

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 Ehrvervsudvalget

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-binds værk, "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.

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 milliard dollar værdiløse, spekulative finanspapirer med endnu en

billiard 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. 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. 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 finanskrakket 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 spreder 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 en 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 unaturligt 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 Instituttet, 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>

Galskab 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 podedkrytallen 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 arbejdsende 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 Ehrlicke) 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 Institutet 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 i Kina af en NASA-direktør.

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

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Intet kan lykkes uden opdagelsen af princippet om Månens bagside

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

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

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

Det transatlantiske samfund er en tabt sag netop nu; det kan ikke, og vil ikke, komme tilbage i denne form. Hvis det skal komme tilbage, må det fødes på ny. Resterne af det transatlantiske samfund, i denne form, er færdigt. Vi må skabe

en ny form for samfund, som det er blevet gjort i fortiden – af Karl den Store, f.eks. Det er, hvad vi må kæmpe for: en fremtid, som virkelig vil være en fremtid.

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

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

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

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

LaRouchePAC Internationale Fredags-Webcast 4. marts 2016:

Vi må udvikle rumprogrammet for hele menneskeheden. Engelsk udskrift

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

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening. It's March 4th, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden and you are joining us for our weekly broadcast here on Friday evenings for the LaRouche PAC webcast, at larouchepac.com. I'm joined in the studio this evening by Jeffrey Steinberg from {Executive Intelligence Review}, and Megan Beets from the LaRouche Pac Science Team. And Megan Beets just returned from a trip to Houston, Texas where she was involved in a very

significant event and other meetings with Kesha Rogers. Many of you might have seen the recording of this event, which was also live-streamed on this website last Saturday. It featured Tom Wismueller, and Kesha Rogers, as well as Megan Beets. We're going to begin our broadcast this evening with some remarks from Megan Beets, coming off the discussion that we had with Mr. LaRouche this morning. As many of you know, Mr. LaRouche has placed a premium on Kesha Rogers' role as a champion, a unique champion, of the resurgence of the United States space program. Kesha Rogers very aggressively campaigned for this cause in her three campaigns for Federal office that she has run so far – 2010, 2012, and 2014, in which she was the Democratic nominee two elections in a row, in the 22nd District of Texas, for the United States House of Representatives, and also ran an internationally profiled Senate campaign in 2014. So, without further adieu, I would like to ask Megan Beets to come to the podium to deliver a few opening remarks, and then after that, we'll feature some more discussion coming off of the meeting we had with Mr. LaRouche this morning, with Jeffrey Steinberg filling in some of those details.

MEGAN BEETS: Thanks, Matt. I can tell you from my visit to Texas that at this moment, when the breakdown of the trans-Atlantic system is undeniable – we're witnessing the complete malfunctioning and shutdown of this old system – we're also see the reopening of the space program down in Texas. Now the event that I was privileged to participate in with

Kesha and Tom Wismueller down in Texas, represents a real beginning of a change of direction of the United States, a rebirth, so to speak, of the United States as a nation. Now, the requirement today is that the United States dump our commitment, our addiction, to this dead, dying trans-Atlantic system, and decide once again to take up a mission in the sense of purpose and contribution to mankind.

Now, you look around today. You look around at our citizens. You look at the heroin epidemic. You look at the death, the self-induced deaths from drugs, from suicide, from alcoholism, and so forth. You look at the breakdown in cities like Flint, Michigan, the breakdown in places like certain counties of West Virginia that were once booming coal towns. There's no reflection in the United States of reality.

Now, what's reality? Look at the leadership coming from Asia, particularly from China. Look at the kinds of optimistic developments, the progress for humanity, that's coming from the leadership of China and their space program; and in their commitment to development projects which are beginning to take hold and take place all across Eurasia. That's reality. There's no reflection of this yet inside the United States. And so when we look around, it's not just that the U. S. economy has disappeared. The United States has disappeared. There's no sense of a unified purpose. There's no sense of a unified mission for the existence of the United States as a nation, and there's no sense within our people of what {we}, as a nation, will organize ourselves to contribute to the purposes of mankind.

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

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

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

NASA during the Apollo missions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

the

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

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

to pull together around a common mission, thousands and thousands

of people across the country to confront these challenges in our

knowledge about the Universe, and to conquer them.

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

We

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

the Moon.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

sense of meaning, this sense of mobilization and commitment to progress for all of mankind, which is what we, down in Texas, are

reminding people of. What Kesha is reminding people of – even people who participated in these great accomplishments 40 or 50

years ago, and who might have encountered now a sense of demoralization with the actions since that time. We're drawing people back out to a commitment of this mission. And Kesha is

showing once again that the United States can, and must, commit itself to this kind of purpose for all of mankind. So I can just conclude by reporting that the beginnings of these developments that we're seeing coming out of Texas, is that people down there still associate themselves with reality, and are now playing a leading role, with Kesha, in being moved toward recognizing that this is the viable option for the United States.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Megan. And like I said, if you haven't gotten a chance to see the recording of the event that occurred down in Texas last Saturday, it is archived on the larouchepac youtube channel, and I would encourage you to watch

it. It was a very uplifting event, and we can expect to hear much, much more from Kesha Rogers, obviously.

Now, the second item on our agenda tonight is something which you may have heard Mr. LaRouche emphasize during the discussion with the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee this past Monday. Towards the end of that show, you might have caught Mr.

LaRouche's reference to a series of very significant articles that were published in the {New York Times} over the weekend. They were titled: "Hillary Clinton, Smart Power, and a Dictator's

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

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

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

up

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

that decision on the inside of the Obama White House.

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

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

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

by the Clinton State Department and the Obama White House.

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

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

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

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

11 in Benghazi in which Ambassador Stevens and three other Americans were killed. However, I think this point to the more important discussion that should be being had: What was Hillary

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

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

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

One note I would say just before inviting Jeff up to the podium to discuss this more in detail, is the importance of the coincidence of the publication of these series of articles in the {New York Times} with Congresswoman Tulsi Gabbard's surprise announcement that she was resigning as vice-chair of the DNC in order to more aggressively campaign against Hillary Clinton, explicitly because of Hillary Clinton's identity as a strong and vocal advocate of the policy of regime change what Tulsi Gabbard has said she personally witnessed the tragic and disastrous consequences of on the ground in Iraq, after the decision to have regime change against Saddam Hussein. Tulsi Gabbard was active service military. And we saw the decision again in the case of Libya, and now we are confronting directly head-on whether or not that decision will be made in Syria. This also obviously has a lot to do with the context of Secretary of State John Kerry's efforts to create the framework for a ceasefire, along with Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov in Syria. Now, what I would like to ask Jeff to discuss at the podium is what Mr. LaRouche's take has been on the significance of these articles, and also the very precise timing of these articles being published right now, during this Presidential campaign season, and what the implications of this should be seen in terms of the ongoing fight behind the scenes continuing to this day in the Obama Administration.

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Thanks, Matt. Well, the two-part series, lengthy articles that were published late last week, early this week, in the New York Times bring back into stark relief and memory, the fact that the decision to overthrow and execute Qaddafi was not only a turning point in recent history. It unleashed a flood of instability. Massive amounts of weapons flooded out of Libya. All across Africa a structure was set up for laundering those weapons into Syria, where they ultimately wound up in the hands of both the al-Qaeda, and later the Islamic State forces. This has been a source of mass death, grave instability, throughout the entire Africa and Middle East region, and beyond.

Now, what the {New York Times} articles make clear is something that was well-known to us and which Mr. LaRouche commented on exhaustively as these events were playing out. But from the standpoint of the current elections and things related to the ongoing war danger, now at the threshold of the danger of a general war, a nuclear war, it's very important to reflect back on this.

Effectively, as the result of Hillary Clinton joining the White House, joining President Obama, joining Samantha Power, joining Susan Rice and Valerie Jarrett, in pressing for the violent overthrow of the Qaddafi government, the assassination of Qaddafi, and effectively the installation of the Muslim Brotherhood and al-Qaeda into power in Libya, this meant that Hillary Clinton had completely capitulated to Obama. Prior to that point, during the Obama administration, despite the fact that it was a grave political mistake on the part of Hillary Clinton to have become a part of the Obama Administration in

the first place, the fact is that she had generally aligned herself with Defense Secretary Gates, with General Dempsey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and had been a barrier to the worst kinds of British policies coming out of Obama, Jarrett, Rice, Power, and the others grouped around this President. Obama is a British agent, plain and simple, and that was one of the first points that Mr. LaRouche emphasized in our discussion earlier today. And he said, Look, Hillary Clinton was terrified into playing the role that she played in Libya. She was not the only person pushing for regime change; she was, in the words of Roberts Gates, "the tilt factor". The decisive vote in a very close 51-49 vote, where Gates himself, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, were opposed to launching the no-fly zone. Launching what was being mislabelled a humanitarian intervention, when from the very outset it was always about regime change. You've got to remember that the characteristic of the Obama Presidency is to be found in those Tuesday kill sessions; where the President sits down with a group of national security advisors, Cabinet members, representatives of the military and intelligence community, and makes life-or-death arbitrary decisions to add people's names to the kill lists. In some cases – we know in at least four instances – people were put on that kill list who were American citizens; who were deprived of any day in court, any due

process,
and were summarily assassinated. Whether by special forces,
whether by drone attacks, or combinations of both.
So, that's the character of the Obama administration. And
with the 2011 decision to overthrow Qaddafi, Hillary Clinton –
out of absolute fear – remember, you're dealing with a
President
who relishes the idea of coming up with weekly lists of
targets
for assassination. With that Libya decision, with Clinton's
decision to side with her own worst enemies, going all the way
back to the 2008 campaign when she campaigned against Barack
Obama; when Samantha Power publicly went out on the stump
calling
her a witch. When she capitulated and sided with those
British
forces in the Libya operation, she not only participated in
the
unleashing of absolute Hell across much of Africa and the
Middle
East region; but she caved in to people who, at an earlier
point,
she knew were absolutely despicable and were her avowed
enemies.
That capitulation is something that she will live with
forever.
Now, recently, in the course of reviewing the Africa events,
the Libya events, some additional information has come out
that
even puts a further punctuation point on the fact that there
was
a top-down decision in which Secretary Clinton participated,
along with President Obama, to overthrow Qaddafi; no questions
asked, no second thoughts. There's a very precise timeline
that
has been provided by a retired US Navy Rear Admiral named
Charles

Kubic, who was retired from the Navy and was a business man working in Libya – also a trained engineer. And when the United Nations Security Council passed the resolution to establish a no-fly zone and a “humanitarian corridor” around Benghazi – this was on March 19, 2011 – on that very day, Rear Admiral Kubic was contacted by people in the inner circle of Qaddafi; and they said, “Let’s talk.” Let’s not go with diplomatic formulations. Let’s immediately convene a battlefield 72-hour truce. And during that time, let’s discuss an orderly procedure for standing down the Libyan forces that were moving on Benghazi, and on an orderly transition of power. Qaddafi was prepared to leave Libya, to go into exile; to arrange a negotiated government to follow from him, and to basically stand down the Libyan forces that were, in fact, battling al-Qaeda and other jihadist networks in the area around Benghazi and Misurata inside Libya. Admiral Kubic conveyed immediately the approach that he had gotten from the head of Qaddafi’s personal security. He conveyed it to Stuttgart, Germany; it was reported to General Carter Ham, the head of the Africa Command, and General Ham responded favorably. Details were being worked out the very next day to convene exactly this kind of battlefield truce and negotiating process; either in Tripoli, or right off the shores of Libya on a designated US military ship. And in fact, there was a halt on the part of Qaddafi of the military movement toward Benghazi and Misurata. So, in other words, everything was there within the first 24 hours of when the bombing began of Libya, for the

conflict to stop right there; for Qaddafi's departure; for none of the death and destruction that followed to actually take place. On the evening of March 20, 2011, General Carter Ham issued a statement saying that the United States had no interest in targetting Qaddafi. That was the return signal that the Libyans were looking for, coming from AFRICOM, that the negotiations could begin perhaps as early as the next morning. However that entire situation was cancelled; Admiral Kubic was ordered to stand down, to drop the contact. AFRICOM was ordered to stand down and abandon any plans for any such negotiation for Qaddafi's departure. Because the decision had been made "higher up in the administration" that there would be no turning back; that this was a regime change operation, and in fact, a part of that was the fact that the British – who had agents inside the inner circle of Qaddafi's own personal security detail – were the ones who fingered his location and set up his assassination later that year. So, in other words, the destruction of Libya, the destruction of Africa, that came in part as a measure of Hillary Clinton's capitulation to President Obama, and above all else, to the British; could have been at least short-circuited and the worst damage prevented. The death of Ambassador Stephens and the three other American officials a year and later probably could have been averted. But none of that happened, because there was a willful decision; undoubtedly the decision was made in London,

was passed in through Obama. And rather than fighting against that, Hillary Clinton capitulated; and it was out of a fear of Obama, out of a fear that this was a killer President. There were a number of opportunities where she had the possibility to

resign and put the spotlight where it properly belonged; but none of those things happened.

And as the result of that, all of the African continent is now one extended battle zone. As the result of that, we have the

existence of the Islamic State; because Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Qatar flooded Syria and Iraq with the kinds of weapons that had

been derived from what was at one point a secured Qaddafi arsenal

of all kinds of weapons. And those weapons have now spread chaos, death, and destruction across that entire swath of North

Africa and the Middle East. That's the legacy, that's the consequence of the fact that, as Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton failed to uphold her responsibilities; capitulated to her

own worst avowed enemies in the Obama administration, and unfortunately, the rest is history.

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

targets were Russia and China; and that these events in 2011 were

the beginning of a process that would now accelerate towards the

general warfare – potentially thermonuclear warfare – involving

the United States, Russia, and China. So, look back with a certain degree of hindsight, and understand the consequences of

what happened in that critical moment of March of 2011; and see how all of the events that have followed from that, and why we are on the verge of a potential thermonuclear war of annihilation of mankind. Understand how critical decisions in critical moments, shape events for long periods of time to come.

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

So, the question reads as follows: "Mr. LaRouche, the US Department of Commerce has imposed a 265% tariff on Chinese cold-rolled steel. The Department of Commerce stated that the tariffs are meant to punish China for dumping cold-rolled steel onto the market; which is used to make auto parts, appliances, and shipping containers. In your view, will these imposed tariffs help the US steel industry? And if not, what measures do you recommend to revitalize our steel industry?"

STEINBERG: Well, the first thing that Mr. LaRouche said

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

Now, the fact of the matter is, that on a global scale centered in the trans-Atlantic region, you have a significant collapse in physical economic output. Real production in the United States has collapsed; we've gone through 15 consecutive months of a decline in industrial output. The shale oil and gas sector collapse is a small piece at the tail end of a 40-year process of economic collapse, disintegration, out-sourcing of what little real economic activity was going on. So the idea that a tariff, at this point, is going to protect a domestic industry that collapsed over the past 40 years, is an act of desperation; when in fact, we need real creative thinking. Now, {Executive Intelligence Review} has recently – we've talked about it on this show before – produced a supplement to the World Land-Bridge report, called "The United States Must Join the World Land-Bridge"; and it lays out a clear game plan for a genuine economic revival of the United States. It starts by shutting down Wall Street; they're hopelessly bankrupt. And the bankruptcy of Wall Street is now in the process of advancing the disintegration of the real economy of the United States; and the real economy of the United States means the American people. When we were discussing earlier today with Mr. LaRouche, he said, "Look, what's the most chilling indication of the real rate of collapse of the US economy? It's the exponential increase in the number of people dying of heroin overdoses; it's the number of people, the exponential rise in the number of people committing suicide in other ways, as well. It's the desperation and demoralization of a population that was once inspired, that was

once the most productive population in the world; and is now fallen into a state of complete collapse." In 2005, we saw the takedown of the auto sector; and what that meant was the machine tool design sector associated with the US auto sector was wiped out. Under President Obama, there has been a conscious and systematic policy of shutting down our space program; and it's only through that space exploration, as Megan just emphasized, that you have any prospect of a genuine future for mankind. The good news is that the report coming out of Texas is that some of the leading circles historically associated with NASA, current and former NASA employees, have reached the point where they realize: 1) that it's all over for the United States if there's not a real fight to revive the space program. They see certain glimmers of reflection of what was once a driving force in the growth of real productivity in the American economy; namely, the space program, centered in NASA Houston. You had the return to Earth of Scott Kelly, who spent a year up in space; an exciting development, it's a glimmer. It's a sort of smell or fragrance of the fact that NASA can be revived; that we can have a resurgence of the kind of optimism that we had during the Kennedy Presidency, before he was assassinated. Where the Apollo program was the centerpiece for the whole development of the real US economy. You've got NASA people now beginning to say, "Yes, we're ready for a real fight." The fight is on; and you've got

reflections of that that you'll see emerging as a tendency in other parts of the country. Southern California used to be a major center of our space program; you had the Jet Propulsion Lab

in the Los Angeles area, a crucial component. And you, of course, had the Lawrence Livermore Lab up in the Bay area. These

are centers that can be revived; but only if we get a core revival of that NASA mission. The mission to join with China, with Russia, with India, with other nations, in exploring and developing the universe as part of man's extraterrestrial mission.

So, if you think about the steel issue again, from that standpoint, how much steel would be required for the kind of nationwide high-speed rail system that is part of the "US joins

the World Land-Bridge"? How much steel will be required for a proliferation of nuclear power plants throughout the United States? The modernization of the existing plants, and they're replacement where appropriate, by fourth generation nuclear power

plants. What would be the requirements once we've actually completed the process of successfully commercializing fusion? These are the issues for the future; but these fights have to won

today. And if you want to understand the biggest mass kill factor with President Obama, it has been his killing of the NASA

space program; because that is a mass execution of the future. And so, these issues are all very much inextricably tied together. Unless we get a revolutionary change in policy, which

means a return to the kind of Hamiltonian principles that we last

saw on display in the Franklin Roosevelt Presidency overall, and

in the Kennedy Apollo program in particular. These ideas are

there; and we're getting now, coming from the Houston vicinity,
from the NASA center there, a rumbling. The start of a real fight to basically bring the United States back into space; as part of a collaborative mission for all of mankind. And as I say, once that happens, the issue of steel, the issue of dumping;
all of this becomes meaningless. Because the actual physical requirements will be so enormous, the return to optimism and the
benefits of that – particularly for a lost generation of young people, who represent a high percentage of those who are going off as heroin addicts, who are committing suicide, who have no sense of future. We've got to restore the future; and that starts with a fight to revive NASA. And the good news is that that fight is now beginning; it's in its early moments, but it's
a fight that is winnable. And the future of the United States hangs in the balance.

OGDEN: Thank you very much. Because Jeff mentioned it, I would just encourage our viewers to revisit the pamphlet; which
is both available in print form, and in digital form: "The United States Must Join the New Silk Road; A Hamiltonian Vision
for an Economic Renaissance"; which features much of what Jeff just discussed in terms of a national high-speed rail program, a
Bering Straits tunnel or bridge project to connect us to Eurasia.
To the phenomenal developments that are happening now in China;
but it also has an entire section on a science-driver development
mission, which includes much of the cutting edge work that needs

to be done with a revived space program – not just in the United

States, but also collaboration that we must begin to cooperate with China's and Russia's space programs. And have what Mr. LaRouche has so aptly termed the common aims of mankind; that is

the truest form of a war avoidance program for a durable piece.

So, with that said, I would like to thank Jeff; and I would also like to thank Megan Beets for joining us here this evening.

And I would encourage you to stay tuned to larouchepac.com. Thank you very much.

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 3.
marts 2016:**

**Schiller Instituttet har
foretræde for Folketingets
Udenrigsudvalg:**

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

Helga Zepp-LaRouche i Indien:

Forlæng Silkevejen til Mellemøsten Sagen om Nykredit/Totalkredit

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

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

28. februar 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – Alle dele af planeten konfronteres nu med valget mellem to konkurrerende stemmer. »Spørgsmålet drejer sig om krisen«, erklærede **Lyndon LaRouche skarpt under sin dialog med Manhattan-projektet den 27. feb.** »Vil du dø, eller vil du leve? Det er de to stemmer.«

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

repræsenterede?

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

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

Det er LaRouche-organisationens enestående »helligelse til kreativ opdagelse«, som LaRouche beskrev det under sin

diskussion med Manhattan-projektet, og udelukkende dette, der sætter os i en position, hvor vi kan forme den globale udvikling i retning af det gode. Men det pålægger os også strenge, interne betingelser, der kræver, at vi gør det klart, når organisationer ikke er en del af denne forpligtelse og således i stedet bliver forhindringer for vore bestræbelsers succes.

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

erklærede LaRouche til publikum ved Manhattan-projektet.

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

Foto: Forberedelse til yderligere udforskning af rummet, det naturlige, næste trin i menneskehedens udvikling. Her arbejder ingeniører fra NASA og Lockheed Martin på NASA's Orion-rumfartøj, der efter planen skal opsendes i december måned.

LaRouchePAC Internationale

Fredags-webcast

26. februar 2016:

Mulighed for fred i Syrien

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

Engelsk udskrift.

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

TRANSCRIPT

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

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

JEFF STEINBERG: Thanks, Jason. Well, let's start with the positive side of the equation. As Jason just indicated, there

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I should say that quite a number of years ago, Lyndon LaRouche was invited to the Zayed Center in the United Arab Emirates, to deliver a paper on the economic future prospects of the

Persian Gulf, and he identified this region as the crossroads for where Eurasia and Africa come together under one great big development design that he's been working on, that Helga Zepp-LaRouche has been working on, literally for decades and decades.

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

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

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

So, it's a powerful lesson to be learned, and it's the same exact neighborhood. So, unless you've got a perspective of a

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

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

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

They know perfectly well that the world from Russia, extending

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

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

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

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

ROSS: Thank you, Jeff. On the other direction, in terms of what is possibly outside of the dying, collapsing current trajectory of the trans-Atlantic, Lyndon LaRouche has been very emphatic over the recent period on the role of space as a driver for a uniquely human mission of discovery and of economic development, pointing in particular to the role here in the United States of Kesha Rogers, for example. I'd like to ask Ben to deliver some prepared remarks that he has on space,

economics, and where we need to go.

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

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

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

And the point is, this is what is happening in the Asian

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

As Jason emphasized, one of the most important things I think about what Kesha Rogers has done, is she has shown that the American people want this; that they're ready for this. What she demonstrated in her campaign is, that if there is real leadership out there, the American people will respond; they want this. They want this perspective; they're sick of what's going on. If we can provide real leadership and remove this terrible fake leadership running our country right now, there's the potential, the inherent desire in the American people to move in this direction. And she showed that very clearly in her leadership in her multiple Congressional campaigns; where with orders of magnitude less financial support than her adversaries, no support from the Democratic

Party establishment – the certified hacks of the Democratic Party over there – despite all this seeming lack of resources, she showed a couple of resounding victories. Which shows you that if you have real qualified leadership out there, this is what the American people want; this potential is there.

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

substance, the real root, of our ability to progress and transform the nature of our species, of our organization. So, that's one dimension; that's in a sense the more fundamental issue that we need to put up front and center when we talk about the "space program".

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

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

universe, man fulfills his destiny as an element of life endowed with the power of reason, and the wisdom of the moral law within himself.”

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

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

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

We can see this in the next graphic [Fig. 2]; this is illustrated rather clearly if we look at the case of the Saturn V rocket. The rocket that took the Apollo astronauts to the Moon. Some people might be familiar with this; some people may be not, but most of that entire rocket was not the

elements that actually landed on the Moon and brought people back. Most of that was just to get up off the Earth. 92% of the mass, the weight of the entire Saturn V rocket, was all fuel; most of that fuel was used just to get into orbit. So, in the pie chart, you can see the breakdown; just the total amount of weight that's fuel – 92% – the dry weight of the rockets and the systems to utilize that fuel is another 6.5%, and around 2% of the weight of the entire thing is the actual people and the stuff you're trying to get on the Moon, and the stuff you're trying to get back. So, you can get a clear sense of how much effort it takes just to get into space; this is also illustrated in the bar chart next to it. If people are familiar with the way the Saturn V worked, you had a series of stages; so you had the first main rocket fires, it gets up off the ground, and starts taking you up through the atmosphere, through the sky. And once that first rocket burns up all its fuel, it's jettisoned, it's released, and a significantly smaller part of the total rocket then continues as a new stage fires, a new rocket fires. So, you had three stages to the Saturn V rocket; the entire first stage, the entire second stage, and part of the third stage was all needed just to get into orbit. And then from there, the third stage carried the astronauts to the Moon; it landed and came back, and then that third stage carried them back to Earth.

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

talking about miles per second; so you have to get up to very high speed to actually get into orbit. And if you want to change orbits, once you're in low Earth orbit, and you want to get into a different orbit, you again have to change your speed, you have to again expend energy to change your speed. So, one way people discuss and analyze space travel, is what is referred to as changes in speed. So, here is just an illustration of the amount of change in velocity, sometimes called "delta V" is the technical terms sometimes used. The amount of change in velocity, the amount of change in kilometers per second needed to get to different destinations. And as you can see on the graph, each of those bars is to a different destination; the first one is to low Earth orbit, the second one is to geo-stationary orbit, the next one is to lunar orbit, and then we have each of our planets there. Venus, Mars, Jupiter, etc. So, in all of those cases, you can see that they all have that grayish-blue chunk at the very bottom; which in most of those cases, is well over half of the total change in velocity requirements is just to get into low Earth orbit.

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

getting the higher speeds very quickly becomes wind resistance. So, if you put this in a vacuum tube, you can get to very, very high speeds. Remember, we need to get to high speeds to be into orbit. And then if you can elevate that track up above much of the atmosphere, you can actually use a maglev vacuum tube launch system to get into space.

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

So, you have these types of proposals out there, for dramatically lowering the cost and expense of getting stuff into orbit. And this general idea is being pursued in China. No surprise; China is where we see interest in actually pursuing these frontiers, and people are actually thinking about these things, are looking at these frontier technologies which can greatly give us a new capability to do these things. Specifically, at Southwest Jiaotong University in China, you

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

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

orbit around Pluto, they would have had to carry the fuel needed to slow down enough to enter orbit; and also the rockets needed to use that fuel. And if they had carried that fuel with them, the launch would have had to have been much bigger, because you would have to lift all that fuel off the ground in the first place. So, this is just one illustration of how difficult it is to have any serious development and travel and moving around the Solar System

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

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

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

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

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

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

So, I think when we talk about the space program, people get excited about the rockets and the space suits and bouncing around in space – and those might be elements of it to some

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

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

**POLITISK ORIENTERING 18.
februar 2016:
Rusland tager strategisk
lederskab/**

Bail-in ikke holdbart/ Gennembrud for Fusionskraft

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

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

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

I disse dage træffes der

skæbnesvangre beslutninger

11. februar 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – De store strateger, såsom William Shakespeare, om hvem Lyndon LaRouche gennemførte skelsættende studier i januar 2014, forstod, at det nye gennembrud, der var nødvendigt for menneskehedens overlevelse, krævede, og man begav sig ud på veje, hvor intet menneske før havde gået; ja, på veje, hvis blotte eksistens ingen hidtil havde anet. Det var, hvad Douglas MacArthur gjorde i Stillehavskrigen under Anden Verdenskrig: han udtænkte en helt ny dimension for handling, ingen før havde forestillet sig, og som hidtil ikke havde været mulig, og som gav hans underlegne styrker mulighed for hele tiden at overvinde overlegne styrker.

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

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

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

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

I sit **webcast mandag, den 8. februar med LaRouchePAC Policy**

Committee sammenlignede LaRouche USA's intellektuelle anskuelse i dag med Det romerske Imperiums nedgang og fald og omtalte Det britiske Imperiums indtrængen lige fra USA's første begyndelse:

»Det skete omgående, i og med USA's begyndelse som en nation. Ødelæggelsen var massiv: de fleste af USA's præsidenter var i realiteten fjender af USA; det var de fleste af dem! Og det er derfor, problemet bliver ved med at dukke op. Og fortsat gør det: Dette er Det romerske Imperium, modellen for Det romerske Imperium.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

»Så spørgsmålet om kreativitet betyder, at hele systemet med Solsystemet og videre endnu grundlæggende set beherskes af disse begivenheder, de samme begivenheder, som er de begivenheder, der karakteriseres af systemet som helhed. Det er der! Spørgsmålet er, hvad ønsker man? Man ønsker at skabe

mennesker, der er kreative, skabende. Man ønsker at kunne skabe spædbørn, der selv er skabende på en original måde. Man ser dette: Einstein var f.eks. et godt eksempel på dette. Hvis man tager det, vi ved om hans historie, at menneskelig kreativitet er en enestående ting; det er det, der i realiteten bør dominere og kontrollere menneskehedens historie.»

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

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

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

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

LaRouchePAC Internationale Fredags-webcast, 12. februar 2016: Genopliv USA's rumprogram! Genopliv en vision for fremtiden!

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

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

Transcript-MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening! My name is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us for our weekly Friday evening broadcast, here, from larouchepac.com. This is our webcast for February 12, 2016. Today is Abraham Lincoln's birthday. I'm joined in the studio today by Jeffrey Steinberg from *Executive Intelligence Review* magazine, as well as Megan Beets and Ben

Deniston from the LaRouche PAC science team. I'm also joined, via video, by a special guest again this week – Kesha Rogers, joining us from Houston, Texas.

We have all just come from a discussion that we had with both Mr. LaRouche and Mrs. Helga Zepp-LaRouche. I think the content of the presentation that you'll hear tonight is directly informed by the tenor of that discussion. It's very clear that there are immediate problems, an immediate crisis, which must be addressed and must be resolved, that are right in front of us as we speak. However, that will be the subject of the answer to our institutional question, which we have decided to leave to the end of tonight's broadcast.

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

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

This is something that we're going to take up in much more detail a little bit later in the broadcast tonight, but what we begin to consider, is that the space program as we knew it from President John F. Kennedy and others, is the necessary ingredient of a mission of any civilization which is worthy of representing mankind as a species on this planet. Mankind must

not be a creature of the Earth. Man is not an Earthling. Mankind must be a creature of the stars! He must learn, both physically and mentally, how to navigate that wide ocean which is outer space. He must come to know what he does not know. He must come to understand the inner workings of the galaxy which he is an integral part of, and also other galactic systems. And, he must come to know his role as a species within that complex of galactic systems which comprise the Universe as we know it today.

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

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

As President John F. Kennedy was wont to say in several speeches that he made, where he quoted Scripture: "Where there

is no vision, the people perish.” And that is absolutely true today. That is what the last 50 years of a “backwards progress” has brought us, as an American people – as we’ve presented repeatedly over the past several weeks in this webcast – and as a trans-Atlantic system, where face an absolutely dire crisis – economic, social, and military crisis today.

Our job here this evening, is to take the necessary steps to restoring that vision, and there’s nobody more qualified to that, in my opinion, than my good friend Kesha Rogers. Following the remarks that Kesha makes, we will have follow-up remarks from Megan Beets, who will elaborate much more on what China is doing in their ambitious space program and where that’s come from in the recent years, and where that’s going towards. Ben Deniston will follow up immediately after her, to elaborate a little bit more of what the necessary *insight* into the genius of Albert Einstein and Vladimir Vernadsky must be, from the perspective of this recent experiment that affirmed many of Einstein’s hypotheses that he made nearly a century ago.

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

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

national prominence, but international prominence as a very significant political figure.

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

KESHA ROGERS: Thank you, Matthew! Well, I think what you've laid out, and also in the discussions we had from Mr. LaRouche, one thing that's important to point out is, this is the level of discussion which is absolutely critical to revive the educational and human commitment that has been lost in our society. The real question is, when we're dealing with the space program – and this is what's not being discussed in any of the political debates or amongst the space community itself – is this question of what is the nature of man; what is the responsibility to the understanding of the mind of man as different from any other species, animal species, out there.

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

I love the remarks from Mike Griffin, former NASA Administrator, who I believe made them in 2006, working under the [George W.] Bush Administration, who demonstrated the idea

that mankind has always committed itself to doing that which is going to leave something behind for the children, grandchildren, next generations – the building of great cathedrals. We think about Brunelleschi or Charlemagne, those individuals who played a significant role in creating something that they weren't going to be able to see themselves, that they may not be able to participate in; but knew that their responsibility was to actually create for the future. I think that's the ultimate question right now. What has been done in the progress of the society of mankind has been with the intention of creating for the future.

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

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

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

program itself, but is what is the destiny of mankind.

I want to reiterate the beautiful example, again, of Krafft-Ehrlicke, because I think this gets at the truly beautiful and fundamental idea of that conception, as to why we have to have a space program. It is only for those very reasons, on the conception of what is the destiny of mankind, what is our responsibility. This is what we should be addressing in our education systems; that, as [Krafft-]Ehrlicke explained, "The concept of space travel carries with it enormous impact, because it challenges man on practically all fronts of his physical and spiritual existence. The idea of traveling to other celestial bodies reflects the highest degree, the independence and agility of the human mind. It lends ultimate dignity to man's technical and scientific endeavors. Above all, it touches on the philosophy of his very existence."

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

So that's what we have to address right now. Can we get back

to that understanding once again? What is going to be our direction? What type of future are we going to see – are we going to create, I should say, on the progress of where society and civilization are going. And I think what we are seeing coming down the pike in terms of a continued escalation toward war and chaos, we have a clear dividing line in front of us. And this is extremely important that the space program has – what it represents gives us a commitment again toward restoring a new direction for mankind. And doing what it is that is our responsibility and intention to do.

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

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

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

Now, 400 years after Kepler wrote this, man for the first time is finally planning to land on that far side of the Moon. Just a little over two years from today, China plans to send its Chang'e 4 lunar mission to go to the Moon, and for the first

time in mankind's history, to perform a soft landing on the far side of the Moon. The far side of the Moon is a very unique place; it's unique in terms of the Moon itself. It presents geological characteristics which we believe to be quite different from the near side. It presents resources such as Helium-3, which might be in higher quantities than on the near side of the Moon. But it's also a very unique vantage point in terms of the Solar System itself; allowing us to perform astronomical observations in wavelengths which we just simply can't see from anyplace near Earth or Earth's orbit.

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

Now, an important element for China's space program is its quest for a very rare isotope for helium. Helium-3, which, as has been said by the father of the Chinese lunar program,

Ouyang Ziyuan, is a unique fusion fuel which could power the Earth as far into the future as we could think. This is a fusion fuel which is very, very rare on Earth; but which exists in abundance on the Moon. Another promise of the Moon drawing mankind in to a higher level of power and a higher level of existence.

Those are the very recent and also immediate future plans and accomplishments of China in space. Going back to 2007, just prior to the launch of the very first phase of their lunar program, the Chang'e 1, China's newspaper interviewed 10,000 Chinese youth. And of those 10,000 young Chinese, 99% were following the developments of the lunar mission; another 90% believed that they one day would travel to the Moon. This remarkable progress of China in their Moon program has been complemented by a very robust, in terms of the success of the accomplishments, manned space program – the Shenzhou program; which began in 1992, and is coupled with the Tiangong program, the space station program. So, it was in 2003 that China put its first man into space. It was five years after that that China put the first man into space to perform the first space walk of China; which was beamed back down to Earth in a live broadcast. In 2012, China sent a Shenzhou mission up into space to rendezvous and dock with the first component of their space station; the Tiangong I. The crew rendezvoused with the space station, opened the portal and entered the space station to beam photographs and video back down to Earth. Only one year after that, the next Shenzhou mission rendezvoused with the same component of the space station; the astronauts entered the space station, and one of the astronauts taught a simple physics class, performing simple physics experiments live to 60 million Chinese students in classrooms on Earth.

This year, 2016, the second phase of the space station, the Tiangong 2, will be sent up; shortly followed by the next manned mission to rendezvous with the space capsule. Now this is progress towards a full-size space station, which is

expected to be launched in the early 2020s; which will permit long-term habitation and scientific work in space. Which is expected to be completed roughly at the same time as the International Space Station is decommissioned.

So, that's a very brief overview, but I want to make two points on this. Number one, the entire Chang'e lunar exploration program and the manned space program, including the space station, is vectored toward establishing mankind on the Moon; not simply a mission to plant a flag and go home. The idea of China is to begin folding the Moon into mankind's sphere of influence; fold the Moon into the noösphere in the sense of Vladimir Vernadsky. But also, to allow the Moon to transform mankind; to allow the discoveries that we make and the secrets of the Moon to change and upgrade man's power in and over the universe. They also plan to use the Moon, very clearly, as a launch pad, a base for further expansion into deep space.

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

Having said all of this, I think it's important to back up and look down on the whole thing. It's not the specifics of what China is doing here which are really the most important thing. What is important is the modality which China has committed itself to. The fact that the minds and the lives of the Chinese people are being engaged in the kind of creative play which we see in the manned space program, and the joy in the accomplishments of that. In the space station program. In their plans for the exploration of Mars and further out into deep space. And especially in their lunar program. This kind of creative play and progress is moving mankind as a species

closer to what the German space pioneer Krafft-Ehrlicke called not homo sapiens, but "homo extraterrestris". Mankind becoming a new species which is not based on Earth, but which is based in the Solar System as a whole. It's in that sense that China today, with their commitment to their space program, with their commitment to involving people around to the world to participate in these kinds of accomplishments. It is in this sense that China today is leading the cause of humanity.

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

we're finally with our technology, catching up to where Einstein had said we would be, over a century earlier; confirming what he had expected with his conception of gravity.

You can read plenty of media coverage about this particular confirmation of Einstein all over the place now. But take a look at Einstein himself; look at Einstein's conception of gravity as a curved space-time. And Einstein, as a scientific thinker coming out of very specific scientific tradition, explicitly referencing back to the work of Riemann and Gauss. Riemann, somebody who overturned the entire chessboard of science, so to speak, with his calling for the ending of a priori notions of science, of geometry. Including conceptions about space and time, for example, which Einstein demonstrated. You see a direct reflection of orientation of this in Riemann's work, in Gauss' work earlier, who Riemann picked up on.

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

What does that leave us with? If we are not going to base, premise science on these a priori notions – or I would say, sense perceptual notions, or you could maybe even say a kind of an animalistic notion, a biological notion of your interaction with the universe. Then what's the basis, what's the substance of mankind's ability to have science, to change his relationship with the fundamental nature of the universe?

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

And I think it's worth just highlighting another of Einstein's insights into this reality of the true nature of science, the true nature of mankind. Interestingly, this takes us away from the very large, as Riemann had discussed, into the very small. And if you look at Einstein's work on the very small, on the nature of atomic processes, sub-atomic processes; the activity in the very, very small, so-called quantum processes. And this was, as most people are familiar, this was the subject of a major scientific debate and fight at the time about what is the nature of causality? What is happening on these very small quantum scales? And Einstein was adamantly fighting against this hardcore reductionist approach that tried to just say

everything on this level is purely statistical; there's no cause that can be known, it's just a statistical random process with no causality and no ability to know causality.

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

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

something about the nature, the fundamental organization of the universe as a whole.

So, I think we look to the Moon, we look to mankind going into space; but we need to look to this prospective future from this proper standpoint of mankind having an obligation to be a fundamentally creative driving force in a fundamentally creative universe. That the only real science is a science of mankind as a co-creator in a creative universe. And Einstein certainly understood that from his own perspective, and the future development of mankind requires the Einstein standard today to be applied.

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

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

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

it. There were other factors that may have contributed to this now becoming a very dangerous global pandemic.

But I think we've got to step back and take a different perspective on this. As early as 1975, Lyndon LaRouche directed a biological holocaust task force with the question on the table of whether or not the conscious policies of the British monarchy and other allied institutions, such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, were creating the conditions willfully for a new biological holocaust by virtue of austerity policies. Literally genocide policies that would have the effect of breaking down the systems that had been built up over centuries for dealing with and avoiding the spread of the kinds of diseases than can create mass-kill pandemics of the sort that we saw in Europe in the 14th Century, where one-third of the population and half of the parishes of continental Europe were wiped out in a relatively small period of time. In other words, the question is, are we dealing with the consequences of what can justifiably and fairly be called a Satanic policy coming from certain leading British oligarchical circles with their co-thinkers and allies around the world?

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

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

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

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

Now we find that the rationale that President Obama used for

canceling Constellation was that there was another rocket program called the Orion, which offered better prospects than Constellation. Well, what's happened systematically over the course of the Obama Presidency, is once Constellation was canceled and literally shut down, you had the cancellation through attrition of budgeting, to where now the Orion program has been canceled as well. Major projects for the kind of exploration that Megan described; developing windows into the universe through the back side of the Moon have been shut down, and stripped or greatly reduced from the NASA budget in favor of "Earth science". Which means the spreading of the false propaganda about the causes of global warming.

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

And if you take that idea, that understanding of what has been done to us, particularly over this last 7-year period under Obama, and go back and remember; have a clear image in your mind of President John F Kennedy announcing the Apollo

program, and announcing that we are going to do this because it represents the challenge to mankind to make great leaps of discovery and to better understand man's position in the universe. And if you consider that his brother, Robert Kennedy, would have revived and continued exactly that program; had Robert Kennedy not been assassinated, had John Kennedy not been assassinated, where would the United States be today? Would there have been anyone who dared to shut down our space program, our scientific research?

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

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

**Uden et rumprogram er der
ingen menneskehed –**

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

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

Uden et rumprogram er der ingen menneskehed

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

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

En ting er nødvendigt for at bane vejen, og det er at konfrontere det faktum, at Wall Street er bankerot. Gør en ende på bail-out (statslige redningspakker), bail-in

(ekspropriering af bankindeståender/-indskud), forbrydelser, svindel og mord.

Se på sagaen om Deutsche Bank – verdens største indehaver af derivater. I mandags faldt bankens aktier mere end 10 procent i forhold til den foregående fredag, og har således oplevet et fald i aktiernes værdi på 40 procent hidtil i år. Midt i mandagens fald udstedte banken en erklæring, hvor den forsikrede om, at den har midlerne til at honorere sine forfaldne økonomiske forpligtelser. Tirsdag faldt bankens aktier så endnu mere. Så udstedte bankens meddirektør John Cryan en erklæring om, at banken er »bundsolid«. Dernæst sagde ingen anden end den tyske finansminister Wolfgang Schäuble, der var i Paris til en afslappet snak blandt finansminister, til medierne, at han ikke er bekymret for Deutsche Bank.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I et webcast i dag sagde Rogers: »Obamas plan, der går helt tilbage til nedtagningen af rumprogrammet i 2010, er baseret

på det faktum, at man fuldstændig har iturevet det, der under præsident John F. Kennedy var et visionært lederskabsperspektiv, som blev nedtaget under Obamaregeringen – og hvor planen var at fremme en nulvækst-politik.

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

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

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

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

Men, vi gjorde det, der var nødvendigt – fiasko var ikke en valgmulighed – for at sikre, at menneskets fremskridt i rummet

var prioritet nummer ét. Og et visionært lederskab er således det ultimative spørgsmål her, og det er, hvad vi faktisk diskuterer her. Det er det, der er blevet fuldstændigt forladt af vores samfund; det, der ikke længere eksisterer.

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

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

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

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

»Som jeg sagde før, så advarede Krafft Ehricke om, at et samfund, der vendte sig imod ægte fremskridt og vedtog en kurs for nulvækst, grænser for vækst, der er i modstrid med det, han siger i sin første, fundamentale lov, at 'Ingen og intet

under dette univers' naturlige love kan påtvinge mennesket nogen begrænsninger, undtagen menneskets selv', så ville man få et samfund at se, der var ophørt med at anerkende sit sande, menneskelige potentiale.«

Ehricke skrev: »Begrebet om rumrejser bærer med sig en enorm indvirkning, fordi det udfordrer mennesket på stort set alle fronter af dets fysiske og spirituelle eksistens. Ideen om at rejse til andre himmellegemer reflekterer den højeste grad af det menneskelige intellekts uafhængighed og adræthed. Det giver menneskets tekniske og videnskabelige bestræbelser ultimativ værdighed. Frem for alt drejer det sig om filosofien for enhver eksistens. Som resultat ignorerer begrebet om rumrejser nationale grænser, afviser at anerkende forskelle af historisk eller etnologisk oprindelse, og gennemtrænger ens sociologiske eller politiske overbevisnings struktur lige så hurtigt som den næste.«

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

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

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

DOKUMENTATION:

Obama tilintetgør USA's fremtid i rummet

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

Ved at anmode om 19 mia. dollar til NASA skar Obama Kongressens bevilling til rumagenturet ned med 300 mio. dollar. Men han krævede endnu dybere nedskæringer inden for udforskning af »det ydre rum« og »planeter«, det område af NASA's arbejde, hvorfra nationale missioner i fremtiden kunne vokse frem. Disse nedskæringer tilsammen var i størrelsesordenen 1 mia. dollar iflg. en gennemgang i *USA Today*.

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

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

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

Da Obama aflivede Constellation, hævdede han, at USA i en eller anden fremtid kunne rejse direkte til Mars med et nyt Space Launch System (SLS) og »Orion«-program. Nu, i FY2017-

budgettet, afliver han dem i realiteten; han ville have gjort det allerede, hvis ikke Kongressen havde insisteret på at investere omkring 10 mia. dollar i SLS/Orion siden FY2011.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)