

Moving Backwards In Space

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor-in-Chief

Laurence Hecht

Managing Editor

Marjorie Mazel Hecht

Associate Editors

Elijah C. Boyd

David Cherry

Christine Craig

Marsha Freeman

Colin M. Lowry

Gregory B. Murphy

Richard Sanders

Charles B. Stevens

Books

David Cherry

Art Director

Alan Yue

Advertising Manager

Marsha Freeman

SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY BOARD

Francesco Celani, Ph.D.

Hugh W. Ellsaesser, Ph.D.

James Frazer, Ph.D.

Emmanuel Grenier

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Wolfgang Lillge, M.D.

Ramtanu Maitra

Thomas E. Phipps, Jr., Ph.D.

B.A. Soldano, Ph.D.

Jonathan Tennenbaum, Ph.D.

21st Century Science & Technology

(ISSN 0895-6820) is published 4 times a year by 21st Century Science Associates, 60 Sycolin Road, Suite 203, Leesburg, Va. 20175. Tel. (703) 777-6943.

Address all correspondence to **21st Century**, P.O. Box 16285, Washington, D.C. 20041.

21st Century is dedicated to the promotion of unending scientific progress, all directed to serve the proper common aims of mankind.

Opinions expressed in articles are not necessarily those of 21st Century Science Associates or the scientific advisory board.

We are not responsible for unsolicited manuscripts.

Electronic subscriptions are \$25 for 6 issues or \$48 for 12 issues. Back issues (1988-2005) are \$5 each (\$8 foreign). Electronic issues from 2006 on are \$5 each. Payments must be in U.S. currency.

Copyright © 2006

21st Century Science Associates

ISSN 0895-682

www.21stcenturysciencetech.com

In a stealth mode, after Friday business hours preceding the three-day Columbus Day holiday weekend in October 2006, the White House posted a 10-page U.S. National Space Policy paper on an obscure government web site, clearly hoping that no one would notice it.

The misnamed “space” policy is not, as one might expect, an elaboration of the space exploration Moon-Mars initiative that President Bush had announced at NASA headquarters in January 2004. In fact, the 10-page document includes just *one paragraph* concerning NASA’s civilian space programs.

Rather, the primary goal of space policy as stated in this document is to “further U.S. national security, homeland security, and foreign policy objectives.” The second goal, is to “enable unhindered U.S. operations in and through space to defend our interests there.”

The document states that the United States is committed to the exploration of space “for peaceful purposes,” to “allow U.S. defense and intelligence-related activities in pursuit of national interest.” Cooperation with other nations will “protect and promote freedom around the world.”

Further, the policy asserts that the United States will “preserve its rights, capabilities, and freedom of action in space.” To do this, the United States will “dissuade or *deter* others from either impeding those rights or *developing capabilities intended to do so*; take those actions necessary to protect its space capabilities; *respond to interference; and deny, if necessary, adversaries the use of space capabilities hostile to U.S. national interests*” (emphasis added).

There was no question in anyone’s mind as to which countries were the target of this policy to prevent the develop-

ment of military space capabilities that could be construed as “hostile to U.S. national interests,” whatever that means. The reaction from China and Russia to this unilateral declaration of U.S. ownership of the “high ground” of space was swift. The policy itself was widely seen as a response to China’s increasing capabilities in space.

In fact, it is up to the United States whether or not there will be any actions “hostile to U.S. interests” in space.

In the early 1960s, and even after the Cuban missile crisis, President Kennedy extended an offer to the Soviet Union to jointly go to the Moon, to lower tensions, and as a war-avoidance initiative. During the Cold War, the United States and the Soviet Union sent astronauts and cosmonauts into Earth orbit to “shake hands” in space, through the Apollo-Soyuz Test Project.

China has made clear its plans for the long-term exploration of space. Its leaders have continually expressed their nation’s interest in cooperating with the United States.

The exploration of the universe, and discovery of new fundamental scientific principles, is the most challenging project facing mankind. As more and more nations join this endeavor, it is incumbent upon policymakers in the U.S. to change the current course, and move ahead with our best foot forward.

Launching the Isotope Economy

The limitations of the Bush Administration’s adversarial policy in space stands in stark contrast to the incredible scientific opportunities that lie ahead.

Humanity stands at the threshold of a new era of breakthroughs in science and applications in new technologies. The two greatest achievements of the 20th Century—the discoveries in nuclear science and the possibilities of space travel—are now poised for quantum leaps

that can, and must, revolutionize mankind's mastery of his world, and the universe.

As Jonathan Tennenbaum describes in his feature article on "The Isotope Economy," our ability to overcome the near-term exhaustion of this planet's minerals and raw materials depends upon the deployment of an increasingly energy-dense array of energy technologies.

A fission-based "nuclear renaissance" is now in progress around the world, and the decision in 2006 to begin construction of the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER), have finally placed the world on the proper path for developing both fission and thermonuclear fusion.

Just as dozens of nations that had been excluded from using nuclear technology, for political and economic reasons, are now planning to enter the nuclear age, dozens of developing nations are likewise entering the space age.

What a nation can achieve through a focussed, nationally directed and supported, long-range program in space, is evidenced by China. That developing nation became the third country to launch a man into space three years ago, and has mapped out a multi-decade plan that will bring it up to par with the world's other spacefaring nations.

Under the pressure of Chinese space developments, in January 2007, India tested its first vehicle designed to safely reenter the Earth's atmosphere, which is a necessary first step to developing a manned spacecraft. For the first time in its history, Japan's space agency is considering its own manned spaceflight program.

These developments stand in stark contrast to recent space policy initiatives from the Bush Administration. As in many other aspects of strategic policy, the Administration is not putting America's best foot forward, as a leader that can offer the world new generations of technology, but is threatening other nations to allow the United States to operate unilaterally in space—or else.

Such preemptive war in space, like its counterpart on Earth, is a bad policy.

—Marsha Freeman



On Duesberg and AIDS

We continue to receive letters and comments asking about the Peter Duesberg theory on AIDS, citing his 2003 article, "The Chemical Bases of the Various AIDS Epidemics: Recreational Drugs, Anti-viral Chemotherapy and Malnutrition," authored by P. Duesberg, C. Koehnlein, and D. Rasnick, and published in the Journal of Bioscience, Vol. 28. Letters have also mentioned the chapter on AIDS in Tom Bethell's book, The Politically Incorrect Guide to Science, and Liam Scheff's March 12, 2005 article published by Accuracy in Media, "The Media Campaign for HIV Tests."

We point readers to our original article on the subject by Wolfgang Lillge, M.D. and others, "AIDS and the Duesberg Controversy" (Spring 1998), answering Duesberg's claims on AIDS. Here, Associate Editor Colin Lowry briefly responds on the issue.

Colin Lowry Comments on Duesberg's Latest Coverup

The latest cover-up attempt by Peter Duesberg et al. to deny the contagious nature of HIV is probably his most pathetic, and immoral masquerade yet. In his 2003 paper, he tries to ignore 22 years of scientific evidence about HIV and AIDS, and simply declares that HIV does not cause AIDS, and that it is not contagious.

Duesberg was a prominent researcher investigating retroviruses back in the 1970s, and surely does not believe the lies he tells publicly these days. His arguments have been answered and shown to be false for over a decade among professional scientists. The main argument of his paper is that AIDS is merely the result of recreational drug use, or in some cases, treatment with anti-retroviral drugs, or maybe just malnutrition.

How can that explain the millions of young children who are infected with HIV and those dying every day? Are they all on recreational drugs, even as infants? This should be mocked as a farce, except that the intent of such lies is to confuse and derail any serious attempt at stopping the AIDS epidemic.

Another of Duesberg's claims is that AIDS patients have HIV antibodies, but they don't have the virus. This too, is not true. The routine tests used for HIV do detect antibodies, but the reason we don't see HIV in the blood at all times is because it is a retrovirus: It can integrate into the genome of a cell, and lie dormant for periods of time, before reproducing and infecting other cells. When someone is infectious, they certainly have HIV in their immune cells circulating in the blood.

Duesberg also attacks the use of the anti-retroviral drugs that have increased the survival time of millions of AIDS patients in the industrialized nations, and have helped decrease mother to child transmission, even in Africa.

The HIV-AIDS epidemic is increasing worldwide every day, with 4.3 million people becoming newly infected last year. In 2006, 40 million people were living with the virus, and 3 million died of AIDS; of those deaths, 380,000 were children under 15 years old. It is amazing that with an epidemic that has already killed 25 million people, some are still confused by Duesberg's distraction, preventing the work required for a cure and the resources needed to build up the health-care infrastructure the world desperately needs.

On Morals and Science

I take this occasion to briefly congratulate you for your editorial work, based on Lyndon LaRouche's intuition, moral certitudes, theoretical developments, and corresponding political action!

I have understood for a long time (even before meeting LaRouche in the 1970s):

(1) that there is no such things as a universe without humans of some sort (nothing to do with quantum mechanics!),

Continued on page 5