

Culture As Science

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

September 4, 2006

It is time to follow up what I have published earlier on the issue of “Science and Culture,” as this was posed famously by England’s C.P. Snow¹: *Is there a science of culture which corresponds to the broadly accepted, essential notions of a systematic organization of the subject-matter of physical science?*

From what I have written earlier, on human culture, it is shown that a systemic form of behavior is comparable to the

1. C.P. Snow, *Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution* (London and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993 reprint).

systematic notions of universal physical principles otherwise. This statement, while fully true, involves two notions which need to be clarified.

- *First*, human culture differs from behavior of animals in a fashion which is comparable to the difference between living and so-called “inanimate” processes.
- *Second*, certain limited aspects of human culture can be introduced to the behavior of beasts without breaching the qualitative difference, as between the Biosphere and V.I. Vernadsky’s Noösphere, between the human mind and the behavioral potentials of the relevant beasts.



EIRNS/Sylvia Spaniolo

Teams from the LaRouche Youth Movement are re-experiencing the act of discovery of universal physical principles. “This is key for comprehension of the actual meaning of the idea of competent physical science, and also for Classical human culture otherwise.” Here, LYM members in Oakland, Calif., demonstrate the principle of the catenary.

That is to emphasize that beasts, pet dogs for example, can acquire a well-ordered capacity for response to human culture and its affective aspects, but without the cognitive feature of human behavior to which the beast has become conditioned to respond with a certain *affective* appropriateness.

For this very reason, a review of the cultured relationship between dogs, as family household pets, and mankind, is, as Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa would, implicitly, have agreed, one of the most relevant of the complementary studies of the precisely definable line of principled separation between mankind and all lower forms of life. As the Cardinal emphasized the crucial point here, the dog is able to participate in mankind, as man must participate in the Creator, as Cusa's faithful follower, Johannes Kepler, did.

* * *

The essential, absolute difference between man and animal, is an expression of the fundamental distinction, as by V.I. Vernadsky, between man and beast, as this separation is expressed by the pervasively distinctive characteristic of what Vernadsky identified as *the Noösphere*. In the matter of general practice, this difference is expressed in terms of the fact that there is no direct, literal form of *organic* communication—as if to say “wiring”—among the cognitive powers of individual persons. Yet, the individual's cognitive (i.e., scientifically creative, and Classical artistic) processes, must necessarily affect the development of the living processes, such as the health, of the human individual.

It is within the bounds, so to speak, of those processes for which there is no connection of likeness to “wiring,” that the commonly characteristic feature of both science (properly conceived) and Classical forms of culture lies. It is, therefore, within the bounds of that common feature, that the differences between the two lie to be defined and distinguished.

The common feature of what is fairly named the discovery of a universal physical-scientific principle, is what is typified by Johannes Kepler's uniquely original discoveries of both universal gravitation and the subsumed principle of ordering of the harmonic determination of the orbital pathways within the Solar System as a whole. As the point was emphasized in the anti-reductionist method of *Sphaerics* shared among such Classical Greek circles as the Pythagoreans, Socrates, and Plato, truly universal physical principles can be demonstrated by appropriate actions which prove the efficiency of certain principles as universal in nature, but these principles, which the Pythagoreans and Plato put under the categorical name of *dynamis*, a term from Classical Greek which Gottfried Leibniz introduced to modern physical science as *dynamics*, are not directly “visible” to sense-perception. Animals and René Descartes can recognize the sensory effects of such principles, but can not recognize the principle as such; only the cognitive processes specific to the sovereign individual mind can recognize such a principle of this category of *dy-*



EIRNS/Helene Möller

It is urgent that we capture the nature of the human species, LaRouche writes, which produces fundamental science and Classical modes of artistic expression “in celebration of the inherent nobility of the nature and worth of the human individual's creative powers.” Here, LYM organizers in Germany, singing in the Berlin district of Pankow.

namis, as such.

Principles which fit the category of *dynamics*, once discovered by one mind, correspond to a cognitive experience, by that mind, which can be replicated by another individual mind, as teams from the LaRouche Youth Movement (LYM) organization are re-experiencing the act of discovery of both universal gravitation, in particular, and the dynamical-harmonic organization of the Solar field of gravitation in general. This is key for comprehension of the actual meaning of the idea of competent physical science, and also for Classical human culture otherwise.

The discovery of a universal physical principle is a socially replicatable act of the cognitive powers of the individual mind; Classical culture is founded on a higher order of comprehension: the comprehension of the social process of organizing the behavior of society, which takes the transmission of

ideas of the quality of universal physical principles, as the subject of the same quality of cognitive powers of the individual to the social processes represented, typically, by the feasibility of replication of the discovery of a universal physical principle through appropriate methods of experimental replication of proof.

Hence, for example, in physical science, the use of a so-called “pure mathematics” as a substitute for science, as in the use of the pathological state of scientific incompetence exhibited by so-called “benchmarking,” is a form of functional insanity with the foreboding of even probably fatal consequences in the naïve design of aircraft, by resort, as since approximately 1989-1991, to substituting benchmarking methods for physical methods of previously traditional design-engineering practice. This is more readily understood by contrasting the competent methods of physical geometry, known as *Sphaerics*, practiced by the Pythagoreans and Plato, for example, with the intrinsically fraudulent method employed by the Euclid of *Euclid's Elements*.

The adoption of aprioristic notions, such as notions of a “self-evident” set of definitions, axioms, and postulates, as the basis for a mathematics, implicitly defines a virtually Babylonian “flat Earth” scheme as the formal universe of plane and solid geometry, and uses such a pathological form of “pure mathematics” as a weapon deployed as a set of alleged canons. Such is the practice by the Babylonian priesthoods disguised as modern “peer review committees,” to cripple science in a manner echoing the thunders of the pro-satanic Olympian Zeus of Aeschylus’ *Prometheus Bound*. The function of such “peer review” practices, is to eliminate the practical recognition of a universal physical principle from science, by substituting a reductionist form of mathematical deduction for actual knowledge of an experimentally validated universal physical principle such as Kepler’s uniquely original, experimental mode of discovery of universal gravitation and its associated Solar-systemic harmonic orderings.

Hence, “pure mathematicians,” especially those addicted to modern forms of the so-called positivism of Ernst Mach, as by Ludwig Boltzmann and his school, or, worse, the radical empiricism of the school of Bertrand Russell and such of the latter’s devotees as Norbert Wiener and John von Neumann, hover on the brink of a plunge into either virtually autistic or schizophrenic modes of insanity, even mass-insanity. In these two cases, we are dealing with highly developed minds, such that it is not lack of talent for formal education which has created their pathological form of deficiency, but, rather, an acute mental-pathological disorder, either of lack of the capacity for empathy for the social nature of the human individual in society, or a virtually schizophrenic deadening of the relevant semblances of a human conscience, as under the influence of the shamelessly Satanic personality of Aleister Crowley associate Bertrand Russell. The result of either case is a compulsion to view man and nature alike, in a social-pathologically mechanistic view, expressing functionally

systemic hostility to mankind and nature generally, as both Wiener and von Neumann exhibited such psychopathological traits characteristically in their work.²

It is the attempt to confine the notions of physical science to the terms cohering with the Olympian Zeus’ ban on man’s knowledgeable use of fire or nuclear power, which has thus created that pathological dichotomy of physical science and Classical artistic practice, to which C.P. Snow referred. Substitution of the aprioristic practices akin to those of *Euclid's Elements* for the act of discovery of the universe’s design according to experimentally defined universal physical principles, as the combined work of Kepler and Bernhard Riemann, is exemplary of all competent modern European science, in the defining of the nature and role of universal physical principles, is a substitution which has been a crucially determining influence in the Twentieth Century’s ruin of modern physical science and the virtual elimination of knowledge of the methods and principles of Classical artistic composition.

The Human Individual As a Cognitive Being

The enduring accomplishment of V.I. Vernadsky’s combined view of the Biosphere and Noösphere, as characteristically *dynamic*, rather than mechanistic systems, is that it forces us today to place the emphasis on the distinguishing principle of the Noösphere in defining the principled basis for functional notions of relations within society. Hence, all social sciences today, including economics and politics, and also problems of human mass and individual psychopathology, must be subsumed under the controlling principle of that which distinguishes the Noösphere absolutely from all inferior expressions of the principle of life. Such is the best modern approach to a richer understanding of man as made in the likeness of the Creator.

Since the original discoveries by Johannes Kepler and such of his explicit followers as Fermat, Leibniz, Gauss, Dirichlet, Riemann, and Albert Einstein, it is clear, that when mankind acts to effect a change in the universe of action by applying a discovered such principle to the Solar system, or the larger universe, this application tends to change the universe, such that mankind then stands revealed more clearly as in the likeness of what the great Philo of Alexandria defined as the personality of the Creator who is not bounded by a mistaken commentator’s notion of the Creator’s limitation by his own Creation.

The corollary of that, is that it is only when the individual and society, base the ordering of the society’s practice on such principled steps of progress in the universe as the application of discovered universal physical principles to

2. E.g., Wiener’s notion of “cybernetics,” his *Human Use of Human Beings*, and the pathological notion of “artificial intelligence” by von Neumann, Marvin Minsky, and Noam Chomsky, are notable examples of this social-pathological, mechanistic misconception of mankind.



clipart.com



“Animals and René Descartes can recognize the sensory effects” of universal principles, but not “the principle as such,” notes LaRouche. “Only the cognitive processes specific to the sovereign individual mind can recognize such a principle of this category of dynamic, as such.”

versal natural law on which the great 1648 Treaty of Westphalia was premised.

There are two leading aspects to this central principle of those sources. First, that those aspects of national cultures which share affinity, in the sense of natural law, with that central principle, must be defended as the sovereign instrument of self-government by a people. Second, that those sovereign nation-states must be united under the sharing of the same universal principle expressed, so, by the exemplary 1648 Treaty of Westphalia.

We have come to a time in which the power to conduct warfare, either as a use of powerful modern technologies, or in the

deadly form of asymmetric warfare, does not permit warfare in any mode but the absolute requirements of self-defense. Warfare launched for any other purpose constitutes a capital crime against all humanity, whatever other purpose might be posed.

The conditions of peace, can not be the silly, counterproductive proposal, based on the foolish doctrine of negation of the negation, by Immanuel Kant. The principle must be, like the 1648 Treaty, a purely positive affirmation of love for all mankind premised on those individual cognitive powers which distinguish man from the beasts.

These cognitive powers are expressed in competent physical science, as by the ancient Pythagoreans and Plato, and by the modern physical science launched, initially, by Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa’s contributions to the continuing work of the great ecumenical Council of Florence, as Kepler, Fermat, Leibniz, Gauss, Dirichlet, Riemann, Einstein, and Vernadsky typify the essential work of fundamental physical scientific progress. However, this were not sufficient. We must capture the principle of scientific thought; but, it were more urgent that we capture the nature of the human species which produces that science and the complementary expressions of Classical modes of artistic expression in celebration of the inherent nobility of the nature and worth of the human individual’s creative powers.

As we move now into the great dialogue among peoples and their nations, to avert the monstrous calamity of economic collapse and war which now confronts us all, we must put the issues I have summarized here in the forefront of our discussions. It is time to grasp more fully that divine mission of all mankind which must unite the respectively sovereign nations to a common global purpose for our actions within the universe as a whole.

raise the universe, or at least part of its whole, to a higher physical standard, that man is behaving as in the likeness of the Creator.

In known history, Satan is of the type of the Olympian Zeus of Aeschylus’ *Prometheus Bound*. It is the anti-Prometheans, in the sense of that reading, who are the expression of Satanic forces within society. The conception of man as human cattle, the which the Olympian Zeus would enforce, is the essence of evil. For example, chattel slavery, as introduced to Transatlantic practice by the Spanish of Torquemada’s Spain, by the Anglo-Dutch Liberal system later, and as defended by the virtually Satanic insurrection against the U.S.A. by Lord Palmerston’s Confederacy assets, is a clear example of the Satanic principle at work. Similarly, the post-1865 practice, by some Yankees of the Liberal persuasion, in not educating children of former slaves, and also others, “above their expected social station in life,” is an example of the Satanic principle of the Olympian Zeus at work. Similarly, the contemporary Malthusians, who have reigned more and more in policy-shaping during the post-1968 developments, must be included among the overtly Satanic tendencies. However, also, for the same reason, much of the work of the academic and related “peer review” establishment, is also Satanicly inclined.

There are three outstanding examples from the known history of European civilization since the ancient Greece of Thales, Solon, the Pythagoreans, Socrates, and Plato, which, like the Christianity of the Apostles John and Paul, have focussed on this point as a matter of systemic principle for society as a whole. These are the assembled Socratic dialogues of Plato, the ecumenical doctrine of Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, and the role of Cardinal Mazarin in organizing the principle of “the benefit of the other” as the principle of uni-