was the flight of Yuri Gagarin, the first human being to orbit the Earth.

This was a tremendous challenge—as President Kennedy said, as significant as the 1957 challenge of Sputnik. And on May 25, he made a speech before Congress, discussing what he called "urgent national needs." Clearly, the most famous sentence from that speech was, "I believe that this nation should commit itself to achieving the goal, before this decade is out, of landing a man on the Moon, and returning him safely to Earth."

The Apollo Project

He had an inkling of what this would require. First, leadership. There was no one in the President's Cabinet who supported this program—not in the military, not his Science Advisor. Basically no one, except his Vice President, Lyndon Johnson. This required the President taking personal leadership to push through this effort.

He knew that it would require creating a whole generation of scientists and engineers, which really did not exist at that time. He knew that it would require the greatest peacetime mobilization of human scientific and industrial resources in this nation's history. And he was willing to make a commitment that all of these resources would be mobilized.

What did the Apollo program create? In Lyndon LaRouche's term, it created a "science driver" for the whole U.S. economy. It created 20 years of real economic growth for the country, and technological spinoffs into every sector of the economy—transportation, agriculture, advances in nuclear energy, medicine, machine tools; and there was one study that said that in overall terms, for every dollar invested in the space program, ten dollars came back to the economy in new goods, new industrial processing, and overall economic growth. It created this generation of scientists and engineers that the President knew was needed, and they went into every sector of the economy.

Most important, it created a cultural paradigm-shift out of the stagnation and complacency of the 1950s. This was true not only in this country; it became a program very closely watched by developing nations all over the world, many of

The American University Speech

In the June 10, 1965 mold-breaking speech in which he halted U.S. nuclear testing and offered the Soviet Union a peace based on common principles of mankind—only months after the Cuban Missiles Crisis—President Kennedy included these statements.

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. . . .

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.

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 man-made—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. . . .

No government or social system is so evil that its people must be considered as lacking in virtue. As Americans, we find communism profoundly repugnant as a negation

© 2003 EIR News Service Inc. All Rights Reserved. Reproduction in whole or in part without permission strictly prohibited.

whom started their own rocket societies and carefully followed all of the progress in the Apollo program.

The Apollo program contributed very importantly to Kennedy's strategic program, of both reaching technological parity with the Soviet Union military, and very importantly, as a war-avoidance policy, based on the idea that this program could be a basis for this community of principle of nations, working on projects that Edward Teller described later as for "the common aims of mankind."

On Sept. 20, 1963, less than a year after the Cuban Missiles Crisis, Kennedy made a very dramatic speech before the United Nations, in which he said that even though there were very serious differences between the United States and the Soviet Union, there was room for new cooperation in space. He said, "I include among these possibilities, a joint expedition to the Moon." This is really quite remarkable, when you think about what the strategic situation was.

Kennedy's vision for what the space program could promise, was cut short because his life was; and unfortunately, under Lyndon Johnson, Vietnam War spending really precluded a continuation of the visionary space program that President Kennedy started. So I think it really falls to us, as our job today, to fulfill that vision and to move forward one of the greatest of the great projects—the exploration of space.

Michele Steinberg: Marsha, thank you.

Bertrand Russell, Pre-Emptive Nuclear Warrior

Francisco Medina: Bertrand Russell's name popped in there—I wonder if Bill could discuss the tradition he was coming from, in contrast to what John F. Kennedy was doing, and the United States as a whole. He is British; recently in the LaRouche Youth Movement in Los Angeles, we have been reading a lot of H.G. Wells and Bertrand Russell.

Jones: Russell was a part of the crowd with H.G. Wells; they had their differences on some issues, but they were basically of the same faction. Their idea was—from about the 1920s—an attempt to create a world government in which nation-states would give away their own rights, and a government would be created with an elite which would steer things,

President Kennedy's June 1963 American University speech was a dramatic turn which "threatened" to end the Cold War, only months after resolving the Missiles Crisis.

of personal freedom and dignity. But we can still hail the Russian people for their many achievements—in science and space, in economic and industrial growth, in culture and in acts of courage.

Among the many traits the peoples of our two countries have in common, none is stronger than our mutual abhorrence of war. Almost unique, among the major world powers, we have never been at war with each other. And no nation in the history of battle ever suffered more than the Soviet Union suffered in the course of the Second World War. At least 20 million lost their lives. Countless millions of homes and farms were burned or sacked. A third of the nation's territory, including nearly two-thirds of its industrial base, was turned into a wasteland—a loss equivalent to the devastation of this country east of Chicago.

Today, should total war ever break out again—no matter how—our two countries would become the primary targets. It is an ironic but accurate fact that the two strongest powers are the two in the most danger of devastation. . . .

In short, both the United States and its allies, and the Soviet Union and its allies, have a mutually deep interest in a just and genuine peace and in halting the arms race. Agreements to this end are in the interests of the Soviet Union as well as ours—and even the most hostile nations can be relied upon to accept and keep those treaty obligations, and only those treaty obligations, which are in their own interest.

So, let us not be blind to our differences—but let us also direct attention to our common interests and to the means by which those differences can be resolved. And if we cannot end now our differences, at least we can help make the world safe for diversity. For, in the final analysis, our most basic common link is that we all inhabit this small planet. We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children's future. And we are all mortal.