
Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

An Address to the Youth Movement: On the Subject of Truth

Lyndon LaRouche spoke to members of the LaRouche Youth Movement in Berlin on June 28. This is a transcript of his opening remarks.

On the Subject of Truth. *Nur die Wahrheit.*

The ability to think, and the commitment to an efficient conception of truth, are interdependent concepts. If you are not committed to truth, then you can not really think.

Now, let's take a case of truth. If you believe in Euclidean geometry, you can not tell the truth. Because Euclidean geometry is a fraud. It was a development out of sophistry, as most of you know by now, which occurred about a half-century after the death of Plato. All of the important aspects of subject matter in Euclid's *Thirteen Books of Elements*, except for a few minor things, which are really not crucial, were all matters of discoveries which had been made previously, more than 50 years earlier than Euclid putatively wrote. But the differ-

ence is that Euclid committed a fraud, and whereas the original discoveries had been made on the basis of what is called *Sphaerics*, as typified by the work of Pythagoreans and Plato, and so forth, Euclid introduced a completely fraudulent assumption. We call it the Babylonian real estate dealer's conceptions of the universe: a flat-Earth mentality. And you can picture these guys, they have flat heads, sawed-off tops of their heads. They have flat-Earth thinking.

So, if you believe that there are self-evident elements in the universe, which you can assume without proof, because you say they are self-evident, and these things happen to turn out to all correspond to a real estate dealer's conception of a flat-Earth geometry, then you are not telling the truth. Because you're saying something is true, which you say at the same time has no proof. It is self-evident.

Now, you will find that most systematic liars—who try to

be systematic, as opposed just to arbitrary liars—but systematic liars, all base their systems on those assumptions. “Is it not true. . . ?” “Do we not agree, that it’s true. . . ?”

Now, this, carried to an extreme, is called sophistry, in which you no longer have any fixed conception of truth, as Euclid prescribes, but you simply say: “Well, all my friends say. . . . People I respect say. . . . All the press seems to agree. . . . Everything I see in the news agrees. . . .” And this is not something like Euclidean geometry, which is fixed, with a fixed set of assumptions for all times, but rather it’s one you make up as you go along. This is called really advanced sophistry.

And so, Euclid is an example of sophistry.

But the more extreme form of sophistry is that which took over from Athens—it was called democracy. Now, democracy is a name for a form of systematic wild-eyed lying. You say: “Well, the majority has to be right. We don’t go by truth, we go by, are our views consistent, or acceptable, to a majority around us? Or a majority of the group we belong to. Or the clique we belong to. Or the faction we belong to.” And therefore, the majority opinion, which is accepted or tolerated by a majority, or an apparent majority, or at least the loudest voices or whatever, or the ones that snarl the most, or the guy who has the most money—this becomes the standard of truthfulness, which is a form of lying.

Lying Is Not Good for You

Now, the problem is, that lying is not good for you, for the person who does it, because it destroys your mental capacities. It destroys that in you which distinguishes you from an ape, and you begin to ape and monkey around with your neighbors, because you no longer have the standard of truth. You no longer are truly human. You were born human, but your human qualities, you’ve thrown away, you’ve sold them for whatever, or you’ve traded them off for baseball cards. So now you no longer are capable of discovering the truth. Because you’ve destroyed the faculty which is essential—a very sensitive faculty, which is essential for discovering the truth.

And that’s the problem. That’s the problem with society. That’s the problem that you have as young people, in dealing with this society. You assume that the upper 20% of income-brackets of Baby Boomers lie all the time—they don’t know how to do anything else. Because they are in a completely sophisticated society.

What is the upper 20%—in Germany, or in the United States, or worse, in France? (It has a more severe form in France, because it has more policemen to enforce it. The French have more policemen than they have people. You don’t count the policemen as people). Well, the Baby Boomer generation was based on the basis of sophistry. Here we came out of the war. We had defeated fascism. We had defeated this under the ideas of Roosevelt, and suddenly we go in the opposite direction. We now accept a fascist program, and say

fascism was not bad; it was not fascism that was bad, it was Hitler. Hitler was bad. We got rid of Hitler. Now we could go back to fascism. And they did!

But the point is, those of us who had been born earlier, who had become adults before or during the course of the war, couldn’t be really convinced of that. We could not sincerely lie. People would say, “Well, I go along, don’t bring me into this, don’t involve me; I don’t want to get in trouble.” But they really didn’t believe it. They still believed in technological progress. They believed in housing, they believed in improving income, they believed in improved health care, better communities, all these kinds of things. It was characteristic of my generation. They believed in this. And therefore, even though they would lie like hell, because they were afraid of the right wing, or afraid of the FBI, as they used to say in the U.S., they’d only go so far with lying, not all the way.

So, what happened is, the people who were running society said: “Okay, we’re going to fix that. Give us a generation. We’ll fix this. We’re going to take all the people who look as though they’re going to be part of the upper stratum of society socially, and start out with infancy, from about the time they’re born.”

“Okay, this guy is probably going to go to university, he’s probably going to become something of significance, or influence, or we may throw him away because he fails. But if he lives up to the standard we mean for this person, he’s going to go to a university, and he’s going to eventually, in about 30 years, he’s going to be part of the influential strata. He’ll be a university professor, a politician, or an up-and-coming specialist in some area. He’ll be in the upper 20% of family-income brackets in the country.”

And the same thing was done in Germany. The same thing was done in France. The same thing was done in a sense in Italy, because you can never keep track of Italians; it’s a very unstable population for this purpose.

So, the result was that you had a generation which came into maturity about 1968, and you look at the 68ers, the actual 68ers! Now there was protest in that, but the dominant characteristic of the 68ers, as a generation, in Berlin or elsewhere: They were crazy and immoral. But, why were they crazy and immoral? Because they had been trained, carefully selected, in their education, the cultural influences on them, to turn them into pigs. Really, pigs in the real sense.

So, what do they say? They say, “Well, society’s bad. We have our opinions, we want to express our own opinions. We don’t like blue-collar workers. We don’t like farmers. We don’t like to have to wear clothes. We like to smoke this, we like to suck this, and all these kinds of things.” And that became the standard of the generation.

Now, that generation is the upper 20%, which was cultivated, meaningfully, under the influence of—like, the whole rock thing. Rock concerts, rock music, and similar kinds of things. All part of this, of degeneration! A systematic degeneration of a whole generation. It’s called the *de*-generation. You

know, my grandfather's generation was the A generation; my father's generation was the B generation; we were the wartime generation—we saw the world. We became known as the see-see generation. Then we had our children, the *D-generation*. And what happened is, you had people who were blue-collar, farmer, essentially oriented in society, the lower 80% of income brackets, or social influence, and they were sort of, more and more, left out of the picture, as you see today, especially since the middle of the 1970s—essentially left out of the picture. And the upper 20%, the insiders, the “golden generation”—or the golden *de-generation*—took over society, especially from 1985, 1987, especially after 1990, they took over. And Clinton's election coincides with that. This is the point: You look at the way it went in this period, from 1986 to 1994; it's about the time that the Baby Boomer generation, so-called, took over.

The De-Generation Takeover

Now, what was the characteristic of the Baby Boomer generation? They lied all the time. They were Sophists, modelled upon two things. First of all, they were modelled upon sophistry as practiced by ancient Greece, the thing that destroyed Greece from inside. Secondly, they were modelled on existentialism as such, which is an extreme form of sophistry, typified by . . . two Nazis, who happened to be Jewish: Theodor Adorno and Hannah Arendt. They both wished to apply for membership in the Nazi Party. They were advised by their friends in Frankfurt not to do it: They said, “Your birth certificate does not give you a good career opportunity as a Nazi. They won't take you.”

You had the thing of Jabotinsky, for example, who's slightly older. Jabotinsky applied *twice* for an alliance with Adolf Hitler, personally, and was rejected twice. He assumed that Hitler was not really an anti-Semite; that it was just some queer characters in the Nazi Party who had this sentiment. So, he was actually intending to be a Nazi.

So, Hannah Arendt, and Adorno, and other people from this group went to the United States, by way of England, or directly. They were pigs there. And they became the role models, together with Martin Heidegger, who was an actual Nazi Party member—they became the role models in Germany, for the cultural transformation in Germany, in the post-war period. This is the model from 1986 on. Especially, this is the Willy Brandt model.

Willy Brandt was a piece of garbage that nobody wanted to touch. I mean, that's actually it. He worked for all sides, as while he was in Sweden. He was born an illegitimate child. And he had certain affairs. He fled to Sweden, and he began working for everybody. And nobody trusted him. He was working for all sides. So, he came back to Germany after the war, and he came back as a piece of garbage into Berlin. Nobody wanted to touch this guy, because his record was so filthy.

Guess what? The occupying powers made Willy Brandt

the sub-Mayor of Berlin, and then promoted him to Mayor of Berlin, and programmed him to become the Chancellor of Germany. So, in 1975, approximately, or actually 1965, they dumped the Erhard government, following the dumping of the earlier government, the Christian Democratic CDU government, and coalition, and they moved into the Kiesinger Administration, which was intended only as a self-destructing Grand Coalition, as a transition to, officially, under U.S. orders and British orders, to bring Brandt in as a rising figure in Germany. And they intended to make him the Chancellor at that time. And the destruction of the culture of Germany, with his arrival in the position of Chancellor—the laws, the destruction of education, the destruction of Classical culture generally, the destruction of scientific culture. It didn't go as far as it went in the United States or Britain, because there was a certain resistance, because of the post-war period of reconstruction in Germany. But it went pretty far, and it went far, fast.

Greenie Stormtroopers

And this produced, in the 1980s, in particular, a more violent kind of Greenie movement than you saw in other parts of Europe. You had a violent Greenie movement—the French are given to violence, so the French movement was violent enough already. But the real violence was here, in Germany. The Greenies were virtually Nazis. They were operating with Stormtrooper tactics, and quasi-military tactics, ready to actually conduct a physical revolution in Germany, in the 1980s. Violence beyond belief.

In the meantime, in '81 and '82, the Social Democratic Party (SPD) had decided it was going to go out of the government, accept losing the power of government, let the CDU come in, under the coalition change. And the SPD accepted going out of control of the Chancellorship, and out of the Parliament, into the wilderness, to mate with the Greenies. And so you had a Green-SPD coalition. And this actually destroyed Germany, to the present day.

Recently, with the severe economic crisis, you had the Schröder government, which was a complicated government, but it was a Red-Green coalition. And you had the Greenies themselves, who were fakes—that's why they destroyed the agricultural department. And then you had a section of the SPD, which was almost as green as the Greenies. So, therefore, when the crisis came—the economic crisis came, a few years ago, around the Hartz IV decision—a situation developed in which the SPD coalition government could do nothing, because [Environmental Minister Jürgen] Trittin and company would not allow anything to be instituted which would actually lead toward an economic recovery in Germany. No measures. So, therefore, a pure austerity policy was introduced, because of the Green character of the Red-Green coalition, which is why Schröder decided to throw the situation open for new elections, because with his own party government, his own coalition government, he



EIRNS/James Rea

LaRouche told members of the Youth Movement in Berlin that the problem they have as young people dealing with a sophisticated society is that the Baby Boomers, especially the upper 20% of income brackets, "lie all the time—they don't know how to do anything else."

could not govern.

Now, you still have a government here, a coalition government, which can not govern. It can pretend to govern, but it can't govern. So Germany is essentially ungovernable; Italy is ungovernable, but they like it that way. Germany is ungovernable, and people aren't too happy about it, because nothing can be done that's any good for the population.

So, as a result of this introduction of sophistry, which took somewhat different forms, as I've indicated, in different countries, because different countries have different specific historical characteristics, but overall, the effect was the same thing: The Congress for Cultural Freedom destroyed the culture. And the first casualty of the culture, was the very idea of truth. And therefore, Classical art went. Science went. Commitment to scientific and technological progress went. The idea of the general welfare of the total population, went. "No, I've got a plan, or I've got a special variety of snail, and I love that snail. I think there should be more of them. I think people should get out of the way, and make room for my favorite snail."

So, *meine Schnecken*, eh? *Schnooken* and *Schnecken*

So, anyway, this is what you're dealing with, you're dealing with a culture which has been the effect of this conditioning, which was the intention at the end of the war by the people who took over, to destroy civilization. Because actually, they wanted to get back to something, a utopia, which is something like the Middle Ages. Something before the 15th Century, a modern parody of something before the 15th Century.

Two Categories of Lies

And you have two categories of important lies that you run into on this. One, you've got people who can not tell the truth. They just are incapable of telling the truth. Not because they're forced to lie, but they just couldn't tell the truth if their life depended upon it. It's not in them. It's been taken out of them. They're so corrupted, they can't tell the truth.

And then you have the oppressive characteristic of the situation, which will not *allow* criteria of truth to be introduced into policy.

People say, "Well, things are getting better." Why are they getting better? And they'll say: "You know, there are little problems here and there, but things are getting better. You know, the market is going up. Oh, it's going down temporarily, but it's going to go up. Free trade is the *only* way we're going to make it! It may be destroying us, totally. We're eliminating our industry, we're eliminating our agriculture, we're eliminating education, we're eliminating health care, but this is going to go better, because of that! Because we now have *free trade*."

Sell yourself—it's a free-trade market.

So therefore, the problem that you face, and you're faced with in the population, is that you come into a big frustration, because you find out what you're up against, on any issue, the opposition seems to you to be insane. They say insane things, because they're expected to say them. They don't *care* what the truth is; no matter how much evidence you present, they don't *care*.

And when you try to adapt to them, and say, “How can we be successful?”—by trying to appeal to people who will not accept truth, you run into a pressure for *you* to adapt, to be successful, by being a whore! This is what they want, this is what we’ll give them! And that’s how political movements, that’s why the youth movements in general, have failed in this period.

Now, you have your own experience of this, as a result of the Baby Boomers. The Baby Boomers do not believe in the future. Because if you don’t believe in the truth, you can’t believe in the future. If you believe in building society, with agriculture, with industry, with technology, then you believe in the future. Or, if you believe you should do that, you still believe in the future, even if it’s not allowed. But if you’ve given up the idea of scientific and technological progress, if you’ve given up the idea of sanity, in favor of rock music, and wiggle-wiggle as a matter of self-entertainment, then you’ve lost even the intention.

You get the typical marriage patterns among Baby Boomers. “Well, why did you get divorced?” “Well, you know—I needed a change.”

Then you get the complications about: Who are my parents? Which is which? Is it the girlfriend before, or is it the boyfriend there, or is it the first marriage, or the second marriage, the third one? Or is this something that happened at a hotel by accident? Or while passing through a railroad station, or something? Where did I come from? Wasn’t I an accident, really? Wasn’t I a momentary impulse, which they regretted after I got born?

So, you have the problem in your generation, of a very poor sense of identity, in one sense, if you accept parental authority, because you know your parents don’t give a damn about you, as a generation, especially the upper 20%. They don’t give a damn. They want to get their parents out of the way as soon as possible. They want to push them off. “C’mon, we want our retirement funds, and you guys are living, and there won’t be enough money in the pot for us, when we retire.”

The characteristic of the Baby Boomer, especially the upper 20%, is they don’t believe in a future. They believe that history ends the day they die. And therefore, what loyalty do they have to you?—You’re the future. They don’t believe in the future—only to the extent that you’re useful, or consoling, or a toy to play with, which is a hell of a family relationship, I must say. But that’s what it is.

So, you’re stuck with this situation, where you have to have a value, which is independent of the kind of dominant values of the society you’re living in. Otherwise, you can’t make it. Because everything you try to attach yourself to, as security, doesn’t exist. It’s here today, gone tomorrow. And thus, you have to have a sense of truth.

Truth in Music

Now, this comes up in the music. . . . It comes up in Classical music; it comes up in no other form of music. Any other

form of music, forget it. It’s not music. It’s something that’s left over from what the chimpanzees abandoned. If you don’t believe that, look at a television program when this stuff is going on. Looks like something the chimpanzees threw away, you know. And they picked it up, and discovered it, and adopted it. Because there’s no element of truth involved in it.

Now, truth, here in music, just like the question of truth in mathematics, is why Euclid is a liar; the Euclidean system is a lie. The same thing happens in music. People say, “I sing the notes.” Oh, you do? You don’t sing the voice, huh? They look at counterpoint, and they say, “What’s that? It’s nothing. It’s a mechanical formula.” This note, or this note, they’re in a certain relationship. “Oh, it’s a triad! It’s triads!”

So, they assume the relations among notes, chords—remember the thing about jazz, and other degenerate music? It’s all based on what? Chords. What’s a chord? A chord is a collection of notes, arranged in a certain configuration. Is that music? Well, let’s do it, let’s take some chords, make chords up. Let’s put them in a certain arrangement. Is that music? It’s something—it’s what they call Tin Pan Alley. Bang, bang, bang.

Now, what’s music?

Music is human voices singing. What’s music is counterpoint. As you may have observed, the population of young people singing is composed of different kinds of specific qualities of voices, general, specific qualities, and some categories of voices. The voice comes with a certain amount of limited range, limited characteristics. Or just the characteristics, the general characteristics, of, you know, sopranos and tenors proliferate more. I don’t know, maybe somehow they breed more frequently or something. We get more sopranos and tenors, than baritones, basses, and altos! That’s one of the big problems in doing choruses, you know. You don’t have enough singers with “bass motives.”

This becomes a problem, for example, specifically in the *Jesu, meine Freude*. In certain passages, to get an enunciation—you also get it in the Mozart *Ave Verum Corpus*—that the bass at a certain point, in certain parts, is a very necessary part. What we do is, we extend baritones, we push baritones down into the basement, and call them basses. We call them our “home bass,” home plate, but we don’t have a real bass. But Mozart wrote that thing to include a real bass voice. And a bass voice specifically is different than an extended baritone. It has different qualities. And therefore, you want a bass quality of voice at certain points in these things. What you have to do then, if you have baritones faking it out as basses, in the *Jesu, meine Freude*, you need more of them. Because by getting more of them, you can synthesize the effect of bass voices, but you don’t actually have bass voices.

It really doesn’t work, but it sort of passes.

So, you have the natural human music, based on the characteristic of the differentiation, and specific qualities of voices, in the human population. Therefore, if you want music

which is universal, you have to compose it for the universe of the chest of voices, and this idea of the chest of voices was clearly established in the Florentine school of *bel canto* voice-training, where the idea of the chest of voices was the crucial experimental drive leading into Bach, from the Florentine school, and also the Belgian school of the same period.

So, now you want to make music with a chorus of voices. So, what you do, is—let's do the same thing you do in drama, because you want drama. So now, you want some action. You want, not a story—though you may have that kind of music—but not so much a story, which is what you get with *opera seria*, or grand opera. You want just a thematic statement. And the typification, of course, is the Bach motets. It's very simply, an idea, as you see with the *Jesu, meine Freude*. It's a very specific idea. You have this poor Lutheran hymn, which came along, as celebrating the escape from mass murder of religious warfare. And then what Bach did: He took the Apostle Paul, and got him in on the act, by being invoked, and created a tension of development of an idea, within the *Jesu*, and extended it.

It's fun, huh? Really fun. That's why I picked this for developing the choral work in the Youth Movement, exactly for that reason, because of this inherent potential in this particular motet. Other motets are also useful, because they show you how the motet method is developed by Bach, but this one is very special.

And this has a very specific challenge in it: Because what you want to get is this absolute voice transparency. You don't want to just have noises, and voices conflicting with voices, clashing with voices. So therefore, you work on the basis that a voice has a characteristic. A voice may be complex at a certain point; you may have a different combination of voices carrying a certain voice, a contrapuntal voice.

And therefore, now, you try to get the human race compacted, within the singing of this motet, by taking the universality of the natural voice qualities of the population.

So, now you're going to produce something which, for the population, is going to be the mirror of the population, presented to itself with this idea.

Now, the key things then become—ideas. And here's where most failures occur in something like the *Jesu, meine Freude*. Or, more simply expressed, in terms of the *Ave Verum Corpus*, which presents the same problem in a much simpler form. Because it simply is a development as a series of Lydian intervals. But the key thing in music is, you get to a point which takes you beyond the printed score. It's not a configuration of notes you're singing, but you're getting to an irony, which comes out as an apparent dissonance. But, in the hands of a great composer like Bach, the dissonance is never intended to be a dissonance. It's a transformation. And therefore, going through an unexpected transformation, but a lawful one, is the notion of an idea in music. And for the simplest demonstration of that, take the *Ave Verum Corpus*, which I

think you've worked on a little bit. Because you've got the simplest way of getting the tension, and this is where the basses become rather important in this thing, to get the extreme tension in that.

Getting the 'Idea' of a Composition

But then you realize that the music, as you walk away from it, from a good performance, you find out you don't replay the entire composition in your head as the idea of the composition. Now you have a pivotal idea about certain ironies, certain transitions. And these transitions form the idea. You can get an instant recall of the entire composition, from certain features of the composition. And you can find the necessity for the role of each voice in the singing of the composition, within this idea, or two or three ideas which combine as one idea.

Each of these ideas involves a singularity. What might appear to be a dissonance, because of the way in which it's resolved by the composer, is not a dissonance.

Now, this means that you are going to have to adjust the way you sing, to compensate for this. You're going to have to somewhat flatten; you're going to have to decide what the relative dynamics of voices are; how they lead into each other; how they lead out of the transition. Which means you're going to darken or brighten certain aspects; increase the volume of certain voices; lower the volume of other voices, in order to get this progress, this sense of dynamics. Because the objective is to walk away from the performance, and be able to put the whole composition into your mind, as a single idea, in such a way that the entire composition comes back to you as an extension of this single idea. That is, the whole composition now has a unique identity, different than any other composition.

You can get Jean-Sebastian to do that, with some Bach cello works, in which this is exactly what happens. The same voicing problem comes in, in the same way. How do you get the characteristic of the entire composition, its entire identity? How do you remember the composition? How can you, without a score in front of you, perform that composition? You have to *remember* the unity of the composition, otherwise you make a mess of it. And these transitions are what you remember, because you're always working from one transition to another transition, and they're interdependent, so you get an idea, on reflection of the composition, which is all these transitions become combined.

Therefore, you are able to remember the entire composition because you think of it in these terms. Where if you think of it note by note, and you try to play it, perform it by memory, you'll make a mess of it, at best, either because you forget parts, you miss parts, or you just don't get how it works, so the thing is disjointed.

It's like the question of the "*Trotz*" in the *Jesu, meine Freude*. The middle voices have to carry this thing, so it's not

a mess. But it does represent this tumult, the actual tumult. Otherwise it doesn't work. Otherwise it's "why, why, why?" But it's very clear. And when the performance is right, this becomes exactly clear, why this is so important. And you get a tension between the different qualities of voices, which is an *expansion* of the entire work in that, the concluding part. It's expanded: the affirmation.

And this is a question of truth.

Now, how do you come to this? You have to come to a sense of truth. And if you try to say, "Well, how are we going to interpret this?" And you try to have a discussion of "How should we interpret this?" you're going to make a mess of it. Because there *is* a right answer.

Composition As a Unity of Idea

Let's take the case of a performance by András Schiff. Now Schiff, when he performs Beethoven or something else, will *vary* his performance significantly, from each occasion. But he does, and he doesn't. Sometimes, usually, from my experience, it's enhanced. That the memory of the previous performance now is reflected in an enhanced version of the performance, a better performance, a better insight into the composition. This is done because the musician has a sense of the way in which the composition is organized as a unity of idea. Each composition is an idea unto itself; it's a unique idea. Otherwise it's not worth doing. Why not do another one instead?

And so, therefore, you have to come to an idea of what the *truth* is. What is the *true idea* in this composition? Not what is *an* idea. What is the truth? What is the idea on which the entire composition hangs?

Well, that you can work out for yourself—I just pose it to you. But this is crucial. And this is the importance of music. This is the importance of the choral work in music. The political, scientific importance.

See, if you're simply trying to better your performance, with the same work from time to time, you will eventually get bored. Can't we sing something else? But why do you want to leave something you haven't learned to sing yet? You've just been practicing trying to get to the point you can actually perform the work. Why leave it?

"But I'm bored. There's nothing new here."

Ah! You have not discovered the truth of the composition, yet. You have not reduced the composition, as a participant in the performance, and stepped outside the performance, to see your role as a participant in the performance, in respect to this question of *the quest for a clear idea*. And when you're dealing with someone like Bach, you know there is a clear idea. And if you're paying close attention, you'll recognize there's a clear idea.

So, the truth lies in what is the *idea* which this composition represents. Not as a description of an idea. "Well, I think he means to say he felt such-and-such a way on such-and-such

a day." No, I mean a real idea, as in a scientific principle—the same thing as a scientific principle. It's truth.

Then you get into politics. You get into science—it's the same thing.

Most people who study science today, don't know anything about science. Those who graduate with honors, in many universities today, don't know anything about the subject they studied. They know how to perform, like a performing seal, or a trained puppet. They know how to dance, Signor—"Signor Contini." They know how to dance.

But, they don't *know the idea*: For example, take the case of gravitation. I suppose you gravitated to gravitation somewhere in your activities here: the discovery of gravitation, by Kepler. How many people do you think, who studied physics, know what Kepler did? . . . So, the point is, there's no truth in it. There's no truth in their education. They've learned to accept a mathematical formulation, as a *plausible* explanation of something called gravitation. But what they believe in, is a mathematical formula, which is not accurate. It's never accurate. It's an approximation.

So, a mathematical formula is *never* a proof. It's an example, an illustration, of a principle. It's a mnemonic device. But it's not a proof. It's not the principle itself. The principle lies in the act of discovering the principle.

The Universal Physical Principle of Gravitation

For example, what is gravitation? I've said this before. Let's use it again here: What is gravitation?

Well, it's a universal physical principle. There's no part of the universe in which this is not functioning. So, the universe is therefore finite. If gravitation exists everywhere in the universe, if I know the principle of gravitation, this illustrates the way in which the universe is actually finite. Also, it's not bounded, which is Einstein's argument. There's nothing outside the universe, which is finite. It's self-bounded.

It's bounded by what? It's bounded by certain things like universal gravitation, which are universal principles; they're everywhere. Now, how do you experience that in a particular case? It comes out as an infinitesimal. You can never make it a discrete magnitude. Gravitation is never discrete, because it's universal. It acts universally. Therefore, you can not locate it within a small interval. But you can not deny its efficiency in any interval.

So, that's what we mean by a principle. Something that is universal, which is as big as the universe, by its nature, and the proof of it has to be the proof that it's as big as the universe. Not by measuring the universe, but by knowing that necessarily, that's the case.

For example, how do you know that a monkey and a man are not the same thing? In some cases, I admit, there is reasonable doubt. But in principle, no. How do you know that?

Because there's something that every human being im-



EIRNS/Brian McAndrews

LaRouche Youth Movement members singing in Washington, D.C., with Matt Ogden conducting. "Always look for the truth," LaRouche told the LYM in Berlin, whether in music, science, or history. "If you are not committed to truth, then you can not really think."

plicitly can do, which no gorilla, or no monkey, can do—which Friedrich Engels couldn't do either, when he tried to monkey around with man; the ability to do what Euclid denies you the right to do.

In Euclid, you're told you have to deduce everything within the limits of pre-assumed definitions, axioms, and postulates. And you must prove everything deductively, *in the small*. Starting from the infinitesimal, in the sense of the small; the particularized infinitesimal. You must deduce from the element, the universe as a whole, by building up the universe as a whole, as from single elements. Like a real estate dealer trying to take over the world, parcel by parcel.

So, therefore, in Euclid, you are lying, because you deny the existence of universal principles. You also deny the difference between man and monkey.

This is called reductionism, philosophical reductionism, which is a form of lying. And you have two forms of lying. You have consistent liars, and you have inconsistent liars. And Baby Boomers tend to be inconsistent liars. And ones who are the formalists tend to be consistent liars, who believe in Euclid.

I've had this—as I've said this—I had this with these scientists in the Fusion Energy Foundation. The biggest fight we had inside the Foundation, among scientists, was on this issue. The good thing about it was, many of these people were actually creative scientists, physicists. In the laboratory, and their related work, they made genuine discoveries of princi-

ple, quite competently. However, when they went before a peer-review committee, as in a university, or an international committee, a peer review of their report, they would suddenly cringe, and turn into Euclideans. They would try to prove everything at the blackboard, in terms a mathematician would accept. And the mathematician was purely reductionist.

So therefore, they would produce competent experimental results, but their proof was dubious. Because they didn't believe in what they had accomplished, when they got to the blackboard. Because they believed there was a higher Babylonian god, sitting up there, on the peer review committee, and this god was telling them what was acceptable. "You, down here, are doing experiments, you're making your thing work. Yes, that's nice. But that's not real! Because God says 'no'!" That's what you're dealing with.

So, this question of truth, and its relationship as it's expressed in terms of principles, in both music, as in choral work, and in physical science, are the same thing. The human mind is capable of recognizing universal principles. No other species of living creature can do that. No creature can change its own behavior by discovering a universal principle, and thus changing humanity's relationship to the universe, increasing man's power in the universe.

And this is the most important thing. This is what is denied. This is the whole history of the decay of European civilization, with the influence of the idea of worship of the Olympian Zeus, or the worship of the influence of the Cult of

Apollo. This was the basis for the introduction of sophistry, into Greek culture, which caused Greek culture to destroy itself in the Peloponnesian War. The denial of the ability of the human being to discover the truth—which doesn't mean the last truth, the final truth, the everything truth: It means the ability to discover and test and determine what is truthful, and what is not.

And as long as you maintain your discipline, and reinforce your discipline, to accept nothing which does not stand the test of truth, as anti-Euclidean, for example, whether it's in music, or whether it's in physical science, or in society generally; if you give that up, and engage in sophistry, "Well, I have to go along, because other people say it's right." Once you do that, whether it's a clique, or general public opinion, because you read it in a book someplace, or whatever; if you allow yourself to be corrupted, by submitting to these external authorities, who present you no *proof* of truthfulness, but only the assertion of it, then you're stuck in sophistry. And if you become habituated to living that way, and reacting that way, you no longer react critically. You no longer look for the truth. You look to the back of the book for the answer. And you pass the examination by looking in the back of the book. Or looking it up on the Internet, and writing out what you found on the Internet, as your answer.

You fake it! Lying!

Adapting to Authority Based on a Lie

And that's the problem we have with the Baby Boomer generation. They make an infinite lie about humanity. Because they accept what they were conditioned to, this upper 20%. They accept the conditioning, which is induced in 1945-46 on, in them. That, they're going to universities, they're going to run the world, they're going to be the *golden* generation, based in sophistry; who explode and take their clothes off, and throw their minds away in 1968. And they are now running most of the world.

And you are told, you have to adapt to this, to their authority. Their authority is based on a lie. And it doesn't mean they're corrupt, in the sense of being primarily corrupt—they're corrupt because they feel they have to adapt to other people who are corrupt.

"If you want to be successful in this society, you have to learn that!" "If you want to get ahead, you have to learn! If you want to influence the political process, you have to learn. . . . If you want to be accepted in the political process, you have to learn. . . . If you want to get a job, you have to learn. . . . If you want to get a good job, you have to learn. . . . If you want to survive, you have to learn. . . . If you want to have a satisfactory sex life, you have to learn. . . ." You're not enjoying your relationship—you're *performing*.

It's the age-old complaint of women. "Men expect us to perform." It makes for hellish-bad social relations, I must say!

And here's another lie, right? It's the great lie of the feminists: "We refuse to perform."

So, that's what I mean by lying, and truth, that sort of thing. It's putting it simply, but locate this question in the daily practice you engage in. Always check yourself, as to, are you really—do you have the truth, or the idea of truth, in mind?

You start daily with the music. That's easy, because as a social task, it's a unifying social task, and therefore if you're trying to find out what is the pivotal idea that makes a composition hang together, as a single composition, one idea: Now you're discovering how a universal principle works. You can say: What is the *truth* about *Jesu, meine Freude*? What is the truth about Mozart's *Ave Verum Corpus*? Reduce it to a single idea. Tell me what the truth is about this piece. Where does the truth lie? How do you remember this thing? How do you remember the whole composition, with a single act of thought? How can you give a name to a composition, where the name does not embrace all the details of the composition?

Reciting the given name, naming the baby, so to speak, without knowing what kind of a baby it is, the name of the object should contain all the parts, implicitly, that it contains, in the name itself.

What is the *uniqueness* of the composition?

Or, take a group of compositions, which are unique in themselves, but are related in a unique way; the same thing. What are all the Bach motets, for example? How are they different, and how do they belong to the same genre? Well, just think about working it out one day. Let's go through it.

This is the question of truth. It's a perfect example of that.

The same thing, with the physical sciences, what we've done there. You just take the starting point, in physical geometry, in *Sphaerics*, and build up all the conceptions of physical science, by sticking to the idea of *Sphaerics*, which is the original source of European science. If you stick to that original source, rather than hopping around like a little freshly hatched toad, or something, then you are capable of thinking scientifically. Because you see the relationship with the problems in physical geometry, like the doubling of the cube, for example, which is a crucial task in the whole process.

Once you see that, now you think about everything in that way. But you keep an open mind. You're ready to expand your view of what this implies. Now, you have truth.

As I said yesterday [in the EIR Seminar], all history has to be reduced to a single history, in particular, European history. You start from about 700 B.C., with the emergence of the Greek culture, from the Dark Age, and you can take the entire history of mankind, the European history in particular, up to the present time. It's one continuous fabric, completely comprehensible. And if you understand that, you understand how to deal with this civilization, what's buried inside European culture. You understand it. Truth. Always look for the truth.

And that's my message for the day.