

LaRouche: Your Mission Is Your Existence

Lyndon LaRouche made the following intervention in the Feb. 22 morning panel on “Is Mankind Capable To Govern Itself?” following the speeches of Jacques Cheminade, Prof. Norton Mezvinsky, and Prof. Father Bonifacio Honings.

Several developments have transpired since this session began as a continuation of yesterday. One of them is the hopelessness of the situation, which my friend Norton [Mezvinsky] has presented, in terms of the Middle East, so-called; Jacques [Cheminade], of course, what has happened from Paris, the Paris view of the thing is also very relevant; but also to Father Honings¹, the same relevance.

The question comes up—the reason I intervened at this point—because it came up in something I referred to yesterday, in the discussion on the question of the simultaneity of eternity, in terms of the spiritual, or the idea of time, and the difference between man, as a human being, and an animal, where an animal lives in animal time—and dies, and that’s the end of the animal. And the human being, if we understand human beings, then we know that the birth and death of a human being is not the beginning or the end of things for that person. This is only true of human beings. Only human beings are immortal in that sense.

We know—it’s difficult for people to understand that, in these times, because of the influence of Paolo Sarpi in shaping modern civilization. Or, what it’s become. Because Sarpi does not accept the existence of universal physical principles—or universal principles of any kind, implicitly. All people who are educated in universities, to think about mathematical formulas as being physical science, and they are not. There’s no mathematical formula that corresponds to the reality, the physical reality of the universe! It’s a shadow of reality, it is not the reality.

As I mentioned yesterday, the question of creativity:

1. Father Honings’ speech to the conference will appear in an upcoming issue of *EIR*.



EIRNS/Julien Lemaitre

“The most characteristic thing about the universe is the role of creativity, LaRouche stated, “and the most characteristic feature of mankind, when mankind is mankind, as compared with the animal, is creativity.”

Creativity can not be represented mathematically. And the most characteristic thing about the universe is the role of creativity in the universe, and the most characteristic feature of mankind, when mankind *is* mankind, as compared with the animal, is creativity. No animal has the ability to create a new condition in the universe! Only man as a living creature, a creature in this universe, can do that.

Now, when you think about this, and think, as they don’t teach you in universities today, in modern universities—they don’t *teach* you creativity. You take an aspect of creativity, like the discovery of the infinitesimal in the calculus by Leibniz; the attacks on that, came from the school of Descartes, and Sarpi before that. There’s no belief in physical science, as taught in that way, of the existence of creativity. There is no *belief*, that Kepler discovered the principle of gravitation, in an elaborated process which was on the question of the harmonies of the universe. That’s a discovery, and the process of the discovery is detailed.

There’s no slop in this thing: Kepler was *rigorous*. He never took anything out of his writings. He added something to them, and criticized himself when he went back to the same subject: *He* discovered the concept of universal gravitation! And no one else! And no follower

of Sarpi ever understood that concept.

So, this idea of creativity is strange to people. Because in this society, in this culture, it does not exist.

A Degeneration of Human Culture

Now we've come to a moment of great crisis, and the pessimism expressed by my friend Norton is appropriate! He expressed pessimism about the future of mankind. Pessimism about the possibility that the President of the United States will be able to live up to the responsibility heaped upon him, crucially, at this time, at a time of a great catastrophe for all mankind.

This is telling us, in a sense, that we can not proceed from the standards of conduct and belief, which have brought us to this point of crisis, and brought us to a process of *global degeneration of human culture*, since especially 1968, to the present time. Mankind has been going downhill toward Hell, since 1968, which is the zero point in the apex of human development, so far.

And therefore, we have to institute a change in the way we think about society, the way we form commitments. I see failure in the Obama Administration, in a different sense than Norton described it, but there's a failure, indeed. There's a danger, that humanity will go into a dark age, because of this failure. And the reason for that, is just the failure in Obama's outlook, or the failure in the outlook of some other people. The failure is that the standard of performance has failed! We've seen the degeneration of culture, in Europe, the United States, and throughout most of the world, world culture, in a dynamic, global sense, especially since 1968—the day the 68er was invented, sort of, was like the Devil came to rule. We've been going downhill ever since.

We have to reverse this cultural trend! We are not faced with fixing the problem of a crisis today. The crisis today is a reflection of this degeneration, which we can measure in its effect, from 1968. From 1968, we went to Hell. And we've been going downhill ever since then, in culture, in institutions, in everything, all over the world. Therefore, there has to be a revolution in the way *we think about mankind*: We have to have a new standard for thinking! Because we see that the present habits of thinking, in the past period, since 1968, have been the wrong habits. And we find that if we're going to make decisions about the present crisis, on the basis of those states of mind, and those habits, we're going to Hell. We're going into a dark age, for all mankind, a breakdown in the world.

Thinking in the Simultaneity of Eternity

Only if we think, or some of us think, more and more, in a different way, and begin to move society by our influence, is there much of a chance for mankind. And that is this concept, sometimes called the “simultaneity of eternity”: That, when you think in terms of discovered, and valid, universal physical principles, and when you think about how you think when you do that—and of course, I've lived that way for a long time, so I'm familiar with this—but when you do that, what happens is, you are referring, always in your thinking, to predecessors which go back even thousands of years. You think of them as personalities, as if you had a personal conversation with them, and, in a sense, in your mind, you go back to that person *living*, who made that discovery, hundreds of years or thousands of years ago, as you know these things.

And you are talking to them, as was described in this [Raphael's] *School of Athens*, in the famous mural in the Vatican library now: You have people of different—who died, who are talking to each other, in this mural! Because, when you think in terms of universal principles, like universal physical principles, and you think about the discovery of these principles, you get into, today, to understand that you get into a conversation in your own mind, with a person who made the discovery to which you're referring. You think of them, you refer back to them. And in that sense, when you think about mankind, and its future and its past, you think in a *simultaneity of eternity*: You reach in both directions.

And because you are creative and human, you don't think of dying as the end of you. You think of it as you, in a sense, are relating to someone who's coming. You are relating, at the same time, to people in the past. You are immortal, in humanity. You're not immortal in the flesh: You're immortal in humanity!

And you have to have that kind of view, and dedication, to look at things as I do, and the way I've committed myself and developed my commitment in life: in exactly that way. You must think backward and forward in time. You must think in a simultaneity of eternity. You must think in terms of universal principles, which exist in the universe, and you have to think back to the people who made you aware of those principles by their discovery of them. And you have to engage in a dialogue with them, you wish to talk to them, to speak to them. To discuss what they did, to say, “Now, we've done this.” You want to say to them, “Look, we've done



Raphael's "School of Athens" (1510-11, detail) depicts the "simultaneity of eternity."

this now; we've used what you gave us. We've done this now."

So, in our conscience, in our sense of identity, we do not live merely in our time of our flesh. We live in eternity. We're in that kind of process, where we think backward to those who gave us great principles to understand, and we think forward to what we have to give to mankind. We devote ourselves, not to what we will enjoy in our lifetime. Because all of the great things I can think of, that have to be done, most of them, will be completed not less than 20 years from now, or 50 years from now, or a century from now. So you have to think about the benefit you are creating, that you will never see in your lifetime. And you have to think of your dedication to those kinds of things, because it's *those* dedications, which will bring man out of the ditch, now.

Talking to Dead People

And therefore, our function, and I find this more and more, as I have these young people—some of whom are playing more and more of a role in scientific work with me, as in the Basement, back in the U.S.A.—and they have come to understand this concept of time. And that's why I push it at this time, because I didn't have anyone really to speak to about this, in terms of scientific terms, previously. So I do now, and we're doing this kind of work.

But, what we have to understand, as a dedication, we have to understand—we have to yearn, at least—to realize that Paolo Sarpi was an evil man, and probably Satan was proud of him: He was an evil man. And we find ourselves in a society, in a culture, which thinks in terms dictated by Paolo Sarpi, called modern Liberalism, Anglo-Dutch Liberalism, or Anglo-Dutch-Saudi

Liberalism: an extension of stealing. And we find ourselves incapable, in these terms, of thinking and being motivated, in ways which are necessary to solve the kind of problem which confronts us today. And therefore, we depend upon, at least some among us, who have some conception of this idea of time, the idea of universal physical principles and related principles, we think in terms, as we do in our educational work, in discussions, we devote much time to dead people; we talk to dead people: That's what science is. You're talking about the ancient Greeks, the Pythagoreans; you're talking about Plato; you're talking about Aeschylus—who are discoverers. You think about Eratosthenes, from about 200 B.C.

Your thinking about these people is what you're doing when you are trying to master science. Mastering science is not learning something by textbook, it's re-experiencing the *act of discovery*, that that person or those people made. And you enter this kind of dialogue. And we have to understand, that in this association that I have, international association, we have established this kind of concept, as a *goal* of self-development and common work. And we have to take that goal, which we are dedicated to, as an association, and contrast that with what is running society out there. If it's the society, if the opinion on the street, the opinion in the governments, *it's wrong!* Because the governments have failed. The standard of performance of the educational institutions has failed! We're in a failure, a failed society! Not a society which is suffering from a mistake made recently: We're talking about a mistake which was consolidated, as a direction of society globally, in 1968, with the appearance of the 68er. So, we're talking about 40 years of going to Hell. And the habits we have acquired in 40 years, which are the habits which we have developed as a society, which we're practicing, are going to carry us to doom, into a dark age.

Therefore, the standard of common sense, of convention, out there in the streets today, is doomed! And this organization's significance is, we reject doom. We deny its validity. And we do that, by affirming a commitment, not to practical considerations, because all practical discussions lead, again and again, to doom! All political discussion leads again and again, to doom! Economic discussion leads to doom! We're talking about a President of the United States and his new administration, we're talking about the probability of a doom! Of a failure!

Where's the failure? The failure lies in the habits of thinking, and reacting, in the cultures of the world today! Therefore, you have to stand *above* that level, and say: "What is *wrong* with this society? What is *wrong* with these governments?" If you're accepted by these governments, you must be some kind of a failure! If they accept your opinion, you know they're no good.

So, that's the problem, I just wanted to make that point of intervention. It's a much more complex point, and I'd do much more on discussion of this thing. But this is the key point, which my dear friend, Father Honings, has brought to the head on this issue, by the way he's presented the President. I just thought I would put this other framework around it as well. We have to understand, that we, as an association, are a commitment to *change the way society behaves!* To introduce a standard of behavior, which is appropriate to the threat, the challenge before us, the challenge of an early doom of the entire civilization, into a dark age, a new dark age. A dark age as evil, more evil, than that of the 14th Century.

And we have to think about ourselves as immortal: that is, we have a past, before we were born. We're able to reach the past by our relationship to those who represent fundamental principles, who have come before us.

LaRouche Makes a Commitment

I'll just mention one little funny example of this, which is relevant to the presentation just made: When I was in India, coming back from Burma, in the immediate post-war period, I spent some time in Calcutta region, in Bengal province region. And I looked at what had happened, back in the United States which I had left before the President had died, President Roosevelt. I made a kind of commitment to a life of dedication based on the understanding of what Roosevelt had represented as a direction, and the United States as it was expressed by Roosevelt, was something I had to commit my life to.

So I engaged in activities, and got into fights, for causes which I thought were necessary. In this process, I developed what became recognized later as an intelligence capability, and by the time I got into the 1970s, some of the leaders of what remained of the OSS, that one faction of the OSS, decided that I was very smart at this business of intelligence. And so, therefore, they collaborated with me. I have never had

a formal association, or employment, or direction, by any intelligence agency, but I've collaborated with a number of them, and I've collaborated especially with a certain faction in my own country of intelligence- and related-type services in my own country.

So, what I'm referring to is the fact that while I was serving overseas, I had a friend of mine, Max Corvo, who was the actual field organizer for U.S. intelligence in Italy, during the period after Sicily: He was one of the people who planned the U.S. Sicily operation. And because of his job in Sicily, he became appointed by Washington, as the chief of the intelligence in the field, for all Italy. In this connection, and toward the end of his service in Italy, he had a contact with a certain Monsignor, who was then in charge of the special department of the Vatican diplomatic office, called Montini, at that time. And, he was involved in that, because he was on the ground, and discussed a number of things with Montini, including the fact that the Japanese ambassador tried to negotiate, or was negotiating with Washington, for a peace agreement—which was later killed. It was killed by Truman. And we dropped two nuclear weapons on Japan—totally unnecessary—when Japan was ready to surrender. But Truman and Churchill did not want Japan to surrender. They wanted to drop these two nuclear bombs, as soon as Truman found out about them, on Japan. And they held back the peace agreement, *until* they dropped the nuclear weapons on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Then, *after that point*, they negotiated with Hirohito. And they gave Hirohito *exactly the same plan of surrender, which had existed beforehand!*

Montini was involved in the discussion, among other things, with Max Corvo, on this subject, which is how I learned later, when people in the United States decided I was important enough for him to talk to me directly, that Max was one of the key people. And his supervisor, his boss, was the other key person. And this thing with Montini came up with him, then. He told me about it later, after I had started these discussions with him.

A Sense of Immortality

And so, it's in this sense, that you get—in my work, my history, my life—it's been like that. And this is a high point, of his mentioning Montini: That suddenly, I met Montini, back in the late 1970s, after he was dead, and through Max Corvo, who had worked with him on this thing. And through Max's discussion with

Montini, and following the events afterward, he understood what had happened to Montini, on the way to becoming Pope Paul VI, through John XXIII. He was in a very obscure position, was not likely to get the appointment, get the selection. But he got the selection, in a rather miraculous way, with the intervention of John XXIII in very special way. And he became an important Pope. So, that came up again, when Father Honings told this story, the way he told it today, what flashed back immediately—I was making notes on it—what flashed back immediately, was that connection, the succession, through John XXIII, to Paul VI, and to the program for today.

And it's when we think in these terms, of going back to reference points, with people who we have not met before, didn't know before, and reference points to them; and then looking forward to the future, we find ourselves experiencing what Raphael portrayed in his *School of Athens* as the simultaneity of eternity. And it's when we live in the simultaneity of eternity, rather than in mere sense-perception, that we find ourselves with a sense of immortality, and it's a sense of immortality which meets a dedication to a mission.

And we need a society, in which we need not merely expertise, but we need people who are leaders in society, who have the sense of dedication to a mission, their mission in life, their mission in the skein of the simultaneity of eternity. And their mission as defined in terms of reference points, from the past, which contributed to what they're able to do now, and create a reference point for oneself, for the future to come. You think of your life, not in terms of what you enjoy in your life, as such, in experience: You think of your life in what you're creating, and what you're contributing to creating, a generation or two generations ahead. And the closer you can get to that, the more intimate that becomes to you, the more confident you are. And it's on this kind of thinking, and only this kind of thinking, that true morality arises. True morality arises, only when your commitment is immortal, when your commitment is immortal with respect to the past points of reference, and respect to what you *know* the mission is, you must cause to succeed, in times to come: That you must make that contribution.

Then you live. And as I said, yesterday, you're willing to die, if necessary, because your mission is your existence. And it's how you define your mission, that's what's important.