

Preparing Today's Youth To Take Over the World

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Lyndon LaRouche gave the following address by telephone to a cadre school of the LaRouche Youth Movement in Hanover, Germany on July 13.

The question is, under what conditions shall the younger generation, those who are in the college age, move to take over the world? What are the limitations that they must impose upon themselves, in doing this?

As most of you know, by experience or reputation, the world went through the Hitler period, into a period of post-war reconstruction, which was relatively successful—with some faults, but nonetheless successful. Following that, in the middle of the 1960s, there was a cultural paradigm shift, better called “a downshift.” This downshift was caused by several things combined: First of all, it was caused by pure terror of the succession of the missile crisis, the assassination of Kennedy, and the launching of the U.S. war in Vietnam. That was our problem.

As a result of that, the downshift, the society went from an emphasis on being a productive society, to a so-called “consumer society”; this is especially true in the United States and Britain, and later in Europe. So, as a result of that, the United States, and the United Kingdom, became the leading imperial-style predator-societies of the world. And, the generation of younger people, who were coming into adulthood, during the late-1960s, they developed this so-called “’68er philosophy.”

Now, the most famous aspect of the ’68er philosophy were the wild-eyed rock-drug-sex counterculture people. But, some people say, “It didn’t affect us, because we weren’t part of that.” But, if you look at the society as a whole, it affected all of them, and it affected very strongly all but a very few. So therefore, the result was, the values of society changed, especially Europe and the Americas: We entered into a pro-environmentalist, post-industrial, parasitical form of society. And we went into a society, which is based on the idea of radical free trade: Get as much money as possible, without actually having to earn it.

Now, that society is disintegrating. The world that was powerful, before 1965, is now bankrupt. But, the reason for the bankruptcy is not something that has happened recently; the reason for the bankruptcy, is what people believed was successful during the past 30-odd years. So therefore, virtu-

ally all the leading political parties, the leading people in government, the leading people in banking and industry, are, in effect, all idiots. That is, they have adopted a set of values, as being customary, which are destroying civilization. Now they look for a reason for the collapse, in something that happened very recently, and they try to go back to the values of the ’70s and ’80s, without realizing, that it was the values of the ’60s, ’70s, and ’80s, which caused the present collapse.

And thus, we’ve come to a point, where we have to induce a *reverse cultural paradigm-shift*, to reverse—to go back, in a sense—to the best values which were leading prior to 1965. The generation which was the adult generation of the 1950s, is now dying out. Most of the leading positions in the private sector, and in government, are held by the ’68er generation. Therefore, this defines, in a very special way, a special role for young people now, in the 18- to 25-year age group. The problem is, that the generation which is dominating all leading institutions, the ’68er generation—except for a very small minority of the total generation, throughout Europe and the Americas—that this generation has values which are the cause of the presently ongoing destruction of civilization. It is for this reason that this generation has tolerated the emergence of this openly fascist group, typified by Cheney and his people in the United States.

Reverse the Paradigm-Shift

So therefore, we have to induce a general youth-movement-based, cultural paradigm-shift, as a reversal of what happened in the ’68er generation.

Now, the problem is, is that the Baby Boomer generation has lost the continuity of history. You have a case, for example, of this crazy Francis Fukuyama, in the United States. He’s a Synarchist; he’s a neo-conservative. He wrote this paper called *The End of History*: This is a very radical version of the ideas of Hegel, that there is no lawful development process in history, but only a mysterious process of the mysterious world-order force, which is a theory of history that Hegel developed, out of his admiration for the Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte. And from Hegel to Nietzsche, this took the form of extreme cultural pessimism, with the theory of history as ending, because the permanent rule of the “beast-man” has come, the empire of the “beast-man,” *Unmensch*, the Nietzschean superman. Such as Hitler—or, perhaps, Dick Cheney! Or perhaps, Cheney’s master, his wife Lynne Cheney!

So, you’ve come into a period where people say, “We’re now searching for perfection of a utopia.” Which is the utopian conception of the post-industrial society outlook, which is typified on the one side, by the Greenies, say in Germany; they’re against progress, they hate progress. In Germany, you have a coalition government, which is a coalition *with* these crazy Greenies! And many of the SPD’ers in the government



The LaRouche Youth Movement campaigns in the election in Wiesbaden, Germany, in April.

are turning Green, too. So, instead of having pink skins, they have green skins.

So therefore, we have to go back to the kind of principles of economy and society, which were the best principles from the pre-1965 period. And we run up against this *negative* idea, of the so-called “Golden Generation.” This is, for example, the idea expressed by Bill Clinton, back during the 1995-96 period. The argument was, that the missile crisis and the war in Indochina were caused by the false values of the pre-’68er generation, and more generally, say, the World War II generation, also. So, this generation of the ’68ers, at the lead, had the ideology, that they were going to create a new set of culture values, which would replace the false values of their parents’ generation.

Now, what that means, is this: that the ’68er generation *has no generally accepted cultural values, which would enable it to survive the present world crisis*. The question is: Who is going to change the values? Who is going to return the thinking of society back to the ideas of *history*, of historical progress?

Now, obviously, you can not simply, arbitrarily go back to the 1950s and 1960s, because that’s a mixed set of values, of conflicting values. Now, this presents a very interesting challenge to the young people who are 18-25 years of age; to the rest of society, too, but the rest of society has to say, “What should this young generation do? Which values, from the pre-’65 period are good, and which were bad?”

Gauss’s 1799 Paper: A Principle of Truth

So therefore, for this reason, I introduced a youth movement development, in the United States, based on a particular paper by Carl Friedrich Gauss.

You see, you can not choose cultures the way some people in Milan choose women’s dresses. (The models in Milan are so skinny, you couldn’t see them if they didn’t wear dresses! So therefore, you have these funny costumes. The result is, that you have this idea in society, only typified by the manikins in Paris and Milan.) You can not choose culture, the way you choose what you eat from a smorgasbord, which means that you can not just simply choose arbitrary tastes: *You must bring in a principle of truth*. What people like or don’t like, is irrelevant. It’s relevant, only to the question of the process of effecting cultural change. You have to find a way of determining *truth*, and use that, as a way of reorganizing society.

So, I start with Gauss. Now, this is an idea, which is already, essentially, existing in the mind of Schiller, before Gauss published his 1799 paper, in Schiller’s Jena lectures on history. So that, for European civilization, history begins with ancient Greece, and studies of the ideas of ancient Greece, and the *conflicts* within ancient Greece, are the model of reference for studying the history of European civilization, since that time.

Now, this is one of the reasons why I picked Gauss’s 1799 paper. It is not the most important paper by Gauss on the subject of the complex domain, but it is one which is histori-

cally most crucial for the youth of today. Because, this is the last time, until later, that someone actually stated the crucial issue of truth in physical science. Then, all of the important work of Gauss after that, of Abel, of Riemann, and so forth—all of that work was a reflection of this principle, actually stated by Gauss in 1799. And also, and this issue of the Gauss paper, involves the great *cultural crisis* of the 19th Century.

All right, now, you have a situation, which is parallel today—it's not the same as today, but it's parallel.

Europe's History and the Nature of Man

Now, Europe degenerated. Despite Christianity, European culture degenerated from the period of Hellenistic culture, the time of Christ, until the 15th Century. There were many important struggles, such as that of Charlemagne, the struggles around Dante and so forth, which occurred during this period. There was the important Andalusian movement in Spain; Frederick II, of course, in Italy. But, these things were not successful. They made contributions, which we can refer to today, and we should. But they failed to deal with the fundamental issue, which had seized European civilization since the close of the Second Punic War. And, the necessary change did not occur, until the 15th-Century Renaissance—the change back from Latin culture, to Greek philosophical culture.

Modern European civilization, and all its achievements, are a reflection of the revival of Classical Greek culture, by the 15th-Century, Italy-centered Renaissance. Now, the modern nation-state was created first in France and in England, during that century: Louis XI and Henry VII. These were the first modern nation-states. Interesting, is the contrast of Spain, in 1492. Why was Spain, in 1492, a moral failure, compared to the efforts of Louis XI's France and England's Henry VII?

In 1492, ironically, Europe rediscovered the Americas, on the basis of ideas developed around Nicholas of Cusa. Columbus was a follower, intellectually, of Nicholas of Cusa, in this sense. But then, at the same time that 1492 occurred—the discovery of America—the great Inquisitional slaughter against the Moors and Jews of Spain occurred. From that point on, the Spanish monarchy became the greatest single military threat to peace throughout Europe. And, with the defeat of the League of Cambrai 1511, all Europe was plunged into a period of religious wars, until the Treaty of Westphalia. And, it's from the Treaty of Westphalia, that we now date the issues of modern civilization.

Now, in this process, not only religious war was used to try to destroy the nation-state, but the revival of Aristotelianism, as also in the example of the errors of Copernicus and of Tycho Brahe. Because, as Kepler explained, it was the poisonous influence of Aristotle, which caused them to make fundamental errors. So that, the second phase, after Aristotle, was a kind of *neo-Aristotelianism*, which was developed by one of the worst Satanic figures of the close of the 16th Century, beginning of the 17th Century: Paolo Sarpi. And, he was

the most evil man of that period. He's essentially the father of the Thirty Years' War. Then he had his house lackey, Galileo Galilei. And Galileo Galilei's ideas became known as "empiricism." And then, you had an off-shoot of that kind of empiricism, which is called "Cartesianism."

Okay, now, what is the basic issue here? The whole historical issue of humanity, up to that time? Is man an animal, or not? Engels says that man is only an ape, and he made a monkey out of the socialist movement.

So, the Renaissance restored the idea of man as in the image of the Creator. For example, prior to that time, the legacy of Rome and the legacy of the Emperor Constantine, was a false kind of Christianity, which was based on an arbitrary kind of teaching, as opposed to actual Christianity—which took the form, historically, of the struggle of Augustine against the tradition of Constantine, in the history of religion and culture since that time. So, what happened in the 15th-Century Renaissance was this conception of man, the Classical Platonic-Christian conception of man, was restored in a practical way by the writings, especially, of Nicholas of Cusa: the concept of *agapē* from Plato, which then becomes the principle of the Apostle John and of Paul.

So, the idea of man as in the image of God, was a characteristic idea of Christianity, and also spread back into Judaism, and spread also into Islam, during this period: For example, in the case of Philo Judaeus of Alexandria in Judaism; or Moses Maimonides for the Andalusian period in Spanish culture; and, similar things in Islam.

But, it was only in the 15th Century, with the actual formation of France, as a nation-state under Louis XI, that the idea of a society based on the principle of man as in the image of the Creator, was first established. In all known forms of political society prior to that point, men regarded themselves, and others, as animals: some few men, as an oligarchy, and their lackeys, would either hunt down, and kill, or herd like cattle, other people. So, there was no *law*, in the sense that we argue for universal law, today. There were only traditions; and these traditions made no functional distinction between man and beast, typified by Latin culture, under Rome; or typified by the Code of Diocletian for Byzantium. And the tradition of Diocletian's Code for all feudal Europe, ultramontane feudal Europe.

So, the struggle for political society, and the struggle *in* society, the struggle in history is a struggle for a form of society which is consistent with the nature of man, as in the image of the Creator. And, this principle of *agapē*, or general welfare, is therefore the fundamental principle of all acceptable forms of modern society.

This was first done, in the case of Louis XI's France, in terms of the role of the King as assumed by him. And this is expressed in Henry VII's England, as expressed by one of the great students and followers of Henry VII, Sir Thomas More. And, the dramas of Shakespeare—especially the historical dramas—are directly based on the work of Sir Thomas More,

which is a recurring theme of Classical culture, which Shakespeare epitomizes to the present day. For example, the influence of the Shakespeare revival in Germany, in creating the German Classical revival in the 18th Century.

So anyway, the significance of empiricism, and of Aristotelianism, is, they both represent a view of man, which is based on the assumption that man is nothing but an animal. The great struggle, in America, for the creation of the United States, was a struggle to establish a true nation-state, based on this principle, under conditions it was considered impossible to establish such a form of nation-state in Europe. And this was made clear, by the events of July 14, 1789, in which two British agents—Philippe Égalité and Jacques Necker—led and organized the storming of the Bastille, both inside and outside, in order to block the adoption of a republican constitution for the French monarchy. The whole destruction of France—which led into the final days of Napoleon, and then secondly, into the Restoration Bourbon monarchy, was a process of destruction, orchestrated chiefly from around Jeremy Bentham, in the British Foreign Office—and, of most of Europe, too.

So therefore, the United States Constitution is a unique political document, in all modern European history.

A Declaration of Independence on Behalf of Mankind

In a similar way, the paper by Gauss, attacking d'Alembert, Euler, and Lagrange, is also a Declaration of Independence on behalf of all mankind. Because, the great accomplishment of Kepler, as a continuation of the work of Cusa and Leonardo da Vinci, was the restoration of the concept of the existence of universal physical principles, which are *known only to the human mind, and not to any lower species*.

Therefore, since Kepler, the development of successful modern science, has been based on a concept, which Gauss defended, in 1799, as the complex domain. And, his attack on the empiricists, that is, the ideological followers of Sarpi and Galileo—d'Alembert, Euler, and Lagrange—was a defense of humanity against bestiality. Because they have two levels of knowledge of the universe, one level known, *only*, to man. On the one side, we have what I call the "Sensorium": that this is the different behavior, but the same essential quality of false knowledge possessed by the animal; that is, what we "know" with the senses, so-called. So, empiricism is that doctrine; Aristotle is that doctrine. Empiricism is a more radical version of that doctrine—which is also very mystical. It introduces explanations of the ordering of sense experience, which are purely arbitrary.

Now, on the other hand, as Kepler demonstrates, with his discovery of gravitation, that there are principles which rule the universe, which the human mind can actually know, but which are not visible to the senses. So now, Kepler's discovery, which is the founding of modern mathematical physics—especially his *New Astronomy*, founded all competent varieties of modern mathematical physics, in which Kepler explic-

itly attacked, exposed, and destroyed the credibility of the method of Aristotle.

So, as a result of that, in the following period, in the 17th Century, around the circles of Mazarin and Colbert, there was a great effort to look at the notion of principle, as defined successively, by Kepler, and Fermat, with his "quickest action" principle: The question is, if we can show, as Kepler and Fermat showed, that the universe as we see it, is efficiently controlled by principles which we can not see, but which we can know; can we show that man can, actually, by knowing these principles, *use them to change the universe*?

And that was the beginning of modern science, around the circles of Gottfried Leibniz.

Now therefore, at that point, the oligarchy, the Venetian oligarchy in particular, moved in, with the more radical empiricism of Descartes, to try to destroy the influence of Leibniz. So, you had a series of fraudulent attacks, specifically on the work of Leibniz, by d'Alembert, Euler, Lagrange, and so forth.

Now, this is the view of mathematics which is axiomatically hegemonic in universities today. Now, the most crucial response, to defeat this empiricist fascism, so to speak, was this paper by young Gauss, 1799, attacking d'Alembert, Euler, and Lagrange *for fraud*. So, what Gauss does in that paper is, he refers directly, by example, to the methods of geometry which existed in Classical Greece in the times of Plato, the so-called "pre-Euclidean, Pythagorean method." Because, all the issues posed by the fraud, by d'Alembert, Euler, and Lagrange, were shown to be issues which had already been addressed, successfully, by people from the period of Archytas, Plato, and other followers of Pythagoras.

So, what this did, is, it showed a direct connection, between what was emerging as modern science in Europe, and the *roots* of that modern science in ancient Classical Greece. This is, in a sense, an affirmation and a further continuation, of what was done in the 15th-Century Renaissance, restoration of the Classical tradition.

The Platonic Principle

Now, the key feature here, is what? The key feature is the Platonic principle: that the human mind, through its senses, has a *false* image of the physical universe. That is, the attempt to interpret sensory experience merely from sensory observation, is inherently false. The universe is not controlled by the interpretation of sensory experience, as such; the universe is controlled by principles which are *invisible* to the senses, but whose *effects* are visible. To the degree that man has been able to show, that the discovery of these principles gives man new powers to change the universe, physically, this gives us a definition of what is properly called "human knowledge." In other words: There are certain things which are invisible to the senses, called "universal principles," but the efficiency of their effects is visible. But we do not actually *know* these principles, until we prove that we that we can willfully change the behavior



At this cadre school in Wiesbaden, Germany, Limari Navarette demonstrates the unique properties of the platonic solids.

of the experienced universe, by acting on these principles.

When we prove that we can change the universe, through the application of certain ideas we call “universal physical principles,” then we can actually say, for the first time, *that we “know”*. This is the definition of truth.

Now, look, therefore, at the implications of what Gauss did in 1799. What Gauss did, was say that there are two geometries, and this is the basis for his followers’, for his own work and that, later, of Riemann: On the one side, we have the first geometry, which is the *visible universe*. This geometry was known by the ancient Pythagoreans as “spherics.” It’s all based on the conception, that what we see, with the senses, from a point of observation, is as to us, like looking at the inside of a giant sphere.

All right, that’s the inside: Competent geometry is an anti-Euclidean geometry, based on the Pythagorean principle of spherics, of looking at the universe, as if everything we see is on the inside of a planetarium sphere.

But then, we find that we can not explain the behavior that we see, by the sphere, which is what Kepler already demonstrated with his discovery of gravitation. Now, when you get a principle like gravitation, where does it exist? How can you see gravitation? You can’t! You see the undeniable *effects* of gravitation—ah!—which means, that what we call universal physical principles, exist *outside* sense perception. And yet, we can prove that these principles *control* what we see. But we can go further, as we do in physical science, to *change* the way the universe behaves, by our will, by using these principles. And then we know, that we actually *know the*

existence of these unseen, universal physical principles.

These principles then define a second geometry, which is a geometry from *outside* the geometry of spherics, but which is actually acting on the domain of spherics. Ah, so thus we have what Gauss defines as the “complex domain.” A good geometry is a Pythagorean form of geometry, based on spherics—as opposed to the so-called “Euclidean geometry.” Euclidean geometry is a mess; overdoses of Euclidean geometry can destroy the mind.

All right, so therefore, you now find that you have to have a mathematics, which is not based on merely spherics, but which accounts for a *second* geometry: a geometry of universal physical principles, principles which can not be *seen*, but which man can discover and use. This, then, becomes the concept of truth, from the standpoint of physical science.

All right. Then, the same idea of truth also applies to the study of *principles of social relations*. We call the second set of principles, “Classical artistic composition.” What defines Classical artistic principles, is the fact that they conform to the human social behavior, in the way that man’s personal relationship to the universe is reflected as physical science.

The Emergence of the Youth Movement

Now, we’ve had success, since we started this program with youth, a few years ago, about four years ago, actually. I started it, personally, about four years ago, in California, and it evolved. And, a little over a year ago, I brought it forward, as a program for the entire organization. And, if you look at what has happened, as reflected in part in a recent edition of

21st Century (it will also be in *Fusion*), the youth movement has shown that it is truly the kind of youth movement I thought it could become. By concentrating, at the same time, on these elementary considerations of physical science, from Gauss, and with that conception of truth, engaging in the social processes of contemporary society, and proceeding, essentially, free from control of the mafia that controls the universities—it's a real bunch of bums, related to the neo-conservatives, actually, intellectually—we're finding that these youth have had a great impact on political processes, in the United States in particular, even though, presently, they only number in the hundreds.

So, I have moved to protect them, and promote them, and help guide them. And it's working. If we sink Cheney, very soon, as we might, in the United States, it will be largely to the credit of this youth movement. The way the world got to know about the importance of Leo Strauss, was a result of my having a youth movement to do it.

So, the point is, therefore, what we need to do is, we have to have the youth inspire the older generation. Not really by instructing them, though it will have that effect, but instructing them by their example of representing a standard of truth, and also a way of dealing with the problems which affect society, today.

Now, let's look at the problem of a person, who is, say, in their 60s or 50s: These people are now coming to the end of their economically active life, by normal standards, and many of them are about to die. And they're human beings; they're not animals. And, what is important to a human being? *What comes out of having lived*. What comes out for future generations? What is accomplished, to fulfill the work of previous generations? The essential thing—religious object, and personal object for any serious person—is: *What is their connection in history, to the history of ideas*? In the simplest case, the person who is living today, having children, is thinking about what they're doing today, and how it will affect the future of their children and grandchildren.

Think, for example, in former times, in the 18th and 19th Century, when the greatest part of the population were farmers. What did the farmers do? They don't produce a crop, one year at a time. They develop the land; they develop the herds; they develop the plants—in order to build a better future for coming generations, who follow them. This is elementary, simple, morality.

The problem, the crisis, of the Baby Boomer generation, is that *they have lost that morality*. They have no *passion* for the future. They have, rather more, a demoralizing preoccupation with their own personal lives, as if it were a self-contained experience. The youth must say to their parents' generation: *"We are your guarantee of the future."* If we're going to untap the potential of the generation of the people in their 50s and 60s, we're going to have to convince them there *is* a future. That there is no end to history. And, the function of youth, by their example, and their search for truth, is to bring

their parents' generation back to life, into the life which exists in a commitment of one's personal life to the future, however long that life is.

It works. It's also hard work. But, it's the only thing worth doing.

So, what we have done, therefore, we have, by referencing Gauss, in looking at ancient Greece as Gauss did, we have restored a strict definition of the meaning of the word "truth."

The Corruption of Science

Now, just one comment has to be added to that, one historical note: That, as a result of Napoleon Bonaparte's sponsorship of Lagrange, and as a result of what happened after that, especially with the 1815 Congress of Vienna, that 19th-Century science was dominated by the influence of Lagrange. Not entirely—but more and more, was dominated by this empiricist, or pro-empiricist view of science. So, science is, to a large degree, destroyed, with the exception of things typified by Riemann's work, as a continuation of Gauss's work. The political situation was such, that Gauss did not *dare*—for the coming 30-odd years after he wrote the 1799 paper—did not dare to defend, again, his own ideas, publicly. Though, you can see that everything, from Gauss's conceptions of general principles of curvature, and other work, is all consistent with this 1799 paper. And, as Riemann points out, in his habilitation dissertation, all of Riemann's work is based on this concept of Gauss's.

And, this kind of corruption, that these true ideas, these true discoveries, were suppressed to a large degree, and the contrary is still taught, like some kind of barbaric mysticism—it's taught in universities, even today—it shows that these past two centuries have been, in a large degree, a cultural dark age.

Economics and Creative Discovery

Now, we come, now, to this question of the economy, finally, again. Now, the point is, what is economy? Essentially, economy is the application of ideas to nature, by man, through which man increases man's power in and over the universe. So, economy starts with the discovery with of universal physical principles, and their application as technology. But society is not merely a collection of individuals; the relationships among individuals, themselves, are a subject of science. The study of the social principles of cooperation in which we *use* discovered physical principles. We call this the principles of Classical composition, which are principles, just like physical principles, but the subject is not non-human nature—is not non-human forms of nature, but rather the *social* processes among human beings.

So therefore, what we call economy today, what idiots call economy, is money economy. But, the real economy is physical economy: Is forms of cooperation among people, to develop and apply universal physical principles, for man's benefit. Ah—but, in order to give people the freedom, to ex-

press their ideas in useful ways, we require what we call “entrepreneurship,” who apply their technological ideas, to devise products and processes which are better. And, this is an essential part, of the process by which the human mind develops the economy. So therefore, we create money and credit systems, to enable the individual entrepreneurs to participate in a coherent process for the benefit of society as a whole.

We see, for example, in the case of the collapse of the Soviet system, an illustration of the point. Now, you see, in the Soviet military-scientific area, tremendous accomplishments, under extraordinarily difficult circumstances. You look at the Soviet non-military economy, and you see a disaster. What’s the problem? The problem was, Frederick Engels was a monkey! That Frederick Engels’ conception of man, was man as an overgrown ape; so that Engels’ ideas defined Soviet society as a society of monkeys. But, the Soviet people are not apes, but the social processes, the laws of behavior imposed upon them, are laws designed for *apes*, not for *people*. The issue was, the Soviet system, in its emphasis on labor as an animal, as an ape, denied the essential role of the entrepreneur. And therefore, there were no *Mittelständler* in the Soviet system. The only kind of *Mittelständler* came later, under Gorbachov and his successors, and the idea of entrepreneurship was to steal. So, you don’t have a steel industry in Russia today, you have a “stealing” industry.

And thus, the function of the state is to create the conditions, under which the individual in the economy, acting as an entrepreneur, or otherwise as an individual, is able to express their freedom of creative powers, to make contributions which improve the economy as a whole.

But, a free-market economy is a dead-market economy, because the conditions of production depend upon transportation, such as high-speed rail systems; depend upon the development, production, and distribution of power; depend upon large-scale water management; depend upon educational systems for the total population; depend upon health-care systems for the total population; they depend upon the organization of cities and communities in ways which correspond to the requirements of life and work in the society. So therefore, these are the responsibilities of government, which will take about 50% of any total modern economy; which represents what the state must do, in its responsibilities for *all* of the people and all of the territory. The freedom of the entrepreneur must exist *within* the framework defined by these functions of the state.

This was understood, in a crude way, but an effective way, by Franklin Roosevelt’s reforms in the United States. It was understood also, in Europe, in the post-war reconstruction period. So therefore, what we need to do, is return to those aspects of that experience which are valid, with the idea of truths, and we have to inspire a generation which has been corrupted by the post-industrial ideology—inspire them with youth leadership—to rediscover what they have lost.

It’s not so difficult to do. If you look around us, all of the ideas which became popular, as changes, in European and American civilization, since the middle of the 1960s, have been proven *false* by experience, to date. Every day, something collapses, new, of those false ideas.

And it reminds me of the story by Hans Christian Andersen, the famous Danish writer, who wrote the story about the “Emperor’s New Suit of Clothes.” A pair of swindlers, calling themselves tailors, came to the Emperor. And they said they could make the most perfect clothes in the world for him. These are typical, free-market economic theorists. So, the Emperor believed it; he got his advisors to believe it; they got the people to believe it. So, the Emperor went out on the street naked, while the crowds were admiring the wonderful clothes he was wearing! As if it were the German population, reading *Bildzeitung*, today, in which there’s a lot of discussion of ideas, but everybody’s naked. And, a little boy, standing on the street, said to his father, “But Father! He has nothing on!”

All right, but so, the young people today, will point to the foolish crowds, and say, “The Emperor has nothing on.” But, that little boy is not sufficient; that boy needs to be educated to an idea of truth, to inspire the onlooking crowd to *see* what the truth is. And when we have a better society, which I’m determined we’re going to have soon, you will all say, “The little boy was right.”

Okay, thank you.



“You won’t read about it in Science or Nature, but the big news in science today is the growth of a youth movement, committed to the principle of discovering the truth.”

- “How It Is, That Every American Shall Come to Understand Gauss,” by Sky Shields
- “Learning the Science of Pedagogy,” by Rianna St. Classis
- LaRouche in Dialogue with Youth

Single copies \$5 each; 6 issue subscription \$25. Purchase on line at www.21stcenturysciencetech.com or from 21st Century, P.O. Box 16285, Washington, D.C. 20041