

MORE ON THE PRINCIPLE. . .

There Has Been A Breakthrough!

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

January 23, 2013

With the initial publication of my January 22nd “The Principle Involved,”¹ a true physical-scientific breakthrough had already been implicitly established for the benefit of the work of our association (among many others, too). Implicitly, hopefully, at a minimum, no longer shall our association be placed under the veritable tyranny of a worship of the myth of an allegedly “self-evident” species of sense-perception. We had thus enjoyed what had been a breakthrough for those among us actively involved, and, therefore, now, a potential breakthrough for a wider body of our organization as a whole. With that step forward for science, a potentially qualitative advance of the cause of physical science, lurks on the doorstep of a large body of those available now, notably for those who had been, for the moment, the still unsuspecting. That subject came up as if just yesterday, in the course of Monday’s meeting of our Policy Committee,² and the carry-over into Tuesday evening.

The history leading into today’s subject on that just stated account, may be fairly described as follows.

The actual first beginning of my introduction to the subject which I had presented to our Policy Committee, on Monday afternoon, takes me back in memories, to my youthful, originally oral protest against that already proven fraud of Euclidean geometry, a fraud against which I had published my stern objection to the hoax at the center of the doctrine of “Plane Geometry (Euclidean Geometry),” a hoax whose roots were an experience to be traced by me, personally, back to the beginnings of my secondary-school education.

My objection had been continued there, but in contrast to a fraudulent

1. See [EIR](#), Feb. 1, 2013 or [Lyndon LaRouche PAC](#).

2. LaRouchePAC Policy Committee [meeting](#), Jan. 28, 2013.



LPAC-TV

LaRouchePAC's intensive organizing for LaRouche's economic and scientific policies, embedded in his Glass-Steagall-plus program, has created the possibility for a true recovery in the United States, and by extension, worldwide. Top: Washington, D.C., January 2013; below: Philadelphia, August 2012.



LPAC/Chris Jadatz

scandal (directed against me, in particular) through the remainder of my secondary-school experience. It continued over the course of later times, since the outbreak of World War II, and beyond, especially since my first serious, and enduring encounter with Bernhard Riemann's habilitation dissertation, in 1951. A bit later, the emphasis in my work as an adult executive engaged in economic forecasting, presented me with proof of the systemic fallacy of all efforts at economic forecasting by statistical methods in particular. My success in forecasting what became the suddenly precipitous collapse of the U.S. market-economy at the close of February 1957, was a crucial event in this respect. The stunning success of my later forecast spanning the end-outcome of the 1966-1971 interval's plunge into the great August 1971 collapse of the existing monetarist system, came, thus, to define what was, in effect, the birth of a sweep-

ing improvement in my effective definition of economic forecasting.

I could not have been surprised, nonetheless, by what I have learned, step by step, and more and more, since that first class-room experience on the subject of "Plane Geometry." What had been certainly learned by me, again, and again, and yet again, has been occupied with the subject of official corruption, that as known to me throughout that much of the course of the ninety-plus years of my life, since the period of my secondary education and beyond. The record since that period, thus far, of sly, or not-so-sly, but actually fraudulent evasions at high levels, as also as much at lower, had only been made clearer than ever in times before, as now, by those familiarly sly evasions of all semblance of actual truth, respecting the matter of President Barack Obama's orchestration of the most flagrant of frauds in the matter of the cover-up by the President and his accomplices uttered respecting the new "9-11" of Benghazi on September 11, 2012.

This result has had deepening consequences for the most significant of recent historical develop-

ments, notably since that new "9-11," to this present time, as from the close of 1971, and earlier, to the present moment. Now, matters have touched upon what might be termed as "the present time." Nonetheless, all such taken into account, it must be said, given the actual circumstances of this matter, that "a lie is a lie which is, itself, a lie," as in this case presently at hand.

It is now way past time to make some still, presently, extremely important facts, clear, at last. On that account, there are several points which must now be presented for the present moments. Some relevant officials, such as Secretary Hillary Clinton, might be screaming their virtual cry of "Forget them; Let me out of here, alive!" Others are therefore left behind, as some others among us are, to defend the truth against the frauds now momentarily (at least) bequeathed to us.

There are crimes against the truth "left out," which

speak, in the end, with a voice which can not be stilled, except at the price of the greatest imaginable risk, even personal risks, even those risks which are to be also presented to the culpable prevaricators.

I. The Search for a Truth

The customary body of belief associated with ostensibly educated opinion on the merely asserted subject of a scientific account of history, is now ripe to be discarded. That point came up clearly, and was also forcefully demonstrated in the course of the discussions of our Policy Committee, this Monday just past. The

What if sense-perception, as commonly defined, produces a crude and distorted sort of product of what is commonly accepted as the alleged elementarity of the emotional experience of sensing?

members of the Policy Committee followed my argued point, which I had detailed in what had been the most recently published item (until this present report), uttered a short time ago. I had named it under its present title: “The Principle Involved.”

My rush to produce this new, additional report on the same matter, now, has been presently required, for the reason, specifically, to correct what had been the widespread, taught illusion, the illusion which works to the present effect of what passes among all too many, for a claimed knowledge of principle. That is to say, in other words, that for such folk as those, that which many among them call “the truth,” actually echoes a fraud, on the particular, commonplace fraud which is the presumed notion of the perjured evidence of an alleged report of what had been merely asserted sense-perception. Actually, the claims made in support for such admittedly commonplace academic illusions as those, hang upon presumptions which have been entirely discarded by the greatest of all truly great scientific minds, for example, as those since, specifically, the publication of the **De Docta Ignorantia** of Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa.

For those familiar with both the extraordinary genius of Cusa, and also Cusa’s most famous contribu-

tion to the foundations of a competent notion of modern physical science, that by Johannes Kepler: The central pivot of that crucially added process of the specific discovery by Kepler, had been a continuation of a larger range for the great discovery of a principle which was a realization of the principle of Nicholas of Cusa’s **De Docta Ignorantia** (in particular). This has been a unique achievement, for all true modern science, although it has also been *often misrepresented (on ontological premises)*, by others. Nonetheless, it remains today as Kepler’s central principle of *vicarious hypothesis*, a notion which is a congruent, ontological practice, with the physical-artistic principle of *metaphor*.

The contrary outlook presented by Cusa’s and Kepler’s adversaries, when the subject is presented in my own fashion, there, pertains to an illusion given by Kepler’s opponents, the presumption that mere sense-perception is, ontologically, the alleged reality underlying what is, actually, wrongly presumed to signify a simplistically crude and false notion of a “God-like verity” wrongly attributed to what has been merely a crude, reductionist’s misconception of a physical science. It is not the notion of God which is to be placed in question, but, rather, that which has failed, this far, have been the attempts to define mankind’s practical relationship to the universe in the dubious terms of blind faith in an essential validity of what is, actually, a merely blind faith in an axiomatic authority of “sense-perception.”

That critical view of what is, regrettably, commonplace “wisdom,” therefore, need not risk being argued “too much.” We need not apologize endlessly for other people’s excessive confidence in what have been merely highly popularized misconceptions. Therefore, let us try to proceed directly from the more secure quality of evidence supplied by truly Classical artistic principles. Turn, on this account, to a more reliable, proven evidence, as available from the case of Johann Sebastian Bach. I present that point as now follows here.

The Search for a Real Truth

I introduce the readers’ preparation for a re-examination of a widespread incompetence inherent in a devotion to those varieties of “physical” misconceptions employed in the dubiously explained meaning of what is called “physical science.” Keep in mind that piece of mine which had just been presented under the title of “The Principle Involved.”

I mean, in brief: “Let us consider: What if sense-

perception, as commonly defined, produces a crude and distorted sort of product of what is commonly accepted as the alleged elementarity of the emotional experience of sensing?" The key to locating the intrinsic fallacy of such proclaimed, but increasingly dubious certainties, is to take into account that which is the fraud against that particular kind of selection of evidence. It is, essentially, a selection which excludes, that systemically, as the most important evidence bearing on human belief: the role of those passions which guide many persons' interpretation of sense-perceptual experiences; and is, therefore, a misreading of the proper meaning of the whole of the experience on which we should actually depend.

I mean by all that said here, this far: the entirety of the human experience, is not composed of the merely questionable, so-called "objective facts" of mere "data;" but, rather, that the whole experience, including that of our own passions, and the consequent conclusions with which we must struggle, is such that we might not put aside an evasion of the strongest evidence which must be rightly conceded to be emphasized on that account.

What should I, and you, mean by both "the whole," and "the strongest evidence"? Is that not the passions which have steered the hearing and seeing of the evidence? Then, what sort of trash are we peddling, if we attempt to put across such a fraudulent suggestion, by means of ignoring the true meaning-in-practice of the role of those passions? Are there not the honorably true passions presented in the books of Bach's **Preludes and Fugues**, for example? How dare any among you, then, to exclude the consideration of that part of those passions which steer to what you claim to have been steering to, as your dishonest choice, when what you have chosen is your choice of misrepresentation of your meaning, even those common to yourself?

Simply said, without respect for the usual "spin" of many politicians and their like, such beliefs as I have condemned as that errant form of practice in the pages of my own recent statements, I have condemned because they were actually lies, "lies crafted as pretexts," as lies which are employed for creating a fraudulent mask of your lies, for example, lies which might have sought to be hidden from a justified, even urgent condemnation.

Perhaps, I should suggest a more careful reading



"For now we see through a glass, darkly; but, then, face to face; now, I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known" (St. Paul's Letter to the Corinthians). Shown: "St. Paul at His Writing-Desk," Rembrandt van Rijn (1629-30).

(or, re-reading of an English representation) of the Christian Apostle Paul's **I Corinthians** 13, a work which has been a crucial feature of the third song of Johannes Brahms' **Vier Ernste Gesänge**: "For now we see through a glass, darkly; but, then, face to face: now, I know in part; but, then, shall I know even as also I am known." Indeed, it is a commonplace truth, that a most significant part of all communications, has been the still prevalent presumption, that both speaker and hearer were frequently liars by nature, on precisely this account of mere belief in "sense-certainty."

The essential challenge which follows from what I have now argued here, this far, is the evident proof of doubt for a belief in what has been merely a cult of sense-perception as such. The root of that error, should be recognized as the substitution of the belief in objects as such, rather than the process of transformations which our general experience of our Solar system (and beyond) treats as the subject of the inclusive potential of adduced universal transformations, as the primary subject-matter to be examined.

II. Man or Beast?

As I have emphasized this following point, repeatedly, in earlier reports, there is a fundamental, but, still presently, actually little known universal principle which defines, rigorously, the essential distinction of man from beast. Only mankind can experience secured knowledge of the essential distinction of human from beast. There are two aspects of this distinction which must be emphasized the most emphatically. First, that mankind is the only known species capable of foreknowledge of the human species' ability to come to know the future: an essentially willful ability which transcends the power for increase of the power of insight into sense-perception of an actual future development of the quality of our species. Second, the firm evidence to the effect, that mankind is the only known species which can actually change the essential nature of the processes of human existence. The two principles are, from a net social standpoint, essentially one and the same in their specific quality of effect.

Those powers are already well known as to the effects in fact; what is usually lacking, is a consciousness of the specific qualities of that specific pair of plausibly contrasted abilities for effects.

To introduce the discussion of the matter in the relatively simplest manner of illustration: Whereas knowledge of the actual physically efficient principles which are required for man to realize such foreknowledge and apply the actuality of experiencing the future exists, yet the awareness of that knowledge has been known only to a relatively tiny ration of the human population of a nation as a whole: the persons who can actually experience the occurrence of such development, or apparently not.

However, despite such difficulty, mankind has demonstrated, in the past, as in the United States or large portions of western Europe, a conscious ability to experience explicit and efficient insight into the knowledge of what can become developed as a change in the character of the future. Inevitably, that means that the knowledge of the preconditions necessary to actually generate the principles of change specific to the future, has been limited so far, historically, to a relatively rare fraction, even sometimes in populations, a relatively rare, almost non-existent knowledge of an actually realizable experience of a precrafted change in the future. The discovery of an efficient principle leading to a progressive revolution in the human condition, had been well-known in the most progressive of modern human societies; but it is

one thing to know (as the members of a society) that a future change in the social process has occurred, and another to foresee an already predetermined potential capability for a highly valuable such change.

For example, in the course of my career as a professional within the domain of management consulting, or the like, I have made a number of forecasts of economic changes which had been realized within a reasonable range of my forecasts. A number of identified forecasts have been made by me since the first made in 1956 for February-March 1957, and notable, specific cases, later.

This ability exists among some range of comparable cases on this account. This is a known ability of some members of society. My own recognition, as during my first relevant experience with the referenced opening day of the class in "Plane Geometry," made me aware of this factor of experiencing a principle of knowledge of the relative future, that of the kind which led to similar experiences later, and, eventually my adult experience of this ability for forecasting, as during the 1960s and 1970s. However, there are apparently few known types of cases, which are clearly known as well-definable such cases of the "more gifted" sections of the populations.

It has come to be my conclusion on that account, that a destructive tendency in rearing and environment of children and pre-adolescent students, tends to "repress" and even "kill off" the potential among the relatively younger generations. It is also evident, that the desired potential has been increasingly rare, as I had observed such trends as increasing among young Americans since about 1966-67. Observation strongly suggests a correlation between the assassination of President John F. Kennedy and his brother Robert, and an accelerating rate of decadence under successive adolescent and young-adult generations of the late 1960s and beyond.

The conclusion which such an intellectual-moral experience of the trend of decline, even increase of potential insanity or quasi-insanity among subjects over the course of the 1966-2013 interval implies, is cause for an embittered view of the moral degeneration of successive generations since about the time of the Kennedy assassination. There has been evidence of a trend of decline since the approaching retirement ages from among the World War II generation, but what I have observed, has been essentially notable since the coming into adulthood within the generation which came to

maturity as the so-called “68ers.” Or, said in other terms, later than “the NASA generation.” My relevant observations on this account, are within a current age-group of relatively proud, rather well-educated, and still better-educated U.S.A. young adults between the ages of about twenty-five to thirty years. The worst intellectual performance, respecting creative abilities, is, probably inevitably, among the so-called “greenies.”

That experience of mine, in particular, shows a trend of general development defined by the accelerating intellectual degeneracy, even near outright insanity, or increased rates of similar other factors among the so-called “environmentalists.” What remains under consideration are the causal factors of adaptation, or else inherent factors of the cases exhibiting such retrograde behavior. The question is: which factor is actually predominant, the adaptive mode, or something inherent (e.g., some embedded degree of actual proneness to manifest insanity)?

The Crucial Option

“Chicken or egg?” Does a mental sickness cause the quality of moral-intellectual collapse, or does society create that sickness? Clearly, when all is considered, it is society which is the stronger factor expressed as the pattern which I have just identified; it is society which creates its own monsters. It is not society as such which creates the monsters; it is history, as in the case of the history of our United States, which is the source of the reigning economic and related “forces” which generate the potential for shifts in one, or the other direction of evolution of the society as a whole. One crucial fact of relevance is the effect of the mass-insanity of the French Revolution’s direction from the then recently new-born British empire, centered on the role of Lord Shelburne



“It has come to be my conclusion . . . that a destructive tendency in rearing and environment of children and pre-adolescent students, tends to ‘repress’ and even ‘kill off’ the potential among the relatively younger generations.” Shown: “Blackboard,” Winslow Homer (1877). The teacher looks as bored as her students undoubtedly are.

in the shaping of the rise of the British Empire, which guided the British empire’s shaping of the roles of Presidents John Adams and Thomas Jefferson in steering the way to the wrecking of the policies of the George Washington Administration, and which laid the basis for the role of the traitor Aaron Burr in creating and steering the Presidency of Andrew Jackson and his successor, Martin Van Buren, in turning over the control to the New York-centered British banking interests under the trend of control over the pre-Abraham Lincoln Presidency.

Since the defeat of the British-controlled emergence of the Confederacy which was associated with the traitor Aaron Burr and his British financier successors operating within the vicinity of New York City, the same evil British influence had repeatedly regained control of the fate of the U.S. economy and its politics. The same British influence has reigned explicitly under the George H.W. Bush family and that empire’s Barack

Obama. We had lost control of our national sovereignty under President Harry S Truman, regained that sovereignty to a large degree under Presidents Dwight Eisenhower and John F. Kennedy, and had lost it during the 1970s, and lost it again under George H.W. Bush, and lost it almost utterly under the British puppets, Presidents George W. Bush, Jr. and Barack Obama.

The recurrence of lost sovereignty under such British-controlled American Presidents, has brought us now to the brink of a terminal state of our nation’s affairs, a state of virtual treason put above our Constitution in rank. The price of that sin of consent would probably mean the earliest extinction of our nation.

The consequent, crucial issue, is that of regaining our nearly lost sovereignty. Treason or stupidity? We have now reached the point that there is no longer much difference. I choose to remain a patriot.