

IT DOES LIVE:

The Mind in Brief

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

May 17, 2011

I begin with emphasis on the necessity of uttering the following sentence, which is, unavoidably, what is called “a mouthful.”

The root of the most prevalent errors of judgment respecting both the essential nature of a competent notion of physical science, and, taking into account the failures of judgment respecting human social processes, is to be located, fundamentally, in the presumption that the root of human knowledge lies in the principles of sense-perception, rather than in higher order of knowledge, that being the knowledge of the creative powers unique to the actual human mind, a mind which knows that sense-perception is nothing better than a distorted shadow of the reality accessible only to that rarely recognized reality which exists only in the powers of what remains, still today, the rarely recognized existence of the actual human mind.

The chief source of moral, as much as physical failure of the behavior of human beings, still today, most notably, ostensibly literate folk, is inherent in the misguided belief that sense-perception shows us reality. Thus, we are confronted with what is actually the irrationality of what is usually mistaken, even on the higher academic levels, for the practice of reason.

The worst of the blunders and related incompetencies exhibited by presumably well-meaning and cultivated persons, are products of the prevalence of the

A Work in Progress: Solving The Problem of, and in, Time

May 20—The following short memoranda by Lyndon LaRouche were directed, in large part, to the scientific “Basement Team” which LaRouche has assembled and led over the past few years. They are, by their very nature, incomplete, a work in progress, and framed in the terms of reference which that team is working on diligently.

Our decision to share them with *EIR*’s audience—to, in effect, have the reader look over our shoulders—comes from the urgency of the galactic situation in which mankind finds itself. How, indeed, shall we prepare to handle the crises now being presented to mankind in the form of “natural disasters,” often of unprecedented proportions? How must we think of the role of mankind in the universe, and direct our scientific research in the very immediate period ahead? What is the appropriate scientific method in a period when mankind’s very existence would seem to hang in the balance?

Let us 'feel the deadly bodkin being slipped into the intended "mortal organ," that, with an accompanying sense of, "the departure of the soul." Hamlet stands, thus, for a moment, as merely a homely actor upon a bleakly ordinary stage, that for an awful moment there. Having died, so, once, like Othello, the soulless corpse now resumes the role of Hamlet, as the presence of the spirit playing the actor's role, in that domain, which is the imagination, which is the stage.

Lithograph by Eugène Delacroix (1843): *Hamlet, III, 3*



a-priori form of belief which is systemically contrary to Johannes Kepler's uniquely original discovery of the principle of universal gravitation. I mean that the discovery that sense-perception constitutes the source of evidence in support of the actually fallacious notion that deduction situated amid relevant sense-perceptual experience, provides us insight into a principled expression of a sensible reality. Whereas, in fact, the existing proof to the contrary, is clearly shown in certain studies premised on assessing the actuality of Kepler's own, and actually experimentally demonstrated discovery by a systematic re-examination of Kepler's actual discovery.

Perhaps, the most dramatic, and also most fruitful among the outstanding proofs of Kepler's argument,

is that of Albert Einstein's insight into the actuality that Kepler's discovery demonstrates that our universe is "finite, but not bounded." Indeed, it can be seen by any of the seriously witting, in this instance, that even most of those heard affirming Einstein's words in this matter, do not actually know what they are "talking about," ontologically.

Yet, the formality of the knowledge, that Einstein's somewhat celebrated argument exists, has usually failed to persuade even "the presumably witting," to see the physically efficient reality toward which Einstein's words have pointed them. That point is the kernel of the entirety of the argument which I have supplied in "When Governments Crumble":¹ *Exactly, where and what is the human mind?*

It could be said, that I have already stated this point clearly in that recent publication; yet, I can be certain, in advance, that it is necessary for me to explain what I have explained, not actually because I did not say it clearly enough, but, because readers will usually need to think through again what I have already written. Thus, as all of the wiser pedagogues of relevance have warned, any subject taught must be composed of, essentially, three successive elements, as follows:

"First, say what you are going to say; second, say it; and, third, and (temporarily) last, say what you had said, that finally, in a manner which reminds them that what you have told them is the exact subject which

1. "At the Brink of Confusion: When Governments Crumble," *EIR*, May 20, 2011.

you had warned them of at the beginning.”

Then, having completed that cycle once, say what you had thus said, again, but in another piece; this time, you will have described the meaning of the preceding three-step process, in the same way, except that, now, you are making the seeing of the object as, this time, the object which your mind is now seeing as an existence which you have experienced as, ontologically, in the two preceding statements.

That, for example, is the motive for the practice of the “basement crew,” to have some of them, each in turn, recite as an individual speaking aloud the text which the others’ eyes are reading. To hear and see simultaneously defines an added dimension to the experiencing of the presentation of the subject-matter. Adding a second dimension of seeing of an object of illustration, adds to the dimensionality of the experience, that in the same fashion as the addition of other precursors in forecasting.

For example, it has become the custom, lately, to have the audio-visual presentation of a drama, or, more pointedly, an opera, on stage, or, on the screen, move visibly on stage. Otherwise, the essential image of the drama is ruined, both in fact, and in effect. Tight camera-shots used on such occasions, are deadly in their effect on the mind’s experience.

Call the net result of that process, the indispensable approach and method for conveying a sense of the actual ontology embodied within the process represented by the preceding combination of successive steps.

The point of what might appear to some, initially, as an awkward proceeding in the arts of pedagogy, represents, precisely, the indispensable mission of making the ontological significance of the concept described as, itself, an efficiently ontological sense of it, rather than merely a formally literary experience, such as a merely descriptive form of argument in the mode of the likeness of an ordinary classroom experience. Get out of “blab school” into the domain of what is both literally and figuratively the ontologically “real,” for the benefit of the mind of the hearer and viewer—and the speaker.

The Problem Considered

To actually convey an idea, one must gain proximity to the witnessing of “a live performance” of a drama on an active stage. Merely “reading text,” as if aloud from a script, but without the quality of drama, suffocates

what should have been the intended quality of drama which the effective delivery of ideas requires. “Body language,” often even “bawdy” language, is sometimes most helpful, on certain accounts.

The most essential of the principles to be considered on account of the considerations I have presented here up to this time, is the urgency of transforming the image of the speaker of the account-in-progress, to a different body (“so to speak”) than the body which we might assume to be the physical body “on stage.” The actual body must recede into the mists, so that the “spirit,” *the soul*, might appear in that place on stage where the incarnate body of the person had, perhaps mistakenly, seemed to have occupied the personality on stage.

“... the play’s the thing
Wherein I’ll catch the conscience of the king.”
...
“To, be,” or, “not to be?” “That, is the
question.”
...
... might his quietus make...? with ... a,
bare, bodkin!”

Let us “feel the deadly bodkin being slipped into the intended ‘mortal organ,’” that, with an accompanying sense of, “the departure of the soul.” Hamlet stands, thus, for a moment, as merely a homely actor upon a bleakly ordinary stage, that for an awful moment there. Having died, so, once, like Othello, the soulless corpse now resumes the role of Hamlet, as the presence of the spirit playing the actor’s role, in that domain, which is the imagination, which is the stage.

I have not exaggerated in the least.

What, after all is said, is real? A discovery of a truly efficient incarnation of a great, truthful principle of physical science, for example, is certainly more real today, that the interred corpse of he who discovered that principle earlier.

On this account, it is notable, that thoughtful young adults of their contemporary, present generation, often think, mistakenly, of the values which they have adopted as their own, and imagine that those values will have lost their efficient meaning which their generation has harbored, once they, in turn have become deceased. Yet, the great scientific discoverers, and creative Classical artists from the past, exist, today, as more real than most among today’s presently living

members of our population.

Without such passion for the spirit, there could be no truth.

Aye, lassie... *“The play, is”—indeed—“the thing.”*

To “see the soul” on stage, so, is the principle of truth, as it is not credibly truthful that it appear in any other incarnation. What we consider as the living flesh, is no more real than the immortality of that which remains as the gift which had been the incarnate habitation of an efficiently creative soul, once the so-called “mortal body” has departed. Such is the principle of human life itself; such is the meaning of the work of men and women which remains immortal, after the human body, is deceased.

What we will have created for future mankind, is, in the end, what we are.

The Irony of It All

Thus, creativity is such, as I have implicitly treated the subject, in both what I have written in “When Governments Crumble,” and in the essence of that piece which I have emphasized here thus far. I have given to you, here, as in the preceding, much longer work, the essence of that greater truth which has been conveyed to serve as truth incarnate. The soul in its reality, is you, for whatever worth the existence of the mortal person for its service to mankind presents, but, especially, the future generations of mankind, a future in whose creation we have participated.

That is the root of our true worth, its worth as living to have lived as the expression of this devotion to creating the future itself.

LPAC VIDEO

TO BE OR NOT TO BE: A GALACTIC QUESTION

If we recognize that to man is granted a higher identity, above the simple perceptions of our mere mortal coil, an identity consistent with the greatest achievements of Classical arts and science, then we must locate our mission not in what is, but in what must become.

<http://larouchepac.com/galactic-question>