther King, who people may remember in his Mountaintop speech, he has the polemic, "If I could travel with God to any other time in history, when would I want to be alive?" So, he talks about the Parthenon; he talks about seeing

Socrates, and Aristotle and Mount Olympus; he talks about the emperors of the Roman Empire. He says, "I would come up to the

day of the Renaissance and get a quick picture of all that the Renaissance did for the cultural and aesthetic life of man; but I

wouldn't stop there." And then he talks about Abraham Lincoln and the Emancipation Proclamation; he says, "I wouldn't stop there. I would even come up to the early '30s and see a man grappling with the problems of the bankruptcy of his nation, and

come up with an eloquent cry that 'We have nothing to fear, but

fear itself.'|" And he says, "Strangely enough, I would turn to

the Almighty and say, 'If you allow me to live just a few years

in the second half of the 20th Century, I will be happy.'|"

So, that was Martin Luther King; and then the other which

Kesha will be very familiar with, is the speech that President Kennedy gave at Rice University, where he announces that we're going to land on the Moon. And he says, "No man can fully grasp

how far and how fast we have come. But condense, if you will, the 50,000 years of man's recorded history in the time span of but a half century. Stated in these terms, we know very little

about the first 40 years, except at the end of them, advanced man

had learned how to use the skins of animals to cover them.

Then

about ten years ago, under this standard, man emerged from his caves to construct other kinds of shelter. Only five years ago,

man learned how to write and use a cart with wheels.

Christianity began only two years ago. The printing press came

this year; then, less than two months ago, during this whole fifty-year span of history, the steam engine provided a new source of power." He talks about electric lights –

In other words, what's the view of Kennedy; what's the view

of Martin Luther King of the development of man? And then you take the view of President Obama, which is exactly what you have

expressed here, Lyn, in terms of the total degradation and a Satanic, destructive outlook.

LAROUCHE: I agree, it's real degeneration; definitely DE-generation.

KESHA ROGERS: Yeah, and I think it's important to note,

one; why we are gathered here today in the context in which we're

gathered. As we've been expressing, what is the intention to create a future state of society where a new species and a new understanding of what mankind should represent comes into play?

The United States right now has to understand that we have a

unique opportunity to join with the nations of Eurasia – with China, Russia. Of the developments which Megan was laying out earlier, that organize a new direction of a New Paradigm and progress for mankind; which you have really stated can be brought

into cohesion with a new development of the United States. This

is why you've put a focus on particularly Manhattan, which was the center point of the Alexander Hamilton foundation of the United States; and Texas and California are joining in that effort.

I think that people really have to get an understanding that the United States can and must play a crucial role in preventing

what we were discussing earlier as the sabotage of the orientation that is being put forth by leading nations coming together and saying that there is a unique quality to mankind which has to be preserved. Which is the creative nature of human

beings; and this is what Diane was just expressing. This has been amongst leading figures of our nation, from George Washington, Hamilton, to Lincoln and others, John F Kennedy, have

expressed this quite profoundly. I think if we look at the fact

that two days on the 25th of May, was the 55th anniversary of Kennedy's speech to the Joint Session of Congress; and in that speech, he called for the very task of doing something that at that point had never been done before. Creating something completely new, which was to land a man on the Moon and return him safely to Earth. He says, as he's calling for the US to take

that leading role in the space achievement, which he said, "in many ways, may hold a key to our future on Earth." That is still

what we face today.

The new developments being proposed by China on the far side of the Moon, are going to hold the key not just for China doing something different for their nation; but for the future of mankind on Earth. Because what Kennedy had proposed, has been hijacked by the likes of the British Empire and those who wanted to stifle human progress in any way that they could. So, I think if we look at the direction the world is going in right now, there is no reason for people to feel like they have to capitulate to the stupidity that they're being bombarded with in Presidential elections, in the media lies that are being told.

The real issue right now is, what are we actually going to create as a new direction for mankind? And what Putin and China and other nations in that direction are doing is crucial.

MICHAEL STEGER: I just would make the point from California. It's clear, Lyn, what you've been describing. Once you adopt a cheap labor policy, which was explicitly adopted in California as probably the leading example; you then have no reason to educate and provoke a higher sense of identity within your population. You lose a sense of that mission, and then you become a slave to the practical, to the mundane, to the day-to-day survival tactics; and you a kind of destruction of the culture and life of the nation over these 50 years. But what makes it most clear is what you see in the current insanity of the Presidential election; there's not a focus around this

particular issue, which is Hamilton. It is what Hamilton drove to shape the Constitution and the economic policies of the country; and it is very much what was the spark of consolidating the organization, and our intervention. Specifically, around the Manhattan Project and Hamilton's economic policies; and this orientation. Because there is no clear voice coming out of the trans-Atlantic, except that perspective and that direction for development. We see it in Putin; we see it in China. That becomes the basis of civilization; that become the basis on which the trans-Atlantic can turn back to this Hamilton tradition, which is really the greatest expression of the trans-Atlantic and economic development up until the modern period. So really becomes the fight defining the political fight in the United States to reject Obama; because there is a loss of standard in the American people. There is a loss of victory, of triumph, in the minds and the culture of the American population today. They're accepting their own form of slavery. And that really becomes the challenge.

SARE: I can report from Manhattan that one of the flanks on this situation – and I think given that it is Memorial Day – all Americans should resolve ourselves, as Abraham Lincoln said in his speech at Gettysburg, that "those who have died" like the people who died on 9/11, as well as of course the people who voluntarily enlisted and fought in the wars; World War II in particular, "have not died in vain." To that end, one; I would

just like to say for viewers of this website, tomorrow at 12:30pm, we will be live streaming a Memorial Day event from Manhattan. Which will begin with Helga Zepp-LaRouche, and then at 3pm, with Lyn yourself, Mr. LaRouche in a dialogue with the citizens of Manhattan, to get another inflection point after the Schiller Institute on April 7th. It's clear that that was viewed with some hope by international audiences; that there could be signs of intelligent life in the United States, as it was viewed with terror by people on behalf of the British Empire like the Saudis. It was not too long after that, that "60 Minutes" aired the special on the 28 pages; on the role of the Saudis in perpetrating the murder of 3000 Americans on September 11th, and the role of the FBI in covering it up. I would say that particularly in Manhattan – although it is the case in other parts of the country – but particularly in Manhattan, people are not prepared now to put the genie back in the bottle. They want the truth; they would like the United States to be restored to its Constitutional role as Alexander Hamilton intended, and not as a cat's paw for the British Empire. The Saudis, I think, are aware of this; so I think people should also know that the Saudi lobbyists are on a full-front, heavily funded deployment into Washington DC to try and clean up their image with glossy pamphlets and PR firms that are getting paid \$200,000 a month, to try and promote themselves as the most wonderful allies of the United States in the war on terror and the leaders in the



fight

against terrorism. This is simply not going to fly. As much corruption as there is in Washington DC, it's a little much to have people parading around as the purveyors of justice when they publicly beheaded 47 people to usher in the New Year.

So, I think we're coming to a point where it's clear the United States is going to take a decision; and I find what Megan referenced at the beginning – the shift that perhaps is occurring in Japan at this moment – is also a potential shift in the United States at this time.

DENISTON: In that context, I really think the 9/11 issue is critical; and Obama's role in the whole thing. As we've been saying, people have to get their heads out of the gutter on this election stuff; people view these elections like a sporting game or something. Root for their team versus another team. We've got an issue immediately before us of this guy Obama is a killer; he has to be pulled out of office. We cannot tolerate him running the country. And just typical of that is his commitment to completely cover up the heinous murder of Americans on American soil in our history; just cover that up. No justice; nothing.

LAROUCHE: That was Obama; that's Obama's operation. And Obama's sitting there still; being an abomination.

DENISTON: That's his number one career asset, is being an

abomination.

LAROUCHE: That's exactly it; and the point is that if people don't recognize that, they're going to find themselves in an Obamanation situation.

ROGERS: Last night on the discussion with the activists, you were speaking about the space program, and you said that the space program goes to the right of the human individual and it's essential for human existence. I think that's what we're dealing with right now; the human individual under Obama, has been denied rights, and particularly the rights to life. Because you have a murderous policy, and if you take what has been put forth under the war drive, closer and closer to thermonuclear war, the policy coming from Obama around the healthcare; just to name a few. When you talk about what are the rights of the human individual, that is being denied; and that is what people should be actually fighting for. The understanding has to become, how do you actually know and understand those rights as a human being? What powers do human beings possess that go beyond just the simplistics of life that people try to hold on to and depend on, which gets to a higher state of existence? Which is really missing from the discussion of most of the ordinary discussion of

society today.

LAROUCHE: Well, the development of the science of human discovery, which was presented by a great individual who was originally German; and then became domesticated, shall we say, in terms of the United States. And he became the secret agent, so to speak, for the progress of the human species throughout the planet. And that case, that example, is extremely important; because what's important is not what mankind does, or what the individual does physically. That's not really that important. What's important is the ability to create a discovery of a principle of productivity which is far advanced beyond what mankind has experienced so far; that's the point. And that is where the United States has lost most of its achievement; and that's what has to be corrected.

DENISTON: And space forces that issue today.

LAROUCHE: Yeah; because without that, you cannot accomplish what is required by mankind.

BEETS: Lyn, that's one of the most beautiful things about the relationship of mankind as a unique species to the Universe itself. We're not the same as the Creator, obviously, but we resonate with that principle of Creation; and our own development is guided by the principles of organization of the Universe. We {have} to go into space in order to advance; and our progress in space is going to contribute to the further development of that

Universe, and the further perfection and improvement of that Universe.

LAROUCHE: You've got the history of discovery of the space program; which was developed by Germans, working from the western part of Germany and moving closer to the United States itself. And they themselves created and generated a view of mankind which provides us with an insight into the actual, efficient practice of what mankind can do in terms of the stars.

DENISTON: And they were doing much of this before they were even allowed to pursue it. They were looking for support; they were looking for people, even before World War I you had these early visionaries. And then up before World War II, they were already thinking all these things; and they were trying to find sane governments that would actually support this endeavor.

LAROUCHE: Like the Moon exploration, which was done earlier.

DENISTON: All the way back to Jules Verne and some –

LAROUCHE: But Jules Verne was not a real good contribution to anything. But what was actually being done, by the space program, by the people on the Moon project, that was really working. And that was what actually turned into a mechanism in order to create an insight into mankind's potential beyond what mankind had previously understood to be the kinds of things

that  
could be experimentally achieved.

DENISTON: Always for me, the first thing that comes out is,  
all of sudden, you're talking about mankind; you're not talking  
one nation or one culture or one people. You're talking about  
what is it about us as a unique species on this planet that we  
can pursue these things.

LAROUCHE: The main thing is, what about the people  
from  
Germany, originally from their Moon project in Germany,  
actually  
created this whole system. And that whole tendency depends  
upon  
that; it depends upon that precedent. German scientists who  
actually came into the United States; developed a program; and  
applied the program; which gave the United States today the  
ability to do what it has not been doing recently so far.

ROGERS: Yeah, and they had a sense of creative  
imagination  
which was different than what some people get inspired by the  
space program. A lot of people talk about the science fiction  
Star Wars, all of this stuff, that really doesn't characterize  
the true nature of mankind to bring these ideas into  
existence.  
For instance, Krafft Ehricke, von Braun, all of these great  
German scientists, they had such extraordinary imaginations;  
and  
they put forth the programs that were necessary to expand  
mankind's existence beyond Earth, beyond the Moon, and into  
the  
outer reaches of the Solar System in a way that nobody else  
could  
do, in a way that could be accomplished and become real.

Because

they understood that man had the power to bring this into existence; it wasn't just some far out science fiction thing, but

this was the destiny of mankind. To conquer the Solar System; to

reach mankind's extra-terrestrial imperative. And it's completely different than what people get inspired by today – Hollywood movies and Star Wars, and all of this stuff that is not real.

STEGER: Well, it's Bach; the real question is Bach. Krafft

Ehrlicke, Werner von Braun, they set up Classical quartets in these rural towns in Alabama where they were sent to do this space research. If you really think about what Bach propagated

as a quality of culture of the Universe itself; he took what Kepler had initiated and continued it and maintained it so you could get this level of scientific advancement. It really is the

question of what drove Einstein. What drove the questions of what's governing the heavens? Even going back to the ancient world, this question of music and composition that Bach really made clear, seems to have captured the imagination of man in a way which makes space travel possible.

LAROUCHE: I think the key thing to look at is Krafft Ehrlicke. Now, Krafft Ehrlicke became the maker of the whole space

program; he did it. And the method he was using was to the same

effect; and therefore it was to the idea that there was some process of the human mind, the creative powers of the human individual mind. This is what can be used, and must be used, as

the instrument for bringing the achievements which mankind will find in due course. And Krafft Ehricke is an illustration of that point; if you look at the history of what he did, and then you apply that to what has been going on still from Texas now. The elements from there are still there. But this was a discovery which came from eastern Germany, which was carried through the period of the war; which went into the southern parts of the United States to build a program which was supported by American officials and so forth. And to presume Krafft Ehricke's achievements; which were terminated because he had a very complicated health problem, and he died under those conditions. But the principle of the matter is still alive. He had been dead for some years, but the principle on which he was expressed and which led and prompted other people who would listen to him; that is still a principle which is important.

So, it's not a practical principle; it's not something that you can measure simply, as a yardstick or something of that nature. This was the achievement of a particular man, among other men doing the same kind of work, which created the possibility of mankind's systemic mastery of the Universe.

DENISTON: I think that's our reference point for today. Anything less than that, and we're failing to achieve the requirements for mankind.

LAROUCHE: Yeah, they're important.

BEETS: And I think that quality is what we have to

re-awaken within the United States; it's a specific reference point from Germany, but in the United States. And I think it's

important to recognize that you have all these beautiful developments around the world, but unless we can shift the United

States, it doesn't matter. We actually have to turn this and re-awaken this true principle of the United States that you've been expressing in order to make this shift to the New Paradigm.

LAROUCHE: And what you know, of course, from your own experience, in terms of what we do with the Moon; the Moon project, which is what our destiny is from the standpoint of China right now.

BEETS: Yeah, if Americans realized that in two years, we could join China on the far side of the Moon, I think they'd have a far different outlook for the immediate future.

LAROUCHE: I think that's where we want to push people's attention to that thing as a commitment.

DENISTON: Yes; always the unknown.

LAROUCHE: Unknown? Who's unknown?

BEETS: Is there anything else from you three joining us by video?

SARE: To tune in tomorrow at 12:30pm. If you're in New York, you should be there.

BEETS: Good. Well, I think that will bring this



discussion

to a close. I think it's a very good point to end on; and as Diane said, tune in tomorrow on this website at 12:30pm and then

again at 3pm for this event being broadcast from Manhattan.

So,

thank you all; thanks Lyn. Thank you all for joining us; and stay tuned.

---

## **“Vi kommer med fred, for hele menneskeheden”**

Det var mindeplade, som de første astronauter bragte til månen for næsten 50 år siden: “Vi kommer med fred, for hele menneskeheden.” Ikke blot astronauterne, men hele den amerikanske nation og millioner af andre mennesker rundt om på jorden fik ændret deres tankegang om menneskehedens fremtid af disse rejser, som de foretog, tilrettelagde og bevidnede.

”For første gang besluttede mennesker sig bevidst for at lære at leve og agere i omgivelser, der er komplet anderledes end dem, fra hvilke vi har udviklet os,” som en astronaut sagde det.

Men næsten fra den ene dag til den anden trak de smukke skibe, der cirklede om månen, sig tilbage; fjernere rumrejser blev glemt. Landet kastede sig ud i krige – modelleret efter britiske og franske kolonikrige –, som er fortsat siden da, og som USA ultimativt har tabt. Under præsidenter G.W. Bush og Obama, har de spredt katastrofer af krig og terrorisme tværs over Mellemøsten, Nordafrika og Europa.

Skønt der blev udpeget ubemandede rummissioner for opdagelser

og opdagelsesrejsende, var amerikanerne overbevist om at være "praktiske" og at glemme at gennemleve opdagelser, som de ofte havde gjort før.

Andre nationer, Kina og Indien i særdeleshed, planlægger nu at tage de store opdagelsesskridt i rummet, planlægger Mars-missioner, programsætter de første landinger på den storslåede platform for opdagelser af galaksen – Månens bagside.

På samme tid har de asiatiske magter sammen med Rusland planlagt og påbegyndt udfordrende projekter for ny infrastruktur, store øst-vest og nord-syd eurasiske landbroer med højhastighedstog, nye byer, energi, selv magnettogetsforbindelser.

Når de griber ind for at bringe krige til afslutning, så de kan påbegynde genopbygning og ny udvikling, så mener de det.

Præsident Obama, der prøver at sammenstykke militæralliancer, handelskrige, NATO-krigstrusler og konfrontationer for at stande de russiske og kinesiske ledere fra disse udviklinger – organiserer faktisk en "liga af tabere." Truslen om global krig fra hans forsøg på at intimidere Rusland og Kina er alvorlige; men han er en taber, der truer virkelige ledere som Putin og Xi.

Glem hvad der er "praktisk muligt": Selv i bekæmpelse af terrorisme, er opdagelser hvad der behøves for at vinde sejre, opdagelser, som i at eksponere de saudisk/britiske hænder, der kontrollerede masse mordene d. 11. september, og pludseligt dermed se kilden til de seneste 15 års katastrofale krige.

Så meget desto mere i at genoplive det storartede amerikanske rumprogram. I samarbejde med de nylige dynamiske rum-magter vil det blive en ny kilde til at leve gennem opdagelser – der faktisk er menneskelige, som nationen lærte det for 50 år siden.

---

# Principper og grænsebetingelser for et nyt rumprogram.

Fra LaRouchePAC  
Fredagswebcast, 13. maj 2016

Ogden: Hr. LaRouche understregede i en samtale fra tidligere på dagen, at folk ofte stiller alle de forkerte spørgsmål, og så overbeviser de sig selv om, at de kan finde frem til svarene på disse spørgsmål, selvom de ikke engang ved, hvad de egentlig vil spørge om. Der er intet bedre eksempel på dette end vores tilgang til undersøgelsen af universets natur og udforskningen af rummet. Som folk nok er klar over, har Kesha Rogers i meget lang tid og meget højlydt bragt dette på banen. Denne uge har hun sammen med Benjamin Deniston sammensat et politisk program, som blev offentliggjort på hjemmesiden LaRouchePAC.com, under en ny kampagneside, som lige er blevet lagt op. Kesha kan selv sige mere om det, men et af omdrejningspunkterne på den nye kampagneside er Kinas igangværende arbejde med at søge efter de rigtige spørgsmål. Hr. LaRouche lagde stor vægt på, at de næste to år er af afgørende betydning, da Kina indenfor denne tidshorisont vil begynde at udforske månens bagside. Dette er en del af det fortsatte kinesiske Chang'e-program. Og forudsat at vi kan undgå en eller anden altødelæggende krise – hvis vi kan afværge, at tredje verdenskrig bryder ud, eller en lignende katastrofe – vil vi ifølge Hr. LaRouche gøre opdagelser som resultat af udforskningen af månens bagside, der vil bryde med alt det, vi troede, vi vidste om månen, universet og vores forhold til disse.

Altså vil jeg gerne, Kesha, invitere dig til at uddybe disse problemstillinger.

Kesha Rogers: Klart, mange tak, Matt. Først vil jeg gerne oplyse, at det politiske program, som Ben og jeg har skrevet, »Principper og grænsebetingelser for et nyt rumprogram (Principles and Boundary Conditions of a New Space Program)«, kan findes her på siden (LaRouchepac.com – red.). Og dernæst vil jeg gerne invitere folk til at deltage i en kommende dialog med Ben og mig omkring dette program. Men jeg vil gerne vende tilbage til den diskussion vi havde før denne udsendelse med Hr. LaRouche, der omhandlede det samme, som vi gerne ville vise med dette skrift, nemlig at der ikke findes en deduktiv eller praktisk metode til at finde ud af, hvad vores solsystem er, eller hvad vi mangler at opdage om det. Vi mangler stadig at opdage, hvilken orden der ligger bag vores solsystem. Og den orden kan vi kun forstå, hvis vi også forstår indbegrebet af menneskets sind, og hvem vi er som mennesker. Den udfordring, der har været, de fejl, der er sket, og den mangel på kompetence, der har rådet omkring udforskningen af rummet, hænger sammen med dette. En ting, vi diskuterede, og som jeg mener, er afgørende, er vores manglende forståelse af, hvad et rumprogram egentlig er; et veludformet rumprogram. Man havde tragiske ulykker i den tidlige del af rumprogrammet, f.eks. den, der skete i forbindelse med den planlagte opsendelse af Apollo 1 raketten, hvor Gus Grissom, Ed White og Roger Chaffee på tragisk vis omkom. Og i det lys må man reflektere over, hvordan mennesker som disse, da de indskrev sig i programmet, var parate til at ofre deres liv for at fremme menneskehedens forståelse af dens rolle i solsystemet. Det er samme form for offer man ser soldater gøre, når de går i felten; de ved, det er med livet som indsats. Men det leder tanken hen på, hvad vi endnu ikke forstår, og hvad det er, vi kommer til at opdage.

Og derfor mener jeg, det er så vigtigt at se på det nye kapitel, som Kina er ved at skrive menneskeheden ind i, i forhold til solsystemet og galaksen. De er ved at bringe

menneskeheden som art, der rejser i rummet, op på et helt nyt niveau gennem deres udforsknings- og udviklingsprogram i forhold til månen, specielt bagsiden af månen. Og når man ser på dette, kan man se, hvordan mange prøver at forstå den rolle, vi har i solsystemet, og den rolle, som rumfarten spiller for menneskeheden, gennem deduktive metoder. Og det fik mig til at tænke tilbage på Krafft Ehrickes ide om, hvorfor rumfart er så vigtig. Han var ophavsmanden til ideen om, at det er af eksistentiel betydning for menneskeheden at forstå sig selv som en interplanetarisk art, hvilket han kaldte menneskehedens »udenjordiske imperativ«. Følgende citat stammer fra ham: »Ideen om at rejse i rummet bærer en enorm betydning, fordi den udfordrer menneskeheden på så godt som alle områder, både i forhold til dens fysiske og åndelige eksistens. Ideen om at rejse til andre himmellegemer er et tegn på det menneskelige sinds højeste form for uafhængighed og livskraft.«

Og jeg mener, det er det, der overgår menneskeheden lige nu; at vi bliver udfordret på alle områder. Det er det, der sker i forbindelse med eksistensen af vores rumfartsprogram; at vi bliver udfordret på alle områder, fysisk og åndeligt og omkring vores løfte til fremtiden. Og det er derfor, vi taler så hårdt mod de ekstreme angreb på rumprogrammet og indgrebet mod alt, hvad folkene i det amerikanske rumprograms kontrolcenter stod for, f.eks. Gene Krantz, der sagde, at vi lover at være vedholdende og kompetente. For der er intet vedholdende eller kompetent ved at tillade Obama at træde frem og afmontere og ødelægge vores rumprogram og gøre det til grin. Han promoverer et program, der er fuldstændig afkoblet fra virkeligheden, ideen om, at vi bare skal fange en asteroide, eller at vi skal sende et menneske med en enkeltbillet til Mars. Vi skal udvikle et marsprogram uden først at have en forståelse af galaksen som helhed eller af solsystemet som et integreret system, et system vi først skal forstå og lære at kende.

Problemet er, at det program vi havde før, er blevet lukket ned af Obama. Det handlede om at vende tilbage til at fokusere på at udvikle månen. Tidligere havde vi et program, der handlede om at udvikle månen, fremsat af astronauter som f.eks. Harrison Smith, før Apolloprogrammet blev lukket ned. Ved afslutningen af Apollo 17 var Apollo 18, 19 og 20 allerede planlagt. Men de blev afskrevet, fordi vi forrødte vores løfte om et meningsfuldt rumfartsprogram og i stedet skiftede til et yderst uansvarligt program. Og derfor blev også risikoen for tab af liv forøget. Men vigtigere endnu – man kan sammenligne det med, hvad der skete i militæret – er spørgsmålet, hvad er det, vi giver vores liv til? Derfor må vi på ny vurdere, hvad meningen med vores rumfartsprogram skal være. Og den vurdering skal ske med udgangspunkt i at forsvare menneskehedens kreative identitet og menneskeheden som art. Og fokus må være, at vi skal ud og opdage, hvad det er, vi endnu ikke ved. Og kineserne udgør et fremragende forbillede for os, fordi de tager livet alvorligt. Og de er alvorligt engagerede i deres rumfartsprogram. Og så længe Obama er præsident – husk, at jeg har krævet hans afsættelse flere gange – men dette udgør denne præsidents største forbrydelse: hans nedlukning af rumfartsprogrammet.

Så jeg mener, det vigtigste spørgsmål er, hvad vi giver vores liv til. Denne nation har brug for et videnskabeligt spydspidsprojekt baseret på menneskehedens kreative udvikling. Og vi bliver nødt til at befri menneskeheden for den dumhed, som har overtaget befolkningens tankegang. Og rumfartsprogrammet er lige det, vi har brug for at befri menneskeheden. Vi har flere gange snakket om, hvordan den kreative kraft blev skænket til menneskeheden af Prometheus. Og det ser næsten ud som om, at Zeus har fået lov til at stjæle ilden tilbage fra menneskerne. Denne kreativitetens ild må gives tilbage til menneskerne igen, og hele befolkningen må opløftes til et niveau, der ikke er set før i historien. Vi må overveje, hvordan vi kan transformere den planet vi bor på, men det kan vi kun, hvis vi forstår, at jorden ikke er en

isoleret planet. Som Krafft Ehricke siger, er den ikke et lukket system. Vi kan kun løse de problemer, vi står overfor: krig, hungersnød, sult osv. ved at vinde en dybere forståelse af det solsystem vi er en del af. Og det der blev snakket om tidligere i denne udsendelse peger på, hvad det er der udgør den grundlæggende forskel mellem Kinas og Ruslands tilgang til måden, hvorpå vi må organiserer os og samarbejder som menneskehed; og Obama-regeringens tilgang til politik; dens angreb på rumfartsprogrammet og dens march mod krig.

Det kommer vi til at diskutere yderligere i morgen, og jeg vil opfordre folk til at læse det politiske program, ikke som teknisk formidling, men fra et udgangspunkt omkring, hvad det er, der mangler i vores tænkning i dag. Hvad er det vi ikke ved, og hvad er det, vi bliver nødt til at opdage?

---

## **Embedsmand fra Kinas rumprogram bekræfter planer om en bemandet månelanding**

30. april, 2016 – Selv om kinesiske videnskabsfolk igennem nogen tid har presset på for en mission hvor astronauter lander på månen, kom den første meddelelse om en sådan plan i forbindelse med fejringen den 24. april af 'Den Nationale Rumdag', fra en højt placeret embedsmand i rumprogrammet. Generalløjtnant Zhang Yulin meddelte ved en konference for fejringen af Kinas første rumdag, at Kina planlægger at lande astronauter på månen i 2036. Zhang er viceleder af 'Kinas Bemandede Rumprogram', som lagde hans bemærkninger på deres hjemmeside den 28. april. Han er også stedfortrædende chef for

Den Centrale Militære Kommissions Afdeling til Udvikling af Udrustning.

Kina må "forbedre sine evner og benytte de næste 15 til 20 år til at virkeliggøre sin intention om bemandede ekspeditioner for at udforske Månen" sagde Zhang, "og tage et afgørende skridt for det kinesiske folk, med at forberede grundlaget for at udnytte rummet". Han noterede også, at projektet ville, i al almindelighed, befordre den videnskabelige og teknologiske udvikling af landet. Zhangs kommentar følger præsident Xi Jinpings udtalelse på rumdagen om, at hans "vision for Kina" er forbundet med Kinas visioner i rummet.

Pang Zhihao, fra Kinas Akademi for Rumprogramteknologi, beskrev de udfordringer der er for Kinas rumprogram, for at udføre en sådan månelanding. Først skal en meget kraftig affyringsraket, i størrelsesorden som en Saturn V måneraket, designes, udvikles, tilpasses mennesker og afprøves. "For at sende vore astronauter til månen, skal vi bruge en enorm raket, som er i stand til at løfte en nyttelast på mindst 100 tons op i kredsløb omkring jorden i en lav bane", forklarede han. "Det er derfor, at vore videnskabsfolk er begyndt på at udvikle Long March 9". Den nye løfteraket forventes at have en kapacitet på 130 tons og være i stand til at lette omkring 2030. Det bliver nødvendigt at udvikle en ny besætningskapsel, større og mere velegnet end rumfartøjet Shenzhou. At skabe nye rumdragter, velegnet til at gå på månen er på vej, og teknikker til nedstigning på måneoverfladen, en blød landing, og evnen til opsendelse fra måneoverfladen og til at møde og sammenkoble med et rumskib til hjemrejsen er alt sammen nødvendige forudsætninger.

Embedsmænd har understreget, at Kinas igangværende projekter danner grundlaget for en bemanded rummission. Møde og sammenkoblingsmissioner i jordrumskibet med Shenzhou-kapsler har dannet grundlaget for de mere krævende måne rumskibes møder, der er forudsætning for den bemandede mission. Næste års Chang'e-5 missioner, der vil sende måneprøver tilbage til



Jorden, vil demonstrere den højhastighedsreturnering til Jorden, som den bemandede månemission vil kræve. Ligeledes var landingen af Chang'e-3 og dens ledsager månebil Yutu på månen en god øvelse for landingsteknikker borte fra Jorden.

Over de næste 15-20 år, sagde Zhang, vil alle disse færdigheder blive udviklet.

---

## **Om rumindustriens muligheder. Astronaut Andreas Mogensen, EIR-interview.**

### **EIR-videointerview med astronaut Andreas Mogensen efter konferencen på Christiansborg, om rumindustriens muligheder, 2. maj 2016**

***EIR:** Hvordan ser du samarbejdet med Kina, og deres ambitiøse program?*

***Mogensen:** Vi samarbejder også med Kina hos ESA; de bliver en vigtig samarbejdspartner i fremtiden. De er så bare ikke i dag en del af samarbejdet bag Rumstationen. Men vi håber da på, i hvert fald fra europæisk side, at få etableret et samarbejde, og jeg også, at der er en god chance for, at vi en dag ser en europæisk astronaut ombord på den næste, kinesiske rumstation. Hør mere.*

Se også:

Optagelser fra konferencen på Christiansborg den 2. maj 2016, om rumindustriens muligheder, inkl. astronaut Andreas Mogensen

---

# **Optagelser fra konferencen på Christiansborg den 2. maj 2016 om Rumindustriens muligheder inkl. astronaut Andreas Mogensen**

Schiller Instituttets optagelse.

Se også EIR's og Schiller Instituttets kort interview med Andreas Mogensen efter konferencen. (kommer senere)

1. del:

2. del:

Program:

Ordstyrer: Helge Sander

15.00 MF Orla Hav byder velkommen

15.03 praktiske forhold ved ordstyrer Helge Sander

15.05 rumlovens perspektiver. Ulla Tørnæs.

15.13 Andreas Mogensen præsenteres

15.15 indlæg under overskriften "de industrielle muligheder indenfor rumfart".

15.25 Niels Buus, Gomspace Aalborg.

15.30 Peter Sloth, kontoret for Rum, uddannelses- og forskningsministeriet.

15.35 Charlotte Rønhof, Dansk Industri (erstattet af en anden fra DI)

15.30 Torben Andersen Lindhardt, Dansk Metal.

15.45 Morten Bødskov, MF Socialdemokraterne, formand for Erhvervsudvalget

15.50 Jakob Engel-Schmidt, MF Venstre, i Uddannelses- og Forskningsudvalget

15.55 der indsamles spørgsmål til Andreas Mogensen.

16.00 Andreas Mogensen besvarer indsamlede spørgsmål stillede af Helge Sander.

---

**Schiller                      Instituttets  
konference i New York, 7.  
april 2016:  
At bygge en Verdenslandbro –  
og       realisere       en       ægte**

# menneskelig menneskehed

Schiller Instituttets konference i torsdags i New York City, "At bygge en Verdenslandbro – og realisere en ægte menneskelig menneskehed", markerede en succes for Lyndon LaRouches idé. Selvom flere og mere fyldige rapporter vil følge, så kan så meget allerede nu siges med sikkerhed; nærværende rapport reflekterer kun en del af begivenhedsforløbet.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche åbnede konferencen med en omfattende og inspirerende tale med titlen, "Hinsides geopolitik og polaritet: En fremtid for den menneskelige art", i hvilken hun blotlagde den umiddelbare trussel om en udslettelseskrig og viste, at alene idéen om Verdenslandbroen, som hun sammen med sin mand udviklede i perioden under Warszawapagtens sammenbrud, kan tilvejebringe en varig garanti for fred. Hun gik videre med at skitsere en dialog mellem civilisationerne, hvor alle civilisationer i verden vil blive repræsenteret ved deres historiske, kulturelle højdepunkter, så som Weimar-klassikken for Tysklands vedkommende og et USA, som det først blev udtænkt til at være af Benjamin Franklin og Alexander Hamilton.

Helga efterfulgtes som taler af den tidligere amerikanske justitsminister Ramsey Clark (1966-67), der sammenvævede sin egen mangeårige erfaring til en redegørelse om den nyere verdenshistorie, og som understregede et alternativ til den krigspolitik, som de fleste amerikanske regeringer efter Kennedy-tiden har ført.

Den næste taler var en aldeles enestående person fra Kina, nemlig landets ledende professor i journalistik og tilligemed leder af meget andet, Li Xiguang. Professor Li har anført en pilgrimsfærd, der har varet i årtier, for Silkevejen – tværs over Centralasien og ned langs hver af de tre nord-syd ruter, og tilbage igen. Ikke færre end 500 af sine studerende har han siden 1990 ført med sig på denne pilgrimsrejse, og han har skrevet et tobindsværk om den Nye Silkevej. Skønt hans mål med Silkevejen ikke er af religiøs karakter – hans mål er de samme

som LaRouche-bevægelsens – så modellerer professor Li sig selv efter de store kulturelle, kinesiske helte, buddhistmunkene Xuanzang (602-664) og dennes forgænger Faxian (337-422). Begge foretog vidstrakte og anstrengende rejser langs Silkevejen og bragte den første, reelle viden om meget af verdenscivilisationen, der især omfattede sanskrit-sproget og kulturen, samt originale, buddhistiske skrifter, med tilbage til Kina.

Xuanzang tilbragte intet mindre end 16 år på denne rejse og vendte tilbage med 600 indiske tekster. Efter ønske fra Tangdynastiets kejser, færdiggjorde han i 646 sit 12-bindsværk, "Krøniken om det store Tangdynastis vestlige områder" der er blevet en af hovedkilderne til studiet af Centralasien og Indien i middelalderen, og som danner grundlag for romanen fra det 17. århundrede, "Rejsen til Vesten", en af de fire store, klassiske, kinesiske romaner.

Der vil senere komme rapporter fra eftermiddagens session, der satte fokus på rumprogrammet, og som blev indledt af Kesha Rogers med en levende præsentation. Sessionens højdepunkt var en spørgsmål-svar-session over Skype med Lyndon LaRouche. LaRouche førte de fleste af spørgsmålene tilbage til kardinalspørgsmålet, nemlig, at forandringer i det fysiske system, og i menneskehedens fremtid, skabes af selve det tænkende menneskelige intellekt; det er der intet dyr, der er i stand til. Menneskeheden organiseres gennem sine egne handlinger af denne art; det er disse, der leder til enten succes eller fiasko. Dette er kendetegnende for den sande videnskabsmands intellekt, som Einstein eksemplificerer. Men denne redegørelse er blot en karakteristik; de faktiske svar bør studeres i detaljer.

Flere end 200 mennesker var mødt frem, kernemedlemmer ikke medregnet. Omkring et dusin fremmede lande fra Europa, Asien og Afrika var repræsenteret, enten ved diplomater, kulturelle forbindelser eller på anden vis. Mange musikere deltog, og mindst fem mennesker fra Brooklyn kirken, hvor vi opførte Messias i påsken. Dette er muligvis den største konference, vi nogensinde har holdt.

Som konklusion skal det siges, at denne konference markerer en sejr for en af Lyndon LaRouches ideer: nemlig Manhattan-projektet, som han præsenterede tilbage i oktober 2014. Og dog blev han dengang, i lighed med Einsteins berømte udtalelse om Kepler i 1930 på 300 års dagen for dennes død, "ikke støttet af nogen og kun forstået af ganske få". Lyndon LaRouche, der skabte det Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ og senere sammen med sin kone skabte den Eurasiske Landbro, har endnu engang skabt en ny og fuldstændig anderledes original idé. En idé, som atter har vist sig at være gyldig.

**Klik her for videoerne og afskrifterne på engelsk.**

---

## **RADIO SCHILLER den 29. marts 2016: Efter terrorangrebet i Brussel**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg:

---

## **Uden en mission er I døde!**

*22. marts 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC)* – »Bankerotten i USA's økonomi er generelt set færdigt. Det er absolut færdigt«, erklærede Lyndon LaRouche kategorisk i sin **diskussion mandag den 21. marts med LPAC Policy Committee**, under den internationale webcast.

Mens de fleste amerikanere ser den anden vej og med frygt i sjælen forsøger at lade som om, at det ikke finder sted, så er det, vi i virkeligheden er vidne til, hele det transatlantiske finanssystems død – det er bankerot og står ikke til at redde. Men, vi er også vidne til en nations død, og dens befolknings død, fordi vores fornemmelse for en national mission – og de enkelte individers fornemmelse af formål og selve det, at have en identitet – systematisk er blevet fjernet af Det britiske Imperium, dets agenter og dets politik internt i USA. Intet har været så afgørende for denne operation som nedlæggelsen af NASA, som er kulmineret under Obamas præsidentskabs-parodi.

I går erklærede LaRouche: »Der er hele kategorier af folk, der under normale omstændigheder var produktive mennesker. De har ikke længere nogen rolle at udfylde. For det første sidder vi på toppen af en vulkan, som er det bankerotte, transatlantiske finanssystem, som kan – og vil – eksplodere i en hyperinflationsskabende nedsmeltning, hvad øjeblik, det skal være. Tro endelig ikke, at den nuværende politik med endeløse bailouts og »helikopterpenge«, som tidligere formand for Federal Reserve, Ben Bernanke, holdt af at kalde det, kan holde stand. Man kan ikke forsøge at 'redde' for 2 billioner dollar værdiløse, spekulative finanspapirer med endnu en billion finansielt affald, uden, at det eksploderer op i ens ansigt. De regeringer, der støtter op omkring denne galskab – såsom Obamaregeringen – er lige så skyldige i de forbrydelser, der begås.

Det britiske Imperium er dømt til total undergang, understregede Lyndon LaRouche i dag, og de handler i total desperation: de vil ikke acceptere et nederlag, og de er parate til at dræbe *en masse*. Der er stærke indikationer på, at dette er i gang i USA, såvel som i Europa.



*Dødsfald som følge af narko-overdosis, alle kommuner, USA, 2002-2014. O.D.'s er steget til tårnhøje tal i næsten alle*

## *USA's kommuner under Bush' og Obamas præsidentskaber.*

Ud over det eksploderende finanssystem, så sidder vi også på toppen af nok en vulkan, som er den erklærede hensigt fra Det britiske Imperium – og fra deres marionet, Barack Obama – om at fremtvinge regimeskift i Rusland og Kina. Som Lyndon LaRouche i årevis har advaret om, så er kriserne i Libyen, Syrien og Irak, og international terrorisme generelt, alle sammen rettet mod et strategisk atomopgør med Rusland og Kina. De seneste »barbariske« terrorhandlinger i Bruxelles, som præsident Vladimir Putin kaldte det, er ingen undtagelse. Idet hun talte om de internationale sponsorer af terrorisme – som vi ved er Det britiske Imperium, der opererer under diverse flag – var talsperson for det russiske Udenrigsministerium, Maria Zakharova, ligefrem: »Man kan ikke støtte terrorister i én del af verden uden at forvente, de også dukker op i en anden.«

Rusland og Kina fortsætter med at spille deres rolle i at gå op imod dette vanvid, og bygge et Nyt Paradigme baseret på en mission for menneskeheden, der udfolder sig omkring win-win-samarbejde om grundlæggende forskning så som rumforskning, og samstemmende store infrastrukturprojekter her på planeten Jord.

Men for at det skal lykkes, må USA bringes med ombord i dette Nye Paradigme. Til en begyndelse må de nazister, der ønsker at forvandle USA til en koncentrationslejr, afsløres som det, de er – lige fra FBI-hooligans, til Obamas drabsmaskine og til Wall Street-bankerne, der har folkemord i deres kølvand. At give dem en stærkt forsinket blodtud er en god måde at få humøret op og genoplive optimisme på.

Dernæst må landet genoprette sin fornemmelse for national mission omkring NASA's rumprogram, med Kesha Rogers' kampagne som spydspids for vore bestræbelser i denne retning. Dette vil gengive folk ikke alene produktive jobs, men selve deres fornemmelse for mening og menneskelig identitet. Og det er en



kraft, som Det britiske Imperium ikke kan håndtere.

---

**Det frydefulde ved at skabe  
overraskelser!**

**LaRouchePAC Internationale  
Fredags-webcast 18. marts  
2016**

Engelsk udskrift: I denne uge får vi en opdatering fra Kesha Rogers i Texas, som anfører en politik for en genoplivelse af det amerikanske NASA-rumprogram; Jason Ross fortsætter sagaen om Gottfried Leibniz; og Jeffrey Steinberg giver os Lyndon LaRouches analyse af betydningen for fredsprocessen i Syrien af de seneste udviklinger, med den russiske militære tilbagetrækning.

– DELIGHT IN CREATING SURPRISES! –

International Webcast March 18, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good Evening! It's March 18th, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden, and I would like to thank you for joining us for our weekly Friday evening broadcast, here, on [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com). I'm joined in the studio tonight by Jeffrey Steinberg from {Executive Intelligence Review}; and Jason Ross, from the LaRouche PAC science team; and we're joined via video by Kesha Rogers, multiple-time candidate for Federal office from the

state of Texas, and leading member of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee.

All of us had a chance to meet with Mr. LaRouche, both in person and via telephone connection (in the case of Kesha), earlier this morning. Mr. LaRouche had some very definite and specific ideas which he wished for us to convey. Mr. LaRouche was

{emphatic} when we met with him earlier today, that the global agenda right now is being set by Russia and by China, and their

allies. He said that the initiative in creating the future and shaping present global policy, lies with those two countries, strategically – in the case of Russia, as is very clear with what is occurring in Syria right now; and economically and scientifically – in the case of China.

You can see very clearly that the outdated and archaic methods of the trans-Atlantic system are proving to be impotent,

both in the case of resolving the current grave crises which are

facing mankind as a planetary species right now, but also impotent in setting the agenda and fulfilling and laying out the

vision for the future of mankind. The mission which has been undertaken by China, in terms of their objective to explore the

far side of the Moon – something which is going to be unfolding

over the coming two years – exemplifies the necessary identity which mankind must have in order to affirm and to fulfill our true nature as a creative species.

Mr. LaRouche stated that something that we should develop, in dialogue with him and with each other, is to think about the

open questions, the unanswered questions about how is mankind, a

species, reflective of a much larger, and as yet not fully

understood, creative characteristic of the galactic system as a whole. This is a relationship which Johannes Kepler drew out in very unique detail in terms of his discoveries about our {Solar} System, but we have many, many large and unanswered questions of what is the role of the human species in our relationship to the galactic system as a whole, and then the complex of galactic systems as a much, much larger whole.

Mr. LaRouche said that this mission to explore the "dark side" of the Moon, so-called, is a pathway in order to begin to understand even the opening of the questions along these lines.

The dark side of the Moon, his hypothesis was, is where you can find some of the shadows of this much larger system, have insight into it, and also to begin to understand mankind's role as reflective of these broader creative processes which are involved in these great astronomical systems.

This is the spirit of the United States at our best. Our republic was founded on these kinds of unique ideas, as we've discussed here in previous weeks. The role of the great philosopher and scientist Gottfried Leibniz is a major contributor, a "founding father", or "founding grand-father" of our republic. This is something which I know Jason Ross has presented multiple times and is in the process of having a series of developing classes on that subject; and I'm sure we'll be part of his discussion later today.

But also, this is what you can see in a great statesman, such as Abraham Lincoln – very, very much so. Franklin Roosevelt; and John F. Kennedy. Tragically, that spirit in the United States has deteriorated drastically. We see now that the leadership does indeed lie with China and with Russia; and this is something which Kesha Rogers, who is joining us here today, wrote about in an editorial which is appearing in this week's edition of the {Executive Intelligence Review} magazine. Kesha's editorial is titled, "To Save the United States Economy, Revive the Space Program."

Kesha and I had a brief conversation earlier this afternoon. I know she has some broader ideas to develop on this subject, so, without further ado, I would like to hand over the podium to Kesha Rogers.

KESHA ROGERS: Thank you, Matt. I think I'd like to start, first of all, by continuing to develop what has and must be the focal point by which we come to understand the necessity for the revival and the defense of, not just the American and U.S. space program, which I have continued to be a leader in championing the development and the necessity of our space program and what it truly represents for the progress of all mankind. But just on the editorial that I wrote, I think, to understand it, it's not just from the standpoint of looking at the economic conditions of the United States and some practical applications to economics

that

the space program will provide; but we also have to look at it from the standpoint of is, the space program as a true conception

of real economic value. This is what's actually missing from our

thinking and what has been attacked by the current Wall Street/British imperial system, is that economic value is based,

from {that} standpoint, on monetary value and not on the creative

powers and progress of the human mind.

The real question at hand right now, is to bring about – as we're seeing and will be developed further in these discussions

today – a new conception of what is the identity and what is the

purpose of mankind. I have continued to use the example and the

works of the great pioneer of space flight, space pioneer Krafft

Ehrlicke; and looking at his conception of mankind as a space-faring creature, as the understanding of mankind's "extra-terrestrial imperative," as that which must be identified

and understood.

If you look at the conditions of the space program and why it's so important, you take the example, for instance, of what China is doing now, as completely rejecting this monetarist policy; that the space program is not how much money you're going

to put into pet projects and specific projects. It is creating something that's never been created before, to actually create a

new conception and identity of mankind, from the standpoint of the idea of acting on the future. That's what this idea and what

is being developed, for instance with China in their investigation of the far side of the Moon. People may look at this, "Well what is this going to benefit us? How is this going to improve the economic conditions, in terms of monetary value, or any of this?" But that is the wrong way to look at it; because the problem right now is that what you have seen is two different opposing conceptions of the view of mankind. One coming from the trans-Atlantic system, coming from a collapsing imperial system that has been based on money and monetary value that is dying; and the other is represented by what Russia and China are doing. And as Matt emphasized and what I developed in my recent writing, was that this was the mindset of the great leaders of our nation, represented by the ideas of Alexander Hamilton, of Franklin Roosevelt, Abraham Lincoln, [and] John F. Kennedy. It wasn't just on the creating of new projects per se, but on a whole new different conception of the identity of mankind. And so, you take for instance, the example of what we accomplished in the United States, of landing a man on the Moon – the idea that Kennedy put forward, that by the end of decade we would land a man on the Moon and return him safely to Earth. What was the vision and intention behind that? Was it just the idea that we would go and plant our flag on the Moon? This would be some short-term gratification and so forth? Or, was it a forward-thinking outlook, in terms of the direction of mankind in recognizing what Krafft Ericke, the great pioneer of space flight, recognized, that mankind was not just a creature of the planet Earth. We were not just a part of, as he called it, a

"closed system," and so it was our responsibility to go out and to do what no other animal had the capability of doing; of actually conquering and developing, coming to understand what is the purpose of mankind and what is the development of mankind in the universe as a creature of our solar system and of the galaxy as a whole.

One thing that I thought was very insightful, is that Krafft Ericke wrote about the understanding of the Renaissance, the Classical Renaissance, as an achievement of human progress. And also the Classical Renaissance is something that contributed to the development of what became our space program and what was the intention that guided the direction of space travel and the space program.

I'll just read a quick quote from what he expressed on this idea. He says, "The development of the idea of space travel was always the most logical and most noble consequence of the Renaissance ideal, which again places man in an organic and active relationship with his surrounding universe and which, perceived in the synthesis of knowledge and capabilities, its highest ideals."

So you look at this from the standpoint of Krafft Ericke understanding that the Renaissance that was guided by the scientific breakthroughs which I'm sure you'll hear a lot more from my colleague Jason there, of Brunelleschi, or the breakthroughs that came about from the works of Kepler. That the idea of mankind, is to create something fundamentally new, something that had never been created before, and increasing

the

relationship of mankind to the Universe.

Now that's economic value! That is not what is being discussed when you look at these debates going back and forth from the standpoint of these Congress Members to the space community, and what budgets are being cut and should not be cut.

But the reality is, as I stated before, we have to have, in the

defense of the space program, a new conception of the direction

of mankind. That means we're removing all limitations to progress, all limitations that are put on mankind's ability to continue to understand how to make new discoveries in the principles scientifically of what's out there. Why should we actually investigate the Solar System? What is our mission in doing so? And it's not about a money-making short-term gratification. And so, I think this emphasis that Krafft Ehricke

put on the renaissance as an ideal of looking at why we have, as

a human species, an extraterrestrial imperative, is really a continued expression of what you're seeing coming from China; not

just in their space program, but in the development of the win-win strategy of cooperation for all mankind, for every nation

to come to join together. And to further the progress of addressing the necessary challenges to the economic condition of

the planet by actually recognizing that the solutions do not lie

right here on planet Earth.

So, I think that's the conceptions I wanted to get across; and what I hope to have further discussion on as we continue this

fight to identify what is the real mission of the space



program,  
and how we come to rid the world immediately of this current  
dead  
system that's keeping us from advancing in the way that we  
should  
be.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Kesha; and I can recommend that  
people read what you've written in the current edition of  
{Executive Intelligence Review}. I also know that you're  
planning

on making a video statement – which will be posted on the  
LaRouche PAC website and available for people – developing  
some

of these ideas a little bit more in detail.

So, if people have been watching this website, you know that  
Jason Ross has also been working very closely with Kesha to  
develop some of these ideas with their implications from the  
standpoint of a scientist, whom I hope you are becoming more  
familiar with by now – Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz. As we  
discussed last week on this webcast, I think if you begin to  
consider this question which Kesha just laid on the table for  
us,

about how do you create a future for mankind. How do you  
initiate

the creation of something which is completely new, as we move  
into the future? Now, this can never be done through the  
replication of the past; there's no precedent for a discovery.

A

discovery is something which is always new, and is created {de  
novo} and is introduced, which changes the course of human  
history. Obviously, there is a lineage that goes back to  
Gottfried Leibniz, and many Leibnizians who have lived since  
him:

Karl Gauss; Bernhard Riemann; Albert Einstein; and I would  
even

include Mr. Lyndon LaRouche in that lineage.

So, without further ado, I'm going to ask Jason to elaborate a little bit more; picking up on what Kesha just left off on.

JASON ROSS: Thanks, Matt. Well, I think if you consider how to conceptualize the value of the kinds of programs that Kesha was discussing that we're promoting today, you reach a contradiction if you try to approach them from a monetarist standpoint. That is, the kind of economics that's generally taught today, the kind of economics practiced as a religion – well, I was going to say as a religion on Wall Street; the primary religion on Wall Street is stealing – but, in general, the basis of thinking is that economy is about money; we can measure things in terms of money. How much is somebody willing to

pay for something? That's how valuable it is. That isn't. Money

doesn't measure different qualities; money doesn't measure the future potential that something is able to create. And if you base money on how much somebody's willing to pay for something,

you don't distinguish between things that are good and useful versus bad and vices. People are willing to pay for heroin; people are willing to pay for other opioids if they're addicted

to it. Does that mean that those drugs, as used by those people,

are valuable, or worth something because they're willing to pay

for them? Quite the contrary. So, we need a different way of thinking about how we can measure economic value if we're going

to be human economists, instead of Wall Street magicians or Satanists.

So, the reason we have economy is that we aren't animals; animals don't have economies. Animals don't change what they do

from generation to generation; they don't improve, they don't

develop. We do. We create a new kind of time for ourselves. In a very real way, humanity is a totally new and totally distinct force of nature from anything else. Over geological time, geologists describe to us how the Earth has changed, or how a planet has formed; this is over hundreds of millions of years. Over evolutionary time, perhaps tens of millions of years, we're able to see transformations in the kinds of life that exists on the planet. Over biological time, we have short-term periods of the life of an organism, of its respiration, very much tied to the daily cycle of the Earth, for example. And with humans, we have a different kind of time. We create time. The flow of history isn't always the same speed. During the Dark Ages, when not much happened, you might say that human time slowed down. And with the Renaissance, and with the ability to discover more about nature by having a more powerful way of thinking about it, and a more powerful conception of us as human beings interacting with it; you could say that time sped up. We create a certain time in that we create new eras of humanity; not in the way that geology or evolution does, but willfully by developing new principles that if we were animals, you would say this is a whole new type of life all together. Life moving from the oceans onto land; that's a totally different quality of life. Life having developed photosynthesis and using the Sun as a power source; that's a totally different kind of life. But we're still human beings after the discovery of the combustion engine, for example; the use of heat-powered

machinery. We create in ourselves the change that's comparable only to large-scale evolutionary changes when we look at life in general. So, we're distinct.

Now, how do we understand this? Both how do we understand that world around us that we act on and interact with; and how do

we understand our thoughts about it and our ability to progress

and use the practice of science itself? What sort of terrain is

it? What sort of world is it? The physical world and the mental world.

Well, here's where I'd like to take up some concepts that Mr. LaRouche has been bringing up recently about Bernhard Riemann

and about Gottfried Leibniz, and a bit about Einstein, too, who

got the verification of his hypothesis of gravity waves announced

very near his birthday this year – which was on Monday. So, let's think about it. Is the terrain that we're operating on, one

which is steady and indifferent to our actions? Or, is it one where what we do and what we discover and how we interact with it, changes that world around us in a way that the world is not

fixed; either in ourselves or in our understanding of it? And, that is the case; we transform the world in changing our mental

understanding of it. The math that we use in understanding how do

we conceptualize that world; that changes our interaction with it, and we're a force of nature. We change the operation of the

forces of nature by improving our understanding of the world

around us and of ourselves and our ability to discover such things. How can we possibly think about that quality of change?

As a couple of other examples, think about the difference between what you might say is a fixed object – let's say iron oxide. Iron oxide is basically rust; it's a mineral that's rust.

It's reddish brown, it's not terribly useful; but with the development of metallurgy, instead of being a deposit of some compound, it's now a resource. It's an ore from which we can create iron and steel. The substance itself, did it change chemically? It did in terms of the potential of what we could do

with it. And remember, we're a force of nature; we changed what

it was. It has to be thought of that way.

Or, what's the value of a technology? How does it change over time? In the 1400s, windmills were a great invention; they

were somewhat new on the scene. They allowed pumping water, they

allowed grinding grain. That's excellent; that's a breakthrough.

Are windmills valuable today for making electricity? I don't think so. Consider helium; helium is an interesting element. It

was first discovered in the Sun, not on Earth. It was discovered

in the Sun by the kind of light that came from the Sun when that

light was broken up into a rainbow with a prism, and certain bands of the absence or presence of color were the clue that there was a new element out there named helium, after Helios, the

Sun. That element, what's it used for? You might think of it's being used to fill up balloons for children; you might think of

it being used as a gas for cooling for physical purposes or for experiments. It's also, as Helium-3, an ideal fuel for fusion. So, this substance transforms its meaning based on our developing understanding. How can we think about this?

Well, let's take the example of Bernhard Riemann. In 1854, Bernhard Riemann delivered a presentation and a paper on the subject of the hypotheses that underlie geometry. That might sound like a dry title; it might sound like it has nothing to do with physical economy or anything that we'd want to be doing right now. But this paper is very important in the view of Lyndon LaRouche for his own development and as a way of understanding economics. So, let's say why. Very briefly, Riemann points out that our conception of space itself and of the way things operate in space is taken for granted. The ideas that we use to understand it, they don't really come from experiments per se, or from physical theories; they come from our thoughts about space.

For example, the idea that space has no particular characteristics of its own; that was the view of Isaac Newton. Newton said space is uniform, it's out there; things occur within space. Space is there first, it's just space; it has no characteristics in particular. Newton said the same thing about time; that time flows on uniformly. That's what time is; it's really not much of a definition, or an understanding. Geometric ideas that people had, for example, are the idea that if you add up the angles in a triangle, you get 180 degrees. Now, if you're drawing triangles on flat paper, yes that's true;

if you draw them on a curved surface like a sphere, it's not true. Triangles on a sphere have more than 180 degrees in them.

If you then ask, "What if I draw a triangle in space?"; that's a

tough question. When we connect points in space, is the space between them flat, is it curved? How could we discover that, and

what would be the basis of it having a curvature if it wasn't flat?

What Riemann does, is he discusses through all the possible ways that this could come about. He discusses in general, curvature – both of surfaces and of space; how a space could be

curved. He works out in general how you could do that; but he can't answer the question. He says, to answer the question, "What's the nature of the space, and which processes unfold?"; you have to leave the department of mathematics and you have to

go to the physics department. You can't answer questions like that just be pure reasoning; you got to have a hypothesis – "What physically makes space?" And in this way, he's coming back

to the view of Gottfried Leibniz, who, just to say very briefly,

Leibniz and Newton totally disagreed on a number of subjects. People may have heard of the dispute over their invention of the

calculus; did Leibniz steal it from Newton, or vice versa? But there's a lot more there.

One of the major disputes they had was about space. Newton's view was that space and time were absolute; and Leibniz's view that space was a way of understanding co-occurrences. The relationship of things that are here at the same time – that's space; and for Leibniz, time was the evolution of things, how things change. But time didn't have its own existence. Now, that's precisely what Einstein took up in his theories of

relativity; he did what Riemann said had to be done. He didn't finish the job; but he did what Riemann said had to be done. Einstein overthrew, in a very specific way, the outlook of Newton; Einstein showed that space was not flat, that it was bent

in special relativity, that it was curved in general relativity.

And very importantly, the basis of its shape, the basis of how things interact over distances – that sense of space – was based not on what a mathematician might imagine, but on what a physicist hypothesizes. Einstein hypothesized an equivalence between different observers that the laws of nature shouldn't depend on whether you're moving; something that Leibniz also said

very explicitly. Einstein considered that light moved at the same

speed to any observer; something he had been pondering since he

was a pretty young man. And he hypothesized that gravitation would transform the shape of space; that straight lines wouldn't

be straight to the extent that gravity is affecting them. This is

what was seen with the experiments about the position of stars around the eclipse of the Sun, performed earlier during Einstein's life; and it's seen in the recent verification of gravity waves.

So, most people acknowledge that Einstein, OK, this is physically important; this is a scientist, he discovered things.

What does it have to do with this other point, though, about understanding humanity, and our role in economy, and our creation

in economy? Well, what Riemann did was, he made it possible to say that human discovery is a force of nature; it reshapes nature, it transforms our understanding about the objects around



us. And the basis of that world outside of us, can't be considered independently of our increasing knowledge about it. What we know about the world around us changes it, in that it changes our ability to interact with it.

So, if we're looking for a real idea of what economics is, throw away any sense of monetarism that says money made in a whorehouse is just as valuable as money made in a steel plant; and instead say, "How do we foster scientific discovery? How do

we foster its social implementation through technologies that physically improve our power over nature and our ability to provide improving standards of living and promote the general welfare of human beings?" If this is our basis of economics, fostering that kind of outlook, then I think we can say that Gottfried Leibniz was the first physical economist in that sense.

I'll just reference to the show on Leibniz from earlier this week, and one of the documents I cited there; Leibniz's paper on

the creation of a society for science and economy in Germany. And

I think if you read that paper, you'll be astonished at how Leibniz pulls together both promotion of discovery, how that works, what kind of thoughts are needed, how people should work

together, and how to implement those thoughts to improve people's

lives to the betterment of mankind. And that really has to be the

basis of our economics.

One simple rough measure, proposed by LaRouche to measure this, is the potential population density. How many people can be

supported in a given area? That's a measure that is fixed for animals. For a certain kind of environment, the number of deer that can live there; deer don't change that. Human beings do.

And

as a rough measure of economic progress, we could take that value. What's the potential population that we're able to support? The ability to use these thoughts is one that is not being expressed in the trans-Atlantic at present. In our discussion today, Mr. LaRouche talked about the positive impact

that Riemann had had on Italian science. Riemann had tuberculosis, and spent a good deal of time later in life – he didn't live that long – but later in his short life in Italy; where thoughts from Riemann influenced the development of hydrodynamics, stretching all the way into the time of airplanes

and the consideration of getting out into space.

Today, this overall outlook is best represented by Russia, and especially at present, by China. So, this doesn't have to be

a purely Chinese development; this is clearly something that we

can take up as a mission for ourselves to contribute to here in

the United States and in the nations around the globe. And we've

got very special and precious people in the past that we can look

to for insights in how to make the next breakthroughs in developing our understanding of what it is to be human, the basis

of human culture, and how best to advance human economy.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Jason. Now, as Jason just mentioned, and as I said in the beginning, really right now you

do see the initiative – the economic and the scientific initiative – being taken by China to lead mankind into the future; especially with the space program. You also see the initiative being taken by Russia; and this is very clearly illustrated this week with the actions that have been taken by

Russia in Syria. The strategic initiative lies in Putin's actions there. As Mr. LaRouche emphasized, Putin is setting the agenda; he is constantly on the flank. You can see this going back to the chemical weapons, where Putin took the initiative to say fine, we will help Assad dismantle these chemical weapons. It can be seen with the decision to intervene, a few months back, by Putin into the situation in Syria; and then with the pull-out that happened earlier this week. What's clear is that every step along the way, Putin's actions have caught Washington and Obama by surprise; constantly breaking profile. And this is what's called "taking the flank" in a military sense. There's clear precedence, as Mr. LaRouche always uses the example, of Douglas MacArthur's actions in Inchon. You always, always act on the surprise. Now, this was illustrated I think just anecdotally very well in an article that was published March 15th – Tuesday of this week – in the {New York Times}, with a very apropos headline which read "Putin's Syria Tactics Keep Him at the Fore, and Leave Everyone Else Guessing". I just want to read the first paragraph of that article, actually, because I think it just describes very vividly what we mean by this:

"President Vladimir Putin's order to withdraw the bulk of Russian forces from Syria seemingly caught Washington, Damascus, and everyone in between off guard; just the way the Russian

leader likes it. By all accounts, Mr. Putin delights in creating surprises."

So, this is the subject of our institutional question for this week; which Mr. LaRouche had some very specific words to say

in response to, which I'm going to let Jeff elaborate on for us.

But let me just read the text of this question to start off.

"Mr. LaRouche, as you know, earlier this week, at the start of the Geneva Peace Talks, Russian President Vladimir Putin announced that he ordered the withdrawal of some of the Russian

military forces in Syria. The withdrawal of Russian fighter planes began the next day and has continued. A residual force will remain at the naval base at Tartus and at the air base in Latakia. How do you view Putin's decision? How might it impact the Russian, American, and United Nations efforts to bring the Syrian war to an end, now underway in Geneva?"

STEINBERG: Of course, we've taking up the bulk of this week's report with a discussion about man's extraterrestrial imperative; the need for man to get off of the planet Earth, because man was never an Earthbound creature. So, we're at a point right now where Mr. LaRouche was delighted in our discussion earlier today at the prospect of over the next two years, China going through the preparations for the launching of

an orbiter that will be hopefully landing on the back side of the

Moon. And will for the first time, give mankind a window into the

Solar System and the Galaxy beyond. And this is something of enormous importance and enormous excitement, because it puts this

nature of man as an extraterrestrial creature capable through creative discovery, of not remaining Earthbound, but of

exploring

the near Solar System and beyond. And it reminds me that virtually every astronaut and cosmonaut who has travelled in space, has remarked at one point or other, that having the vantage point of looking down on Earth, you become at one point

overwhelmed with the fact that so much of what goes on, on the planet of Earth, is trivial relative to the challenges that are

very obvious when you look at man from the standpoint of man's ability to explore the Universe and make these kinds of discoveries. And it was that approach that actually informed our

discussion about the Syria situation per se. Because as Matt said, Russian President Putin has demonstrated once again that he

has a certain understanding that at the core of grand strategy is

always the idea of continuously moving; continuously flanking; continuously confusing your adversaries by constantly being on this kind of offensive.

So, we do have the developments of the past days, where at the very moment that the Geneva second round of peace talks were

beginning, President Putin announced a draw-down of the Russian

military forces inside Syria. And in fact, the very next morning

– Tuesday morning of this week – the first Russian bombers and other air force equipment and personnel began leaving. Now, the

Russians are there still; make no mistake about it. Russia has established a fundamental change in the situation on the ground,

which is both a military shift and a shift at the diplomatic table taking place right now in Geneva. Russia has a permanent naval base fully established and more secured than at any time

previously at the port of Tartus; and it has now a major air force facility in the Latakia province. And more recently this week, yesterday President Putin issued a statement where he said,

if the circumstances change, if the peace process does not go forward, then Russian forces can be reinforced in Syria, not in a

matter of days, but in a matter of hours. And quite clearly, the

infrastructure is in place for that to happen.

But Mr. LaRouche wanted to make a larger and much more fundamental point about what is going on here. What he emphasized

is that you can't lose sight of the fact that the war is still going on. We don't know how things are going to play out; what we

do know, is that there has been a change of conditions. In fact,

there was a major change of conditions beginning on September 30th of last year, when the major Russian military presence began. And when the situation systematically shifted from that point on, and yet at the same time, certain leading political figures around the world – the spokesman for the Jordanian government; Steffan de Mistura, the UN representative for Syria

– they all said, "We're not surprised by President Putin's announcement this past Monday." In the case of the Jordanians, the chief of staff of the Jordanian military, the chief of staff

of the Syrian military, were both in Moscow last October; and they met with Russian Defense Minister Shoigu, they met with President Putin. And they were told quite clearly that the Russian mission was not a permanent mission; but was a limited mission in both size and in time duration. And that when the circumstances reached the point where it was feasible to reach a

diplomatic solution to the Syria crisis, that the Russian

forces

would begin to be withdrawn.

As Matt pointed out with the {New York Times} coverage, people in the West were scratching their heads, because they refused to take note of the fact that Putin is a strategic thinker. And very often, what he says – in most cases, in fact – is exactly what he intends to do; but he's not going to do it

in a predictable fashion. He's going to do it in a way that will

catch you by surprise. And the biggest surprise is that most political thinkers in the West, most officials in government in

the West, are ignorant and prejudiced. So, their own prejudices

prevent them from understanding how Putin thinks about these things. Their own prejudices prevent them from understanding because they're incapable of thinking in this kind of a strategic

fashion. Now the problem is, that we're still in a state of warfare; and that state of warfare will continue until certain things occur that go way beyond the borders of Syria.

Until the British Empire ceases to exist, there will be a condition of warfare on this planet. We see it, not necessarily

in the form of warfare that most people think about – soldiers shooting, artillery pieces firing, bombers dropping bombs. Look

what's happening right now in Brazil. The British Empire is waging a war against the new emerging Asia-Pacific-centered global system. They're trying to destabilize Brazil, which is a

founding member of the BRICS. There's a similar effort underway

to destabilize the Zuma government in South Africa; because South Africa is the latest country to join in the BRICS initiative.

So, there are all kinds of problems going on; you can't look for a simply linear expectation or projection of what's going to happen by the situation now ongoing on the ground in Syria or in Geneva. Another example: President Obama is taking a series of measures that will lead unavoidably – unless they're reversed – to a major confrontation between the United States and China. We had a report earlier this week from David Ignatius in the {Washington Post}, who is very often a kind of reliable leak sheet for what's going on inside the administration. And the Obama administration is preparing for confrontation with China over the South China Sea; they're waiting for a ruling from the World Court in the Hague on a complaint filed by the Philippines. So the United States is preparing contingencies for poking China in the eye, for carrying out new provocations against China. The sanctions that President Obama announced this week, ostensibly against North Korea, are in fact sanctions against China; they go way beyond what was agreed upon by China and the United States at the United Nations. So, if you take all of these factors into account, and if you think of them as a process, not simply as a series of discrete events, then you get a very clear idea of what Mr. LaRouche means when he says that the planet, in general terms, is in a state of war. Now, ultimately what this state of warfare comes down to, is the fact that you have a new emerging Asia-Pacific-centered future. It's defined by the economic initiatives of China, by the One Belt-One Road policy, and



most

emphatically by China's systematic plan for collaborating with other nations on the kind of space exploration that once was a hallmark of American policy; but has not been abandoned.

President Obama has spent the last seven years systematically taking down and dismantling America's space capability; and Kesha

is leading the fight to reverse that process.

Over the last 15 years, if you look at the Bush/Cheney administration followed by the Obama administration, the United

States has been under British occupation. Both Bush/Cheney and Obama were each, in their own way, governments that were at the

beck and call of the British Empire, of the policies of the British financial oligarchy operating through Wall Street. And as

the result, the United States, really the entire trans-Atlantic

region, is dead. Germany was once a great prospering economy; the

result of the "economic miracle" that Franklin Roosevelt envisioned for the post-World War II period; no replay of Versailles, but a completely different approach. Germany has now

been destroyed by the policies largely coming from the British Empire. All of continental Europe is hopelessly and irreversibly

bankrupt; and Mario Draghi's announcement of an expansion of quantitative easing and a zero interest rate policy is a reflection that certain people are desperate over the fact that

Europe is doomed, that the United States under present circumstances. We've talked in recent months on this broadcast about the death rate increase in the United States; the true rate

of unemployment; the epidemic of heroin addiction and heroin

overdose deaths; the declining life expectancy in the United States. These are all measures of the fact that the trans-Atlantic region is dead; and will only begin to reverse that death if there is a revolutionary, fundamental change in policy. That alternative policy is being carried out in the Eurasian and Asia-Pacific region; led by China, led by Russia, reflected in the way that Russian President Putin has navigated the strategic situation.

So, the great threat is coming from the fact that a dying British Empire – which is irreversibly doomed – is lashing out and is trying to preserve something that can no longer be preserved. There was a time when the British Empire could impose

petty tyrannies on countries around the world and achieve a certain limited degree of stability. That's over with. All of the

efforts within the framework of the mindset of the British Empire, the mindset of the Obama administration, the mindset of

virtually all European leaders – the French probably the worst of the bunch on the continent – is doomed; it doesn't work. Yet,

there is an opportunity; and opportunity for all of mankind in what's going on in the Asia-Pacific region, led by China, by Russia. India is clearly stepping in to play a significant role

in this new emerging combination, cooperation among nations for

purposes that go beyond national interests, but address the interests of all of mankind. Egypt is fully established as orienting towards that new Asia-Pacific combination.

So, this is the larger picture; this is the framework for judging the initiative taken by President Putin this week. And it

must be judged from the standpoint of the global consequences; and not just simply the consequences for the immediate

negotiations around Syria. Although his actions this week have certainly greatly improved the possibility of bringing that five-year tragedy to an end.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Jeff. I would just add, the initiative being taken by these countries also very much has to

do with the decades-long work Mr. Lyndon LaRouche and Mrs. Helga

LaRouche have undertaken. The One Belt-One Road policy that China

has adopted, is the Eurasian Land-Bridge policy which the LaRouche movement uniquely championed in the beginning of the 1990s. Now, you have an evolution of that to the World

Land-Bridge; and this is what is documented so thoroughly in the

350-page Special Report that was issued by {Executive Intelligence Review} called "The New Silk Road Becomes the World

Land-Bridge". One very exciting announcement, because you mentioned Egypt, just this week there was a very high-level event

which was sponsored by the Transportation Ministry in Cairo; featuring a LaRouche collaborator, Hussein Askary, to announce the formal publication of the Arabic language of this full, 350-page World Land-Bridge Special Report from {Executive Intelligence Review}.

So, you can see that at the very highest levels of government around the world, this is what is shaping the discussion; the initiatives that the LaRouche movement have taken

for decades. And one final note along those same lines, as we announced last Friday, Mrs. Helga LaRouche just got back from a

very important trip to India; at which she was one of the featured speakers in a very prominent, very high-level dialogue

– the Raisina Dialogue. And if people have not seen it yet, a wonderful half-hour interview that Jason Ross conducted with Mrs.

LaRouche was posted on the LaRouche PAC website earlier this week. So, if you haven't watched that yet, I would really encourage you to watch it; and to just think about everything that has been said here today. Think about these initiatives that

are being taken by some of the world's leading countries to create the future; and think about the role that the LaRouche movement has played over years and decades in shaping the possibility of these initiative being taken today.

So, thank you all very much for joining us here today. I'd like to thank Kesha Rogers for joining us over video; and I would

like to thank Jeff and Jason here in the studio. Please stay tuned to [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com). Good night.

---

# **Økonomisk kollaps = Fascistiske stemmer i Europa og USA; DER FINDES ET VIRKELIGT ALTERNATIV**

*14. marts 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC)* – Den kinesiske avis *Global Times* udgav i dag et indsigtfuldt synspunkt på afstand i det truende kollaps af visse amerikanske institutioner og udbruddet af massestøtte til en præsidentkandidat à la Mussolini – som, bemærker avisen, bryder frem som følge af

økonomisk nedgang.

»Trumps tilhængere består for det meste af hvide fra den lavere klasse, og de mistede meget efter finanskrisen i 2008«, skrev avisen. »USA plejede at have den største og mest stabile middelklasse i den vestlige verden, men mange har oplevet en nedtur. Så var det, at Trump dukkede op. Stor i munden, antitraditionel, direkte med indslag af overgreb, er han den perfekte populist, der havde let ved at provokere offentligheden ... han er endda blevet kaldt en ny Benito Mussolini eller Adolf Hitler af nogle vestlige medier ... USA konfronteres med udsigten til fiasko for de etablerede institutioner, der meget vel kunne blive udløst af en voksende mængde problemer i det virkelige liv.«

Det samme sker i hele Europa, hvor et mønster, der spredte sig, med stemmer til den ekstreme højrefløj, som vi atter så det i denne weekend, hvor partiet AfD, Alternativ for Tyskland, skød frem med 15-20 % af stemmerne i valget i nogle af forbundsstaterne, efter at partiets leder truede med at skyde immigranter på stedet. AfD's stemmeprocent svarede i bogstavelig forstand til arbejdsløshedsprocenten i den ene stat efter den anden.

Vi befinder os i realiteten i en tilstand med institutionernes sammenbrud i USA og Europa. Det kommer efter 15 år med økonomisk stagnation, massearbejdsløshed og indkomsttab, samt en hel stribe af frygtelige krige, som blev startet af Bush og Obama, samt af disse let bevæbnede, men rasende krigere, Storbritanniens Cameron og Frankrigs Hollande. Der har været så mange af disse massemordskrige, at den seneste, med Obama, Cameron og Hollande, der hjælper Saudi-Arabien med at ødelægge Yemen, knap nok omtales i de fleste medier.

Obama kan stilles for en rigsret alene pga. disse forfatningsstridige krige.

Men, hvad der er værre end tabet af respekt for nogen

institution, så blev USA's og dets borgeres mission – på den fremskudte grænse af teknologisk fremskridt – dræbt af Obama, da han afsluttede NASA's planer for udforskningen af Månen og rummet.

En genopbygning af NASA's programmer – der mobiliserer amerikanernes kreativitet i en genoplivning af USA's rumudforskningsfremtid – er den centrale kraft, der kan vende dette kollaps omkring.

De økonomiske midler hertil er dem, der stod deres prøve under præsident Franklin Roosevelt, for at løse problemet med Wall Street og skabe statskredit til en økonomisk genrejsning. Men, det større mål er atter at have denne mission, menneskehedens fremtid i rummet.

Anfører af denne missions genrejsning er den demokratiske LaRouche-leder Kesha Rogers fra Texas, der identificerer dette som den enkelte, sikre vej til at vende det økonomiske kollaps, som Kinas *Global Times* ser. Og hun kræver, at dette gøres i samarbejde med især Kina, som nu er den nation, der hurtigst går frem i rummet og i opbygning af infrastruktur på Jorden.

---

**Lyndon LaRouche:**  
**»Vi må have en udvikling mod**

# **frihed; og udgangspunktet kan kun være indsigt i, hvad der er det sande og gode«**

**Lyndon LaRouche, 12. marts 2016:**

»Jeg ville sige, at, i USA netop nu, i den grad, hvor nogle af os bidrager med nye indsigter i, hvad USA kan blive til, at vi må have en udvikling mod frihed. For problemet er, at de folk, der ikke kan lide os, der ikke kan lide frihed, er problemet. Men spørgsmålet bliver derfor, hvad er frihed? Nogle mennesker siger, »min idé om frihed er det her«, og deres idé om frihed er så ikke det.

Så pointen er, at der må være en sammenhæng, en aftale, baseret på fornuftig indsigt i den praktiske udførelse. Dette er, hvad der altid har fungeret i nationer. Dette er, hvad der har destrueret nationer! Napoleon destruerede nationer! Briterne har altid destrueret nationer! De specialiserer i det; og dette har været kun alt for sandt i historien.

Så man har altså det, at dannelsen af regering er baseret på ødelæggelsen af særskilte regeringer, på konflikt, mord. Jeg tænker på det, Tyrkiet nu gør, diktaturet i Tyrkiet. Men dette er ikke en karakteristisk af tyrkerne; dette er en karakteristisk ... for jeg ved noget om tyrkerne og deres historie. Jeg har været tæt associeret med nogle af heltene i Tyrkiet. Og lignende ting er sande for andre ting. Der er ingen grund til, at vi bør sige, at der er et naturligt had, en naturlig konflikt blandt folkeslagene i verden! Det er ikke naturligt. Det faktum, at der er konflikt, er ofte et u-

naturligt produkt.

For, når folk ser, hvad det gode er, når mennesket ser, hvad det gode er, i praksis, så vil man finde, at de ikke ønsker at gøre den slags ting, som tyrannerne gerne vil frembringe. Spørgsmålet er, vi opstiller argumenterne for, hvad bør det gode være? Hvad er det, vi bør gøre, som er det gode? Hvad er bedre? Det er, hvad det handler om.

Og alle de andre ting er nonsens. Mennesket er forpligt... Hvor står vi f.eks. nu? Bare for lige at afbryde mig selv. Hvor er vi nu? Vi er på randen af en generel atomkrig over hele planeten, og udover selve planeten. Og denne ting kan ske, lige nu, i den form for krig, som netop nu bliver planlagt, som kan ødelægge hele planeten, og planetens mennesker, netop nu! Og spørgsmålet bliver derfor, hvordan kan vi forhindre dette i at ske? Og hvordan gør vi det, uden at gå ud i en eller anden form for underkastelse under dette, eller underkastelse under hint? Nej! Det må komme fra en indsigt i, hvad sandhed er, hvad menneskeheden er, hvad menneskeheden må være. Og mange mennesker, ligesom – jeg tror, man kunne sige, at Putin er et ret godt eksempel på en model – forsøger at gøre præcis dette. Og der er mennesker i andre dele af verden, der har til hensigt at gøre dette.

Og det er, hvad vi må gøre. Vi ser dette med Kina, med Rusland og med andre dele af planeten nu. Vi ser, at disse nationale enheder kommer sammen, og de går ikke bare i seng med hinanden, men det er en proces af at erkende, at de må arbejde sig igennem det, ved hvilket deres fælles interesser fremmes, på en bevidst og progressiv måde.

Og det er, hvad vi forsøger at gøre. Se på, hvad Kina gør. Indien forsøger at arbejde sig igennem her. Andre dele af verden forsøger at arbejde sig igennem denne proces. Det er denne form for mål, denne form for proces, hvor man siger – og det udmunder i, når man begynder at tale om rumprogrammet. Man taler om Månens bagside. Hvad gør Kina? Kina har kig på Månens



bagside, og Månens bagside er det, Kina forsøger at finde ud af: Hvad er den virkelige betydning af det her, Månens bagside? Og Kina er ved at mobilisere for de næste to generationer, blot for dette formål. Og det er ikke bare en hensigt, men det er et begyndelsessted for at forstå, hvordan menneskeheden, jord-mennesket, kan spille en rolle i at udforme galaksen. Og galaksen er det mål, som menneskeheden bør have for øje netop nu.«

**John Ascher (mødeleder):** Jeg vil blot lige nævne her, at alle de temaer, du netop berørte, vil blive temaer for en meget vigtig konference, som bliver afholdt den 7. april i Manhattan, sponsoreret af Schiller Institutet, om spørgsmålet om, hvad det nødvendige begreb om menneskeheden er; og at få USA til at tilslutte sig Verdenslandbroen. Vi har en invitation, og forsøger at få denne konference, der kommer den 7. april, til at blive det store gennembrud. Og det, som hr. LaRouche netop gennemgik, er præcis temaet for denne konference, inklusive spørgsmålet om rumprogrammet og videnskab som drivkraft.

*Ovenstående er et uddrag af webcastet The Manhattan Projekt med Lyndon LaRouche, fra 12. marts. Hele videoen kan ses her: <https://larouchepac.com/20160312/larouchepac-manhattan-project-town-hall-lyndon-larouche-march-12-2016>*

---

## Nancy Reagans død betegner 'Afslutningen af en bestemt

# æra'

7. marts 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – Det transatlantiske systems kollaps er en dødbringende situation – fra det fysiske, økonomiske sammenbrud, til den finansielle nedsmeltnings kaos, til faren for krig og den rædselsvækkende virkning af det rådne opbud af kandidater til det amerikanske valg og dettes forløb. Det, der kræves under disse irrationelle omstændigheder, er en rationel respons. Der findes løsninger. Netop en sådan rationel respons er i gang i form af det fremstød, der kommer fra Ruslands og Kinas ledere, for samarbejde om rummet, videnskab, økonomisk udvikling i Eurasien og hele verden, og om fred. I sidste uge blev det under nationale møder i Beijing fastslået, at rumforskning nu vil blive en integreret del af Kinas økonomiske innovationsprogram. I USA leder LaRouchePAC's Kesha Rogers det politiske fremstød for at genrejse netop samme anskuelse, der oprindeligt var et varemærke for det Amerikanske System, og som NASA legemliggjorde.

I dag satte Lyndon LaRouche spørgsmålet om lederskab ind i et umiddelbart, historisk perspektiv med reference til Nancy Reagans død i søndags. Han sagde, at, hvis man tager perioden fra Ronald Reagans valg til præsidentskabet i 1980, i frem til Nancys død, så er det et tegn på, at »en ganske bestemt æra netop er afsluttet«. Reagan legemliggjorde en kvalitetsstandard for lederskab. Han var en meget dygtig person. LaRouche talte om sin forbindelse med ham, og nu om mindet om hans hustru.

I den ny æra, der nu er i gang, handler krisen ikke kun om fraværet af lederskabskvalitet, men om den udbredte fjendtlighed over for en sådan kvalitet. Folk i det transatlantiske område – Vesten – bliver mere og mere vanvittige. Men vi kan ikke desto mindre, hvis vi intervenserer med rationalitet for at levere lederskabet, komme til undsætning og have held med vores forehavende.

Fjendens deployering er intens, med fremstød imod BRIKS og mod krig. Ingen anden end selveste den britiske krones tjener Ambrose Evans Pritchard er på scenen i Sao Paulo, hvor han udgiver en artikel fra 7. marts om, at »BRIKS-fantasien« nu er forbi, og at »BRIKS-konceptet er blevet meningsløst ...« Han hævder, at »Brasilien er den første af BRIKS-kvintetten, der bryder sammen på så mange fronter på samme tid«, og at Sydafrika, Rusland og Kina alle er plaget af problemer. Han hævder, at kun Indien stadig har »vind i sejlene« – hvilket i realiteten refererer til beskidte, angloamerikanske tricks for at forsøge at få Indien til at blive 'den sidste, stående BRIK'.

Med hensyn til den relaterede, forrykte militære oprustningsfront, så er de største militære øvelser nogen sinde – kaldet Key Resolve – nu i gang mellem USA og Sydkorea. Med et opbud af 17.000 amerikanske styrker og 300.000 stk. sydkoreansk personel vil øvelserne vare i otte uger. Dette finder sted på et tidspunkt, hvor der er skarpe spændinger med Nordkorea, i betragtning af den kumulative virkning af årevis med geopolitik.

I **LaRouchePAC's ugentlige TV Policy Committee-udsendelse** i dag formandede Lyndon LaRouche, »Det er slutningen på det gamle system. Det må erstattes af et andet. Det kan gøres.«

Det er farligt. Bliv ikke bange.

---

## Galsskab pulserer igennem USA

8. marts 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – Præsident Obama holdt i mandags et møde i Det Hvide Hus for at fejre Dodd/Frank-lovens succesfulde forhindring af et nyt kollaps, som det i 2008. Eneste problem er, at hele det transatlantiske

finanssystem er i frit fald, suget ned af værdiløs spillegæld til en 'værdi' af omtrent 2 billiarder dollar, og som Dodd-Frank intet har gjort for at forhindre – men tværtimod har fremmet. De vestlige økonomier står og vipper på randen, mens befolkningerne bliver ødelagt af den værste narkoepidemi i Vestens historie, og af selvmord, der begås af desperate, midaldrende, arbejdsløse arbejdere.

I mellemtiden gør Obama og hans kontrollers i London alt, hvad der står i deres magt, for at bringe den eneste del af verden, der fungerer – Rusland og Kina – til fald. Øverst på deres »dødsliste« står BRIKS, der repræsenterer podekrystallen til et nyt verdensparadigme, baseret på udvikling, rumforskning og »win-win«-samarbejde nationerne imellem, som Xi Jinping beskriver det. Den kinesiske udenrigsminister Wang Yi sagde i dag: »Bæltet-og-vejen er et projekt, som Kina lancerede, men mulighederne tilhører hele verden.«

Men Wang Yi måtte også advare USA om, at USA's indsats for at »forplumre vandene« ved at anstifte konflikt i Korea og i det Sydkinesiske Hav kunne »støde Asien ud i kaos«, og at Kina i så tilfælde ikke kunne se passivt til.

I Europa fortsætter NATO-ledere med at deployere større og større militære styrker op til den russiske grænse, som forberedelse til krig.

Alligevel har Putin flankeret dette krigsfremstød ved at intervenere i Syrien og knuse Obamas støtteapparat for terroristernes netværk, og ved at danne en arbejdende militær og politisk relation med de fornuftige elementer i det amerikanske militær for at gennemføre en våbenstilstand og tilintetgøre ISIS og al-Nusra. Putin viser nu, at han kan arbejde for fred såvel som at føre krig, og får hver dag flere og flere oppositionsgrupper til at gå med i våbenstilstanden og fokusere deres beskydning på ISIS' sidste tilbageværende bastioner.

Men, uden at vende USA omkring og tage kampen op med forbryderne i Det Hvide Hus og på Wall Street, vil den fremstormende, globale krig ikke kunne forhindres. De eksisterende institutioner er døde, som det bevises af den klovneforestilling, der kaldes præsidentvalgkampen 2016. For at skabe de krævede, nye institutioner, må den dræbende kultur rives ned gennem skønhed, en tilbagevenden til klassisk kultur og kreativitet, inden for musik, såvel som inden for videnskab.

I USA udgør LaRouche-bevægelsens 'Manhattan-projekt' og genrejsningen af NASA, med base i Texas, og den »Udenjordiske forpligtelse« (Krafft Ehricke) de uomgængelige startpunkter for en mobilisering af befolkningen til denne store opgave.

---

**En genrejsning af USA's  
økonomi med  
rumforskning som spydspids,  
og en  
international mission for  
menneskehedens  
fælles mål, som basis for en  
varig fred**

*Vi må genrejse fremtiden; og det begynder med kampen for at genoplive NASA. Og de gode nyheder er, at denne kamp nu er i gang; den er endnu i sit begyndelsesstadium, men det er en*

*kamp, der kan vindes. Og USA's fremtid ligger i vægtskålene.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

## **DOKUMENTATION:**

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 udartede 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«.

---

# Kun himlen sætter grænse for Kinas Nationale Strategi i ny femårsplan

6. marts 2016 – Sådan karakteriserer *Xinhua* udkastet til den 13. Femårsplan, der er blevet forelagt Den Nationale Folkekongres til gennemgang. For første gang, bemærker videnskabsmænd, anerkender planen for Kinas økonomiske vækst innovation som videnskabeligt fundament. Og Kina har til hensigt at være på den fremskudte grænse.

»I tusinder af år har tænkere kæmpet for at forstå universets oprindelse. Nu er dette spørgsmål blevet inkluderet, ligesom mere jordiske emner såsom landbrug, i Kinas nye plan for økonomisk og samfundsmæssig udvikling«, opsummerer artiklen.

Artiklen citerer den kinesiske forfatter Han Song: » ... ligesom oldtidens filosoffer Lao Tzu og Chuang Tzu for mere end 2.000 år siden, så tænker moderne tænkere over det store spørgsmål om eksistens. Fundamentale spørgsmål som dette har magt til at øve indflydelse på løsninger på nogle af de mest fremtrædende problemer, som samfundet og verden som helhed står overfor.«

Zhang Xinmin fra Instituttet for Højenergifysik, og som også er involveret i forskning i gravitationsbølger i Ali-programmet i Tibet, sagde, at uden forskning kan innovation i stor skala ikke opnås. På lignende måde udtalte Wu Ji, direktør for Kinas Rumforskningscenter, og som i løbet af den seneste uge har skitseret Kinas planer for videnskabelig rumforskning: »Hvis man ønsker at innovere, må man have viden



om videnskaberne. Rumforskning er uadskillelig fra Kinas innovationsdrevne udvikling«, der, som det rapporteres, er fokus for den næste femårsplan.

Ifølge Wu er en 15-årig strategi for rumforskning blevet udarbejdet af Centret, og som vil takle spørgsmål såsom universets dannelse og udvikling; udenjordisk intelligens; planeter uden for solsystemet samt andre spørgsmål. »Hvis Kina ønsker at blive en stærk, global nation«, formandede Wu, »bør det ikke kun varetage sine umiddelbare interesser, men også bidrage til menneskeheden. Kun dette kan vinde Kina verdens respekt.«

---

## **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 udartede 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*

# **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.*