

The Promise of the Space Program To End Poverty Worldwide

The following is an edited version of a [presentation](#) given by Dennis Speed to the LaRouche PAC Manhattan Dialogue on Jan. 20, 2018.

We are going to take up a matter today, as a form of repentance for what we all should have realized last week. In the words of Malcolm X, “You’ve been had! You’ve been ‘took’! You’ve been bamboozled.” That’s what happened last week to the country. The country accepted a liar, Illinois Senator Dick Durbin, as a truth-teller. *People accepted it* because—as many people said at the time—“I already knew that he thought that,” about Donald Trump. So they presumed that Trump had said what the known liar, Durbin, claimed he said, even though the President stated that he had not said it.

This *prejudgment*, of course, is a practice that is not limited to the Presidency and this current President. It’s one that people engage in all too often, and has caused great harm. But it can be corrected by simply admitting when you’ve been bamboozled. We ourselves, for example, failed to immediately check our own documents and to check the source of the statement being made. It turned out that we have a whole set of articles, set of statements, archived from the *Congressional Record* that told us exactly what was actually going on. So, in the future, what we can certainly say to anyone who is concerned about any future attack against the President of the United States, the first thing to do is to check that attacker’s LaRouche file.

Whenever anybody attacks *A rocket at the Kennedy Space Center, Cape Canaveral, Florida.*

Donald Trump, the first thing that should be done is to check where that person stands on Lyndon LaRouche; check the file before you believe anything that is being said in any way. Check the LaRouche file.

Now, this is an important thing to say, because what we’re going to try to do today is to introduce an idea, by means of not merely asserting that it’s true, but by instead suggesting that there are things that you already know, which should have caused you to realize that this *idea* was true, long before this presentation was given. The reason for doing that, is that, in this way, we can quickly correct a problem that plagues the American people.

The space program, and the offer for the reintroduction of the space program put forward by President Donald Trump, is the natural point of unity for the human race, and particularly for the nations of Russia, China, and India, with the United States. Japan and others are, of course, also included. This is something



EIRNS/Dennis Speed

that John Kennedy famously talked about at American University, Washington, D.C. back in June, 1963 (see box). The nature of why there is a space program, or how it became policy, is the first thing we want to establish, because of the nature of the topic and what the

topic is, fundamentally. It's what's contained in Lyndon LaRouche's book, [Earth's Next Fifty Years](#). Today what I want to do, is simply talk about something that is now under discussion and is rather controversial inside of NASA.

John F. Kennedy at American University, June 1963

President Kennedy gave the speech excerpted here on June 10, 1963. The next day, June 11, he delivered "The Report to the American People on Civil Rights," in which he proposed the laws that would ultimately become the Civil Rights Act of 1963. To support that Civil Rights Act, Martin Luther King, with the assistance of Rev. C.L. Franklin, organized 125,000 people to march in the streets of Detroit eleven days later, culminating in King's speech at Cobo Hall before 25,000 people called "The American Dream." The Reuther brothers and the United Auto Workers joined with King, A. Phillip Randolph and others to organize the "March for Jobs and Freedom" in Washington, D.C. Excerpts of President Kennedy's June 10 speech follow.

... I have, therefore, chosen this time and this place to discuss a topic on which ignorance too often abounds and the truth is too rarely perceived yet it is the most important topic on earth: world peace.

What kind of peace do I mean? What kind of peace do we seek? Not a *Pax Americana* enforced on the world by American weapons of war. Not the peace of the grave or the security of the slave. I am talking about genuine peace, the kind of peace that makes life on Earth worth living, the kind that enables men and nations to grow, and to hope and to build a better life for their children not merely peace for Americans but peace for all men and women not merely peace in our time but peace for all time.

I speak of peace because of the new face of war. Total war makes no sense in an age when great powers can maintain large and relatively invulnerable nuclear forces and refuse to surrender without resort to those forces. It makes no sense in an age when a single nuclear weapon contains almost ten times the explosive force delivered by all of the

Allied air forces in the Second World War. It makes no sense in an age when the deadly poisons produced by a nuclear exchange would be carried by wind and water and soil and seed to the far corners of the globe and to generations yet unborn.

Today the expenditure of billions of dollars every year on weapons acquired for the purpose of making sure we never need to use them is essential to keeping the peace. But surely the acquisition of such idle stockpiles which can only destroy and never create is not the only, much less the most efficient, means of assuring peace.

I speak of peace, therefore, as the necessary rational end of rational men. I realize that the pursuit of peace is not as dramatic as the pursuit of war and frequently the words of the pursuer fall on deaf ears. But we have no more urgent task.

Some say that it is useless to speak of world peace or world law or world disarmament—and that it will be useless until the leaders of the Soviet Union adopt a more enlightened attitude. I hope they do. I believe we can help them do it. But I also believe that we must re-examine our own attitude as individuals and as a Nation for our attitude is as essential as theirs. And every graduate of this school, every thoughtful citizen who despairs of war and wishes to bring peace, should begin by looking inward by examining his own attitude toward the possibilities of peace, toward the Soviet Union, toward the course of the cold war and toward freedom and peace here at home.

First: Let us examine our attitude toward peace itself. Too many of us think it is impossible. Too many think it unreal. But that is a dangerous, defeatist belief. It leads to the conclusion that war is inevitable that mankind is doomed that we are gripped by forces we cannot control.

We need not accept that view. Our problems are manmade therefore, they can be solved by man. And man can be as big as he wants. No problem of human destiny is beyond human beings. Man's reason and spirit have often solved the seemingly unsolvable and we believe they can do it again. ...

NASA, the TVA, and Martin Luther King

In a conference that took place at Huntsville, Alabama last March, the subject was the relationship between NASA and the civil rights movement. It was called “[NASA in the ‘Long’ Civil Rights Movement](#).” One of our associates, Marsha Freeman, was at that conference. One of the things that she spoke about was that several of the people who are the official historians of NASA take issue with the fact that NASA did have a *social agenda*. As a Federal program located primarily in the South, in, for example, Langley, Virginia, or in Florida, where there were more lynchings going on in the United States than any other state in the Union, or in Texas, or in Huntsville, Alabama, or also in Louisiana and Mississippi, NASA, which is a science agency, had no choice and had, essentially, the inclination that it must, in fact, refute racial categorizations and anything other than the idea that the excellence of the operative employed for the space program is what qualified that person to participate in science and in frontier human endeavor. This was not new with NASA, and even in the case of the recent film, “Hidden Figures,” and the book version that was also published, was a bit misleading, since the focus there was on the Gemini program, and John Glenn, and related figures, and that left out the fact that it was during the Second World War that the main changes actually began to occur, particularly in Virginia, in the employment of African-Americans in engineering and other scientific roles.

I want to quote something from what Marsha Freeman presented on that occasion last year. This was about President Franklin Roosevelt. She said:

Even before his inauguration, just weeks after he was elected, President-elect Roosevelt toured the Tennessee Valley. The President saw that the conditions of life in the Valley were most akin to conditions in the Third World. The most backward regions of the nation, encompassing all of Tennessee and parts of Mississippi, Alabama, North Carolina, Kentucky, Virginia, and Georgia, had suffered conditions of extreme poverty for decades, poverty which had only been magnified by the Great Depression. *Just 37 days after taking office*, President Roosevelt transmitted a message to Congress to request “legislation to create a Tennessee Valley Authority.” On May



Evening Star/Bernie Boston

Rev. James Bevel (second from right) and George H.W. Bush (left) at the Resurrection City encampment on the National Mall in Washington D.C. on May 22, 1968.

18, with his signature, the bill became law. In his request, the President outlined the specific goals of the new institution, including power development, flood control, reforestation, and agricultural restoration. But he continued that the power development plan begun during the First World War “leads logically to national planning for a complete river watershed involving many states, and the future lives and welfare of millions.”

There’s a reason that I particularly emphasize Marsha’s citing of the Tennessee Valley Authority. People have heard about Martin Luther King and the Birmingham Children’s March. The Birmingham Children’s March occurred over the period from approximately May 1-2, 1963, through May 10-11. King had earlier gone to jail in Birmingham, because he had defied the Federal injunction which Bobby Kennedy had imposed against marching in Birmingham. So, this was King’s first major rift with the Kennedy brothers. He was defying them in Birmingham, and he had gone to jail on Good Friday, April 12, a couple of weeks earlier. He had requested, as he was going into jail, that the Reverend James Bevel show up and preach for him.

Many people in this room are familiar with the Reverend James Bevel, because he worked with our organization and ran as a Vice Presidential candidate with Lyndon LaRouche in 1992. Bevel came up with a tactic, which later became known as the “Children’s March.” King knew nothing about it; King was in jail when Bevel came up with this. He devised this with a few of

his friends, including Bernard Lafayette and one or two others. This was completely in opposition to the other members of King’s staff, like Reverend Wyatt Walker and others—they were completely opposed to the tactic, because it involved taking 7-year-old and 9-year-old and 12-year-old kids, and involving them in a series of nonviolent actions. That was considered by the staff to be completely the wrong thing to do. There was a discussion about that between King and Bevel, and I won’t go into that right now, because I want to make a different point, which is, that despite the fact that the Kennedy brothers opposed King, which they did, and that the March on Washington of 1963 was actually originally called by Reverend Bevel *against* the Kennedy brothers—between that point and the end of that year, there was a sudden change, and there was a congruence among the Kennedys, King, and others.

On May 18, 1963, eight days after the Children’s March had more or less concluded, with a full defeat of segregation in the city of Birmingham, President Kennedy went to Muscle Shoals, Alabama to deliver a speech, and standing next to him was George Wallace. Now, for those who aren’t familiar, Mr. Wallace had become infamous for his Jan. 14, 1963 Inaugural Address as governor and for later standing in the doorway of the University of Alabama against the National Guardsmen who were there to make sure that the University was integrated. He said: “Segregation Now, Segregation Tomorrow, Segregation Forever.” So, about eight days after the Children’s March, President Kennedy was standing next to George Wallace in Muscle Shoals, Alabama. They were there to commemorate the 30th anniversary of the TVA. This is what JFK said on that occasion. This is not the full speech, but includes excerpts from it which are relevant. For those who come from that time, this will have a certain echo for you. Kennedy said:

Thirty years ago today, a dream came true. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in the presence of TVA’s two great defenders—George Norris of Nebraska, and Lister Hill of Alabama—signed his name to one of the most unique legislative accomplishments in the history of the United States. That simple ceremony, which took only a few minutes, ended a struggle which had gone



public domain

President John F. Kennedy, walking to the speaker’s platform at Muscle Shoals, Alabama, May 18, 1963. Kennedy later had a “frank talk” with Governor George Wallace (arms extended).

on for a decade. It gave life to a measure which had been vetoed twice by two preceding Presidents—Calvin Coolidge and Herbert Hoover. In reality, this act of signature was only a beginning. There were many who still regarded the undertaking with doubts, some with scorn, some with outright hostility. Some said it couldn’t be done. Some said it shouldn’t be done. Some said it wouldn’t be done. But today, thirty years later, it has been done.

They predicted the government was too inefficient to help electrify the Valley, but TVA by any objective test is not only the largest, but one of the best managed power systems in the United States. They predicted, and there are always those who predict everything against something new. They predicted that a Federal, regional corporation would undermine the state governments and the local governments. But state and local governments are thriving in this Valley, and hundreds of state and local park and recreational areas have been set aside through the entire TVA. They predicted that the TVA would destroy private enterprise. But this Valley has never bloomed like it does today. Hundreds of thousands of jobs have been created because of the work that these men did before us. New forests have been built, new farms have been developed. Engineers who testified that multi-purpose

dams would not work, that rivers could not be developed for navigation, and the generation of electricity and prevention of floods at the same time, were proved wrong. Barge traffic on this system has grown from 33 million tons in 1933 to 2 billion tons today, on a river spanned by more than 30 dams. They are contributing to the life and vigor of the largest supplier of power in the United States. And as the people of this state and Valley who made this possible, I congratulate you all, because this has not been made to work in Washington. It has been made to work by the people of the Valley.

From time to time, statements are made labelling the Federal government an outsider, an intruder, an adversary. In any free federation of states, of course differences will arise, and differences will persist. But the people of this area know that the United States government is not a stranger or not an enemy. It is the people of 50 states, joining in a national effort to see progress in every state of the Union. For without the national government, without the people of the United States working as a people, there would be no TVA. Without the national government, and the people of the United States working together, there would be no protection of the family farmer, his income, and his financial independence. For he never would have been able to electrify his farm to insure his crop, to support its price, and to stay ahead of the bugs, the boll weevils, and the mortgage bankers. Without the national government and the people of the United States working together, there would be no school lunch or milk programs for our children, no assistance on conserving soil or harvesting trees, no loans to help a farmer buy his farm, and no security at the bank.

During the period of, for example, 1962 in Mississippi, you had a near civil war with the infamous General Walker, who had actually called out the Mississippi National Guard against the Federal National Guard. If you understand the process that was occurring in the United States in 1963, then you understand the significance of Kennedy's speech and what he was doing on that occasion. The idea of economic development, the idea of advanced technological progress, the idea of great projects, the idea of breakthrough technologies,

and the notion of civil rights, were arguably *one and the same idea*. But that's not what was said at the time. At the time, particularly as time went on, in 1964, 1965, 1966, and 1967, it was said that the investment in space is detracting from the civil rights movement and from the Great Society "War on Poverty" of Lyndon Johnson. The two were *opposed*, and that was the conception that was outlined. Also during that same period, as you can document looking at the history, the zero population growth disease began to spread very widely in the United States.

The Need to Actually Think

What we're going to do at this point is a slideshow I've prepared for people, so that we can abbreviate and just punctuate a few things about the space program itself. I already referenced that all the centers were in the South. We've talked a bit about the idea that these centers were premised on the Presidential conception that man would get to the Moon and would be brought back safely within the decade, as had been said by Kennedy in his famous remarks at Rice University. In that famous speech, Kennedy said:

We choose to go to the Moon in this decade and do the other things, not because they are easy, but because they are hard, because that goal will serve to organize and measure the best of our energies and skills, because that challenge is one that we are willing to accept, one we are unwilling to postpone, and one which we intend to win, and the others, too.

The first slide [Fig. 1] is of the Lincoln Memorial. The reason I put this up, to start us off, is a famous quote from this man: "You can fool all of the people some of the time, and some of the people all of the time. But you can't fool all of the people all of the time."

I put that up, because that's what *was proven* last week.

That's right! And we just barely got out of it because we happened to wake up. A few of our people woke up and realized "Wait a minute! Why are we hearing this?" And then by just beginning to think about who we are, we recognized that that was actually aimed at us. Now, it wasn't aimed at us because we're a small organization. It's not that. It's because of the way in which we shaped the "double envelopment" attack on Mueller and on the coup. We shaped it with two things, as you

FIGURE 1



LPAC/Dennis Speed

remember. One was the actual exposé of Mueller; but the other, was the Land-Bridge and the United States joining the Silk Road. We've insisted that you must do these two things, and only these two things.

So, there was an assault on the people of the United States, using this character Durbin, who was lying, to change the subject—to rattle people on a matter that people have been rattled on ever since the time of Abraham Lincoln. People have been rattled on this question of not merely racism, but of slavery. Because the issue of our United States today is one of debt slavery, of intellectual slavery, and in some cases, close to real slavery also. You can't really see it in the picture—it was very late and dark—but there is an inscription which says, "I have a dream—Martin Luther King." This is at the spot where King stood in front of Lincoln, on Aug. 28, 1963. The reason I saw it, was because there were so many young people taking pictures of it. It was interesting, because at the memorial last night, the older people were all gathered around the Gettysburg Address and the Second Inaugural, and all these young people were gathered around this little piece of ground. I came over, and I realized why.

The second photo, [Fig. 2] I would argue, is the dream of Martin Luther King. It shows

a series of rockets that were used in the space program. This is Cape Canaveral, Florida.

Here I just want to repeat something which I referenced when I wrote a two-part series of articles last year: [Part I](#); [Part II](#). This was on the occasion of the "Hidden Figures" film. Part I was titled: "Hidden Figures: What Color is Genius?" Part II was titled: "Minds that Soar Above the Impossible." I said that "When John Glenn stepped into his Mercury capsule in February 1962, sitting atop an Atlas inter-continental ballistic missile, he undoubtedly recalled that the first test launch of an Atlas that the seven Mercury astronauts had witnessed, saw the rocket blow up in front of their eyes. Many acts of courage, however, take place not on television but outside of public view. They no less enable the leaps that society makes in conquering challenges." So, I just want to emphasize this.

I also visited the King Memorial, which is part of the Martin Luther King Center for Nonviolent Change, built by Coretta King, in Atlanta, Georgia. It exhibits a very specific statement there: "Principle #6. Nonvio-

FIGURE 2



LPAC/Dennis Speed

FIGURE 3



lence believes that the universe is on the side of justice.”

My argument in general today is going to be that this was the conception that King always actually represented, *sometimes against his own followers, as well as his own detractors*. That conception of nonviolence is not really different, in its moral content, than the idea of a force-free universe. This was the way in which Kepler, for example, in his conception of the orbits of the planets, thought about *the planetary harmony* as a Godly order. In one sense, you can think about his *Mysterium Cosmographicum* as a kind of theological work, as I think he thought of it.

Immortal Courage Produces Miracles

I want to say something here now about the first major loss of astronauts that happened in the American space program. [Fig. 3] That was Apollo 1, which was on Jan. 27, 1967. It is well known to some, but not to others. So the following is from the official NASA account:

The first Apollo command module was scheduled for launch on the 21st February of 1967. The crew of that first flight was to be Gus Grissom, Edward White, and Roger Chaffee.

On the 27th of January, 1967, the three were scheduled for some routine exercises aboard the command module as it was perched above the Saturn V-1 rocket, 220 feet above the ground.

The spacecraft, like all the previous ones, was pressurized to 16 pounds per square inch with pure oxygen. The astronauts wore suits pressurized with less pure oxygen. It was early evening, about 6:30 p.m., when a voice cried out, “Fire in the spacecraft!” Another voice cried, “Get us out of here!” Technicians on the gantry saw a sheet of flame inside the module. Wearing face masks and asbestos gloves, they tried valiantly to open the hatch, but they were driven back by the intense heat and smoke coming from the capsule. Some six minutes after that first alarm, they were able to remove the hatch. It was too late, however, for the three astronauts. They had died almost instantly in the smoke and flames that destroyed the capsule. The accident left the nation speechless with shock. These were the first astronauts to lose their lives in the line of duty.

At Canaveral, they have a special exhibit which is for Chaffee, White, and Grissom. At this point, I want to present Grissom’s words from a previous press conference. Here’s what he said:

If we die, we want people to accept it. We’re in a risky business and we hope if anything happens to us, it will not delay the program. The conquest of space is worth the risk of life.

Because he had said that, his statement was immediately used to allow the program to go ahead. In other words, there was initially a lot of nervousness, and there was a question of whether it should be just stopped altogether. But because of his remarks, it was not stopped.

Some would like to think that the deaths of civil rights workers like Schwerner, Chaney, and Goodman¹ wouldn’t be compared to this. I say: *No, you should compare them*. Because it’s precisely the same thing. What was being done by the civil rights, nonviolent movement, was to suggest that the actual words of the U.S. Constitution contained real ideas that were required to be lived up to by the American people. It wasn’t a question of what it literally said, it was a question of understanding the intent. In the case of the space

1. Murdered in Neshoba County, Mississippi in June 1964.

FIGURE 4



LPAC/Dennis Speed

program, it's a situation in which you are always exploring a new way of thinking, a new way of seeing the universe, a new way of acting on the universe. And so, I think it's valuable to reflect on the fact that this is one of the exhibits that you would see if you went down to Cape Canaveral.

The next slide is a picture of the back of the Saturn V rocket that took man to the Moon. [Fig. 4] There's one of those in Huntsville and there's one also in Houston.

I think we played—at one of our meetings here—the message that was read by William Anders on the occasion of the Apollo 8 [orbiting](#) of the Moon, which happened Christmas Eve 1968. It's important to set the context: Jan. 27, 1967, the accident happens, and three astronauts are killed. Apollo 8 was the first mission in which man orbited the Moon. That was the original mission that James Lovell was part of with William Anders and Frank Borman. In December 1968, these three astronauts sent a message back to Earth:

In the beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth, and the Earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep, and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, "Let there be light," and there was light, and God saw the light that it was good. And God divided the light from the darkness and God saw that it was good.

That was the Christmas message of the Apollo 8 astronauts, and they returned to Earth on Dec. 27.

Meanwhile, on April 4 of the same year, Martin Luther King had been assassinated, and on June 6, Robert F. Kennedy had been assassinated. So it's important to understand that the conclusion of that year saw a dramatically convulsed United States pulled together from the Moon by three astronauts, who would not have been there, except for the fact that one dead astronaut—prior to his death—had willed them and the nation to continue that mission—as had President Kennedy. As did Martin Luther King on April 3, when he said:

I've been to the mountaintop.... And I've seen the Promised Land. I may not get there with you. But I want you to know tonight, that we, as a people, will get to the promised land!

And so I'm happy, tonight.

I'm not worried about anything.

I'm not fearing any man.

Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord.

That conception is no different than the conception that Gus Grissom stated, when he talked about continuing with the space program.

So, as people know, we landed on the Moon with Apollo 11: Neil Armstrong, Michael Collins, and Buzz Aldrin. Michael Collins is not usually remembered (because he did not get to walk on the Moon), but he's the man who was very happy, as he said, "cause I'm getting us back!"

We all know about that success. I'm interested today in talking about the price of the successes as well as the persons that made the policies. As is known, the Apollo Project was followed by the Space Shuttle missions: Enterprise, Columbia, Challenger, Discovery, Atlantis and Endeavor. Those are the six space shuttles that we had.

FIGURE 5



LPAC/Dennis Speed

This next picture [Fig. 5] is Columbia, which as you know, was destroyed in an accident. This was the second accident of the space shuttle program, in 2003, in which we lost all of the astronauts as well. They were Rick Husband, who was head of the mission, Michael Anderson and Kalpana Chalwa. These are all people of different ethnicities, they were all in the space program. That was the Columbia.

Those who lost their lives in the earlier Challenger accident were Christa McAuliffe, who is the teacher that people remember, Ronald McNair, and Judith Resnik. One of the things that you see when you're at the space museum is the humanity of each individual, how different they were, their interests. And so it gives you a sense of the humanity in space.

I think this is an important thing that is understood about manned space flight: It's not that you want to have people do things that are dangerous for their own sake, but you are, in having them involved—as for example the Chinese intend to do with the mining of the Moon and as we should join them in doing: It's a way that we are all represented in the actions of the individual. In the same way that government is supposed to work! This last picture [Fig. 6] shows four women in space together: This is one of the little known aspects of space exploration.

In a serious sense, the concept of the International Space Station and the concept of what in the '70s—with the Russian-American missions around Soyuz and around the idea of having joint Russian-American missions in space—was a fulfillment of what Kennedy had spoken about at American University. Because he had proposed there, just so people are clear, that there should *not* be an American mission to the Moon, or a Russian mission, but a joint mission.

It's critically important that we all know or understand that there was something else that Kennedy was planning to do, something different than what actually ended up happening. Had Kennedy had his way, the worst enemy of the United States—our Cold War foe and our biggest competitor—would have joined the United States in that mission.

The Moral Basis for Political Unity

About nonviolence, Dr. King often said that *the purpose of nonviolence is to recruit the soul of the so-called oppressor*. That the nonviolence was aimed, not at public opinion, but nonviolence was aimed at recruiting the soul of the person that was committing violence against you, and that that's how you win.

Now, Malcolm X took great umbrage at this, as some of you know. Malcolm, in a famous speech, was struck by and was incredulous at a very specific phrase that Martin Luther King used to use, which was “over-

FIGURE 6



LPAC/Dennis Speed

come them with our capacity to love.” Malcolm just could not process that! “‘Overcome them with our capacity to love,’—what kind of a phrase is that?!” Go listen to him, that’s what he says about it.

Yet, it should be said that prior to Malcolm’s death, which was on Feb. 21, 1965, he had been in Selma, Alabama. He had been in contact with the King forces for about eight months, and he had decided that he was going to work with them on voting rights. Since 1964, he had had a conception about this, called “the ballot or the bullet,” about which he gave speeches. But then he went to Selma in early February 1965. He had several conversations with people, and decided that he would try to work with them. They had urged him to stay for the campaign, but he decided that he would not. And his house was firebombed, about a week after he left Selma. He was killed the week after that. But I indicate this, because this idea of collaboration of people finding their humanity, above the Earth, is a crucial idea in the concept of the entire space program.

Here’s what I intend in this presentation: I hope I’ve been able to give you some idea of how to think, because we’re going to have a discussion about that in a few minutes. Kennedy is often thought about as a kind of failed figure, or a romantic figure, or a compulsive figure. But he’s not thought about in the image of Franklin Roosevelt. And the United States of 1961 is not thought about in the image of the United States of 1932-45. Yes, there are differences in the two time periods, but there’s an idea that in particular, Lyndon LaRouche talked about in his book *Earth’s Next Fifty Years*. And I want to get to this: This is a surprising idea that you may not have heard, or if you’ve read the book, you may have gone past it. And to introduce it, I want to say something here: LaRouche wrote a memorandum in 1982, which was called “The Cultural Determinants of an Anti-Missile Beam-Weapons Policy,” and I’m going to quote from that first, because you’ll be interested in what he had to say:

The general technology under which a spectrum of many kinds of beam-weapons is subsumed is what appears to most at first to be a specialized aspect of physics, relativistic physics. Actually, if we trace out the history of modern science, from its roots in the grounding-work of Leonardo da Vinci nearly five centuries ago, we are obliged to recognize that all the fundamental accomplishments of modern science are rooted directly in the conceptions of relativistic physics



Library of Congress

Martin Luther King (left) talking briefly with Malcolm X in Washington, D.C. on March 26, 1964.

already understood in broad principle by da Vinci. If we study closely, as we have been elaborating this in recent times, the functional interdependency between da Vinci’s discovery of hydrodynamics and his work in relativistic geometry of visible space, something very important begins to become clear to us.

I want to say something in response to this: Da Vinci was born in 1452. LaRouche has put a very important focus organizationally on the work of Filippo Brunelleschi and his completion of the Dome of the *Cathedral of Santa Maria del Fiore* in Florence in 1436, as well as on the work of Nicholas of Cusa and his writing of *On Learned Ignorance* which took place 1439-41. The discussions going on between Brunelleschi and Nicholas of Cusa on physical principles are what inform the young da Vinci, who does place his own mark on that cathedral: He was involved in the design of a perfectly spherical ball that’s placed at the top of the cupola of the Brunelleschi Dome.

The important idea here that I want to indicate about what LaRouche is saying, is that if we think about these ideas not as separate branches of thought, but rather, think about them as coming out of a much more fundamental voyage of discovery of humanity, that that is what Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa was doing. Nicholas of

Cusa was not merely trying to reunify the churches: He was trying to find a common aim of mankind that all could agree to, which was transcendent of the Earth. Helga Zepp-LaRouche's work on this is groundbreaking in the same way. Let me point out that LaRouche is writing this in 1982, *prior to the adoption by Ronald Reagan of the Strategic Defense Initiative*, called a "beam weapon policy" by LaRouche.

Let's remember that the purpose of that policy, as Reagan understood, *was to end the threat of thermonuclear war*. It was actually the same thing that Kennedy was trying to do with the joint space mission to the Moon, with the Russians in 1963. Twenty years later Ronald Reagan would adopt the LaRouche beam-weapons outlook, and Lyndon LaRouche would become the most dangerous man in the world. He was seen that way and has been treated that way, since that time, by the British establishment. It was LaRouche, a World War II veteran, of course, and a proponent of Roosevelt's worldview, who with his unique breakthrough of 1952 in his work on Bernhard Riemann and relativistic physics, *and* economy, and the application of this in physical economy, who allied with former Roosevelt-supporter Ronald Reagan to actually resolve, or attempt to resolve Kennedy's intent with his space program.

Of course Kennedy wanted the United States to get to the Moon, and for the United States to be pre-eminent in space, but he did not believe that goal required conflict with another nation, just as Donald Trump does not believe that that involves conflict with Russia or with China.

This, I think, is crucial for us to understand to get a single idea about what we really mean here, by the notion of the "cultural determinants" of a policy.

Understanding Tragedy and Overcoming It

I want to, at this point, say one last thing about [Earth's Next Fifty Years](#). LaRouche wrote the following:

The communication of the meaning of any statement is to be adduced by the test of the presence of such *living words*. Only *living words* qualify as *ideas* in the strict, technical sense of the meaning of ideas. One actually knows an idea contained within a statement, by the presence or absence of that idea as an adducible *living word*, whose adduced meaning is the fruit of the same kind of mental process associated with the regenerating of an idea from indications of the specified problem it solves, as by a modern stu-

dent's reliving Archytas's construction of the doubling of the cube.

And then he gives this example. He says:

For example, the idea of knowing the circumference of the Earth becomes a *living word* in the mental processes of the user, when the user has relived the experiment through which Eratosthenes measured the great circle of the Earth, circa 200 B.C., by deep well observations from two locations in a North-South alignment within Egypt. . . [Alexandria and Aswan, where he measured the difference in the shadow cast by the Sun—ed.] and then measured the great-circle distance from Alexandria, Egypt to Rome by the same method.

So the idea is:

The accumulation of such re-enactments of discoveries of proof of principle, is the required ordinary basis for the development of what we should aim to evoke as a resulting sense of scientific literacy in the adolescent mind.

What's he getting at? He actually says at one point, the way that you know an idea in a statement is—it's a discontinuity. It actually doesn't go with the rest of the statement. That's the way he puts it. So I want to give you an example of that, in the case of Lincoln. I'm going to reference the Second Inaugural Address, which Lincoln delivered in March 1865. He's trying to draw people's attention to an idea that he doesn't state. Here's what he says:

On the occasion corresponding to this four years ago all thoughts were anxiously directed to an impending civil war. All dreaded it, all sought to avert it. While the inaugural address was being delivered from this place, devoted altogether to saving the Union without war, insurgent agents were in the city seeking to destroy it without war—seeking to dissolve the Union and divide effects by negotiation. Both parties deprecated war, but one of them would make war rather than let the nation survive, and the other would accept war rather than let it perish, and the war came.

And then he says:

One-eighth of the whole population were colored slaves, not distributed generally over the Union, but localized in the southern part of it. These slaves constituted a peculiar and powerful interest. All knew that this interest was somehow the cause of the war. To strengthen, perpetuate, and extend this interest was the object for which the insurgents would rend the Union . . . , while the Government claimed no right to do more than to restrict the territorial enlargement of it. Neither party expected for the war the magnitude or the duration which it has already attained. Neither anticipated that the cause of the conflict might cease with or even before the conflict itself should cease. Each looked for an easier triumph, and a result less fundamental and astounding. Both read the same Bible and pray to the same God, and each invokes His aid against the other. It may seem strange that any men should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men's faces, but let us judge not, that we be not judged. The prayers of both could not be answered. That of neither has been answered fully. The Almighty has His own purposes. . . .

So what's going on here? This is the Inaugural Address of the President of the United States: there's nothing about budgets, there's nothing about timelines, there's nothing about taxes, there's nothing about human rights *exactly*, really, is there?

There's a discussion in which he's trying to point out to people that they believe certain things about their cause. Each side believes it, and they both say that God is on their side. But whether He's on the side of either one is still to be determined. And *this* is what he decides to present to the people of the United States, as the state of their union. It's a state of tragedy, and he continues here; I'll just go through one element, one other part here. He says:

Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsman's two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said three thousand years ago, so

still it must be said "the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

So, you may not like it, but this may be what happens, because that may be the way God thinks it is. And so then the conclusion of this speech:

With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

And that is our position as of this afternoon. We're in something similar, without the physical conflict in our country, right now. Yes, the press has misrepresented. And yes, the press has lied. And yes, it's true that most of the people of the United States don't want to have war with one another. But it's also true that we are, this afternoon, in front of a coup, an ongoing coup; something that's been ongoing since the assassination of JFK. And it is our job to fulfill, what Lincoln and Kennedy, Roosevelt, Robert Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Malcolm X, and many others have sought to do. We do this because we are Americans. We don't do it because we are Republican or Democratic, or nonpartisan. We do it because, as patriots of a nation which understands that there's a divinity in humanity, we recognize that the battle for the stars is a battle for ourselves.

So this is the conception that I think is actually at the root of what President Donald Trump *would* have said, and would say, concerning the space program.

Let me say one last thing about this: There will be no program unless we, the LaRouche movement, spearhead a process of creating, if you will, a new human rights movement, if you want to call it that: A movement on behalf of all humanity, where we take this idea of LaRouche's Four Laws and the space program as Lyndon LaRouche redefined it in conjunction with what the Chinese and the Russians are now doing, and make *that* the new movement for rights in the United States, the right to discovery, the right to become intelligent, the right to represent *all* of humanity, *off the planet as well as on it*. Peace is the expression, for us, of the successful creation, *utilizing the Presidency to do that*, of that condition in the United States and with humanity as a whole.