

3

Leibniz's mind



Left: Gottfried Leibniz (1646-1716). From this universal thinker LaRouche learned the principle that the efficiency of creative reason is represented by the nature of the connection of each isolated individual who does creative reasoning in the present, with the past, present, and the future. Right: Sir Isaac Newton (1642-1727), the British enemy and plagiarist of Leibniz.

Now, we turn to the question of scientific thought.

Some time ago, I made a reply to a paper in which Euler had attacked Leibniz's *Monadology*.¹ In that connection, I emphasized two things about Euler's attack on Leibniz, beyond the bare fact that it is simply incompetent. I emphasized the fact that Euler's argument was not physics, in the first place, and showed what its fallacies were geometrically, the nature of its geometrical fallacies. I also emphasized that the empirical basis for knowing the *Monadology* does not lie in some abstract, arbitrary, geometric construction, but rather, lies in a very simple demonstration of physics.

For example, it is shown that all creative reason, and therefore all knowledge of the lawful ordering of our universe, is associated with a sovereign power of creative individual reason in the individual personality. Hence, that individual is, as Leibniz emphasized, a *monad*. Hence, the

organization of the universe is based on the action corresponding to creative reason by monads. That is physics. It can be demonstrated that in no other way can we possibly achieve science.

The notion that a science, an empirical science leads us to a different kind of view, i.e., the Euler view, is absurd.

For example: In a universe which undergoes change, we can demonstrate creative reason in the case of human behavior, that is, historical behavior, as the creative lawful ordering of change. In such a universe, one can know the lawful ordering of things only by a knowledge of a transfinite ordering, which corresponds to that lawful ordering, the creative lawful ordering. For example, as I indicate this extensively—and I think in what is a very happy mode of representation, of pedagogy—in my *In Defense of Common Sense*, only the principle which determines the ordering, implicitly, of the successive scientific revolutions, i.e., as I did with the A through E lattices, only that principle represents knowledge. Only that principle corresponds, even in approximation, to a lawful ordering of the universe.

Therefore, any knowledge of the universe as to the principle of ordering can only arise from the standpoint of the creative reason, i.e., the sovereign creative reasoning powers of the individual: being conscious of those sovereign creative reasoning powers and other creative phenomena which are

1. See *Appendix*. Euler's material was sent to my attention by Larry Hecht.

analogous, shall we say, to what happens in creative reasoning.

That gives us the essential map of the universe in germ. To go further, we have to take the other principles into account. We have already demonstrated again, socially, that the efficiency of creative reason is, in first instance, represented by the nature of the connection of each isolated individual who does creative reasoning in our society in the present, with the past, present, and the future, as I have indicated earlier. That demonstrates that that causal relationship is the nature of the efficient relationship between creative reasoning and the universe. That is, the individual, creative reasoning, and the universe. This gives us the map.

Whenever we go away from this map, we are wrong. Whatever we build, there is a fundamental fallacy in it, if we depart from this map. Hence, the *Monadology* is perhaps the most essential document in all of physics.

You will note that Leibniz, in essence, says, in his own terms of reference, exactly what I say here—which is not entirely accidental; about the age of 13 to 14, I learned this from Leibniz, directly. I wrestled with it then for over a year, and I got it into my head; so today, I don't have it necessarily in the form I learned it from Leibniz, although I was stimulated to my discovery by him. I have learned it in my own way; but, I can go back now, and find that what I am saying and what he is saying are really the same thing, in the sense we are talking about exactly the same phenomenon, and are posing exactly the same questions.