

Literate Language: A Wise Basis for Defending National Sovereignty

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

October 20, 1990

*[Published in **Executive Intelligence Review**, Volume 17, Number 42, November 2, 1990. View [PDF of original](#) at the LaRouche Library.]*

What follows has been slightly shortened from a commentary made by Mr. LaRouche on October 20. He is a candidate for Congress from Virginia's 10th C.D.

It is urgent that some serious thinking be done both by the government of the United States, and other governments, on the question of national sovereignty.

We have two directions from which national sovereignty is endangered now. One is the tendency toward formation of global and regional blocs which dissolve national sovereignty in effect, or threaten to do so. The second is, the resistance to the aspirations of peoples for national sovereignty from within confederations such as the Soviet Union, the Warsaw Pact, or the Federation of Yugoslavia.

Unfortunately, for most statesmen these days, I see reflected no understanding of the essential principles involved in such matters. This is probably due to a fault in trends of 20th-century higher and other education, relative to the highest standard of education in the best institutions during the 18th and 19th centuries, when this matter was better understood.

Dante Alighieri made it clear in *De Monarchia* and other writings, taken together, that one of the essential conditions for an effective form of representative self-government, an effective form of national sovereignty, was the premising of the state itself upon the common use of a literate form of commonly spoken and written language.

The principle is twofold. First, without a common language, a people cannot deliberate together, and therefore cannot form a *durable* form of coherent self-government. A government which is composed of people of different languages, who cannot deliberate directly with one another, is no representative government at all.

Second, it is not sufficient that people speak a common form of language. People who speak in an argot, think in an argot; and people who think in a defective form of language cannot comprehend even the simplest of the life-and-death issues which determine the durability or

the collapse of a nation-state. Therefore, we must emphasize the two conditions: the condition for the most effective form of sovereign nation-state—the precondition for any form of truly representative self-government—is that the span of government among the electorate must not *exceed*, in general, the boundaries of those who share the common use of a literate form of language.

The exemplary model for literate form of language is the Italian of Dante Alighieri's *Commedia*, which set the standard for literate Italian, particularly during the period of the Renaissance, and following.

The Principle of Literacy

If we avoid limiting the notion of logic, or reason, to a deductive logic, we can say then: that a good language, such as the ancient Vedic or Sanskrit as a model, has all of the features of a geometry; a mathematics in general; music; and so forth.

A language in a literate form, embraces all of the capabilities needed to express the highest form of physical-scientific knowledge, and of classical humanist art forms. It may have difficulty in representing, directly, geometric forms, or forms of great paintings and so forth, the so-called plastic arts, but it can deal directly with the ideas bearing upon those subjects of the so-called plastic art forms, and geometry.

Contrary to some radical thinkers of the 18th and 19th century, and contrary to the misguided authors of so-called “new mathematics” during the present century, the ability to understand any important policy of government or of self-government, depends upon an adequate founding in both a literate form of language and of the use of a rigorous geometry as an auxiliary or part of that repertoire of literate thought and speech. This mastery of geometry, in a civilized society, is reached by approximately the age of 10–12 at the latest; otherwise, lacking that, the child will tend to be crippled as an adult throughout life, through a lack of mastery of a rigorous form of elementary geometry.

The issue is not how to communicate slogans, to which some people degenerate politics and political thinking. The issue is the ability of a people to think: to use the words of Shelley, in his *A Defence of Poetry*, “to impart and to receive the most profound and impassioned conceptions respecting man and nature.” This is the condition of a healthy electorate: The ability to *share* this kind of thinking, is the geography of an effective form of representative self-government.

For example, at one point in the history of the United States, there was a decision faced, as to whether the young United States should adopt as its universal language, English or German. These were very wise people, who posed that question. A nation must have one

language which is its official language, in which everybody can think articulately, literately. That language must be a literate form. It must not be reduced, also, to a deductive form of expression; that is, a deductive grammar. Otherwise, the language is incapable of communicating important thought.

A Communicable Form of Creative Reasoning

Just one sidelight on this. As I referenced this in a recently published short book, *In Defense of Common Sense*, Kant's *Critiques*, which are an attack upon Gottfried Leibniz, more or less in the spirit of David Hume and Voltaire ... denied the existence of a communicable form of creative reasoning, which Leibniz had shown to be possible, and which I have, in the course of my work, had occasion to freshly demonstrate. As a matter of fact, one of the essential parts of my life's work has been a refutation of Kant, in defense of the tradition of Leibniz, the latter to which I adhere, which all my important contributions to scientific and related thought have been derived.

But if a people were to speak only a Kantian or Cartesian form of language, that people would not be an intelligent people truly capable of self-government. And, as Kant defines the problem of *deus ex machina*, that implies, and rightly so, that a people whose thinking is limited to deductive formalism in its habits of speech, is a people which leaves the most important questions out of the arena of comprehensible deliberation. The result is that effective government comes in the form of something outside the capacities of reason of the people at large. In other words, tyranny, or dictatorship.

So, as Heinrich Heine warned against Kant and René Descartes, if adopted as a mode of thought of a people, it condemns that people, either to anarchy, or to the solution of anarchy known as dictatorship, or outright tyranny.

Thus, the importance of a people being able to reason, as I define reason in the short book I've referenced, is an essential condition of representative self-government.

In contrast to this, let us consider what many people say today in the name of democracy.

Modern ideas of democracy—that is, in the postwar period—are largely influenced by a rather satanic group of people centered around the Institute for Social Research at Frankfurt, particularly the ideas of that evil fellow, Theodor Adorno, with his and Hannah Arendt's idea of the authoritarian personality. To these fellows, all forms of reason are essentially authoritarian, or dictatorial.

These are the people who gave us Adolf Hitler; these are the people who have given us Bolshevism; these are the people who have given us modern terrorism, at least the structure

of it; these are the people who have given us that radical counterculture, which is eroding and threatening to destroy Western civilization from within,

Democracy is not based on everybody's right to their own opinion; true democracy is based on the right of the person, and the obligation of the person, as well as the right, to have the means of literate forms of effective common deliberation, respecting the policies of self-government of a sovereign nation-state.

A Community of Principle

Beyond that, given that a state is sovereign within these principles, a state may enter into agreement with other states; an agreement which is based on a community of principle. Thus, the French and the Italians and the Germans, each having a literate form of their own language, may enter fruitfully into various kinds of agreements which are mutually advantageous to each and all members of the states. They may loosen the borders among the respective states, without looting thereby, the sovereignty of any of the states. They may promote commerce in a most intensive degree, provided they do not loot the political sovereignty of the respective states.

Because the deliberation must be done in the literate form of the respective languages, thus, the principle of sovereignty by language definition must be preserved. But, they may cooperate in all kinds of forms otherwise. This cooperation depends, however, upon a common principle which is known within the literate use of the respective languages. That common principle is what Christian tradition since St. Augustine in particular identifies as natural law.

The only supranational authority which can be rightly tolerated on this planet, is not any form of supranational government, or any treaty organization which has the forms of supranational government. The only form of supranational rule is the authority of the highest moral law, natural law, as the Augustinian tradition identifies it. *Any other arrangement, is folly which leads but to bloodshed.*

Thus, we have the situation in Eastern Europe, in the Soviet Union, in Yugoslavia, and elsewhere. States must be bound together, either as truly sovereign states, which are based on the literate use of a common language or there must be arrangements, considerations, based on a true valid and durable principle of natural law, for which there is no substitute for natural law as defined by the Augustinian tradition.

Failure to adhere to this principle, or intentional or reckless violation, leads but to violence and bloodshed in the long run. That is my policy on this matter, which I am prepared to defend, and believe that I must prevail in any dispute on this question.