

**Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. (1922–)
Beyond Psychoanalysis – Lecture One¹
1973, November 16**

This is the editors transcript based on an internal sound recording. Due to the low quality of the recording, especially concerning the questions from the audience, the accuracy of every word cannot be guaranteed. With that said, the author has gone to a great length to correct the transcript. If you think you found a mistake, please confer the recording before reporting it. The transcript is made for use with the recording, therefore some repetitions etc. that would normally be removed is retained here.

This lecture by Mr. LaRouche is the first in a series of four lectures given at Columbia University in 1973 on a then recently published paper by Mr. LaRouche titled “Beyond Psychoanalysis”.

Edited by Hans Frederik Ross Nielsen.

All emphasis by the editor. Suggestions for corrections and improvements are welcome.
hf1985@gmail.com

Speaker

Lecture one. Lynn Marcus, lecture series on “Beyond Psychoanalysis”. November 16th, 1973.

Introduction

Mr. Perlman: My Name is Tony Perlman, and id' like to welcome you to the first of a series of four lectures on the paper “Beyond Psychoanalysis”. The future three lectures will begin promptly at 6:30. We were delayed tonight by electrical or electronic difficulties of Columbia University, which we don't anticipate in the future. For the rest of this evenings lecture and discussion, there will be no smoking permitted in the hall. This is one of the conditions of our use of this hall. If people smoke tonight, we will have to move future lectures elsewhere, perhaps off the Columbia Campus. I will read announcements after the lecture during the question and discussion period. Any announcement, which must be made should be given to me in writing during the lecture. Without any further ado, I would like to introduce L. Marcus, national chairman of the National Caucus of Labor Committees, author of the textbook “Dialectical Economics”, out of the groundbreaking paper “Beyond Psychoanalysis”, and smaller companion papers, which have appeared in recent weeks, which have introduced a revolution in psychological science, L. Marcus. {applause}

Shelley's thesis and The Bolshevik Revolution

Mr. LaRouche: During a period of reaction, which occurred among British intellectuals in the wake of The French Revolution, there was an attempt to explain creativity and art as being something, which occurred within art itself, as independent of political movements of that time. In rebuttal of this, <Percy Bysshe> Shelley (1792–1822) wrote an essay, one of his several important essays—and I will refer to an other one later tonight—entitled: “In Defense of Poetry”. And I shall

¹ From Mr. Moore: “Lyn gave his first 'Beyond Psychoanalysis' lectures at the Columbia School of International Affairs auditorium and Amsterdam Avenue. Zbigniew Brzezinski (1928–) was then running the school from the upper floors of that building!!”

read a section from the conclusion on that, which is a thesis from which we shall work to provide a setting for the purpose of this program.

“[T]he literature of England, an energetic development of which has ever preceded or accompanied a great and free development of the national will, has arisen as it were from a new birth. In spite of the low-thoughted envy which would undervalue contemporary merit, our own will be a memorable age in intellectual achievements, and we live among such philosophers and poets as surpass beyond comparison any who have appeared since the last national struggle for civil and religious liberty. The most unfailing herald, companion, and follower of the awakening of a great people to work a beneficial change in opinion or institution, is poetry. At such periods there is an accumulation of the power of communicating and receiving intense and impassioned conceptions respecting man and nature. The persons in whom this power resides, may often, as far as regards many portions of their nature, have little apparent correspondence with that spirit of good of which they are the ministers. But even whilst they deny and abjure, they are yet compelled to serve, that power which is seated on the throne of their own soul. It is impossible to read the compositions of the most celebrated writers of the present day without being startled with the electric life which burns within their words. They measure the circumference and sound the depths of human nature with a comprehensive and all-penetrating spirit, and they are themselves perhaps the most sincerely astonished at its manifestations; for it is less their spirit than the spirit of the age.”²

If Shelley's thesis is correct, that is, that great periods of revolutionary transformation are heralded and accompanied by an intellectual renaissance, then The Bolshevik Revolution, and the period following it, is ironical. For The Bolshevik Revolution was preceded by approximately a quarter century of general decay, accelerated decay of intellectual life in Europe and The United States, and has been followed by 50 years of accelerated decay in the arts. The situation in the sciences is not much better; while there has been much elaboration, which is called fundamental advance, in the psychical sciences, so called, there actually has been no breakthrough during the past 50 years, nor any sign of a new breakthrough in development, but rather an elaboration of those achievements—the fundamental achievements—which were made in the first two decades of this century. There has been, of course, a rather revolution in biological sciences, but that again falls in the same category. Essentially from approximately the end of the first world war, this has been a period of accelerated decay. And if Shelley's thesis is borne out, there must be some correlation between the intellectual decay of capitalist culture, and world culture, generally, throughout the past 50 years, and the fact, that there has not been, heretofore, successful socialist revolutions in the advanced sector. I would say that Shelley's thesis is correct, and that without an intellectual revolution, it will be impossible—perhaps not impossible, but extremely unlikely—that there will be a socialist transformation in the brief period left to us to do that.

The Science of Mind

Oh, but it's not quite so simple. We are in fact in the Labor Committee tenancy, initiating an

² It continues: *“Poets are the hierophants of an unapprehended inspiration; the mirrors of the gigantic shadows which futurity casts upon the present; the words which express what they understand not; the trumpets which sing to battle, and feel not what they inspire; the influence which is moved not, but moves. Poets are the unacknowledged legislators of the world.”*

intellectual revolution. And the question of “Beyond Psychoanalysis” is essentially an attempt to get at the lawfulness, or the lawful processes, by which we will accomplish this revolution. We are not concerned—except in a peripheral and secondary way—to deal with problems of psychoanalysis per se. What we are concerned to do, is to get at certain lawful aspects of human power for cognition, in order to unblock those mental powers, which are necessary, if we are going to initiate and convey—communicate—the kind of intellectual revolution in progress. Exactly what that is, will become clearer in the course of the four lectures. This is not unprecedented; if one turns to the major works, which preceded and followed The French Revolution, we will find that this attention to examination of the laws of mind is by no means unprecedented. As I indicated in the article itself, the first systematic effort to deal with the lawful processes of cognition was undertaken by <René> Descartes (1596–1650), particularly in the two theorems which I cited, which I will refer to again tonight. More significantly the principle work of <Immanuel> Kant (1724–1804) was essentially psychological in its purpose. That is; it was essentially psychological science. <G. W. F.> Hegel's (1770–1831) “Phenomenology <of Mind>” is nothing but a report of the loss of the mind itself as explored by one of the greatest creative thinkers of modern times, who used the exploration of his own mind as the means for developing his dialectical method; his Phenomenology of Mind. In the case of Hegel's immediate successor, Ludwig Feuerbach (1804–1872), the same applies. Feuerbach's “Essence of Christianity” is—as he professes it to be—an exploration into the laws of human thought, the laws of human mentation. What we are doing here, then, is to make a further exploration in a sense in the tradition of Descartes, in the tradition of Hegel, the tradition of Feuerbach and also, though with less emphasis in Marx' case, the tradition of <Karl> Marx (1818–1883). Now, what we shall do tonight, is to concentrate on the question of the context, the grounding within which we have to situate any attempt to establish the science of mind.

The entities of the mind

First entity: The Infantile Ego

However, before doing that, I shall just indicate some of the empirical features of the mind, and so doing I will enable us to refer to these things as we go along, and then I'll develop these points in later lectures. If you examine the contents of your own mind, your own mental processes, you will discover, with a minimum amount of analysis, that there are essentially three accessible identities within your head. The first of these is a relic of infancy, which none the less is predominant, the predominant sense of self in most individuals in capitalist cultures. It's the so called ego, which more probably should be termed “The Infantile Ego”. This is the aspect of your identity which becomes clearest when you say: “I sincerely feel that I must do this”, or “I do this because I feel that this is true”. It's the part of yourself which is immediately associated with immediate action. And is associated with three kinds of emotion.

First emotion of The Infantile Ego

One of the types of the emotions immediately characteristic of the infantile ego is simple infantile elation at object possession. And object possession to the ego includes possession of people, that is the elation that a child feels in having its mother, its wife, its girlfriend around is simple elation of object possession, there is nothing very human about it.

Second emotion of The Infantile Ego

The second of these emotions is the emotion of infantile anger or rage. And this type of emotion is, what you are seeing manifest in the work of logicians and mathematicians and so forth. The essential emotion of mathematics is infantile rage, and that is no exaggeration. As a matter of fact, this becomes clearest in chess play, where there's a similar relationship. Across the board,

chess play involves an emotion, the emotion is pure infantile rage. There is no human relationship between the opponents across the chessboard.

Third emotion of The Infantile Ego

The third emotion associated with the ego is infantile sense of fear or depression. And these three emotions are associated with the ego.

Second entity: The Self-consciousness

Now there's an other entity, a second entity to consider, which you can experience by—and Hegel describes this somewhat in the introduction and preface to the “Phenomenology of Mind”, but it's something you can get at very easily—that you can in a sense be conscious of what you are thinking. You can be conscious of the mechanisms, or certain dynamics involved in understanding why you feel certain things. Rather than simply feeling something, you can be conscious of this feeling as generated in you in a certain way. You can, in a sense, come up behind your own back, the back of your mind, and see what you are thinking, see how you are operating. This is self-consciousness. Now, self-consciousness, which in an adult or in adult society, which capitalist society is not—that is in which human beings became adults, and outgrew the infantile ego—the location of the sense of identity would be entirely located in this self-consciousness self, which you can know empirically as that part of you which is able to look at what the other part of you is doing. In capitalist culture, in alienation, the self-consciousness self is a rather weak creature emotionally, it generally does not know any emotions, it's simply a passive creature, which is tolerated and utilized like a slave by the ego. It's used for thinking. To give an example: some of you were exposed to a hideous experience which is called secondary school geometry. And in the US that is a hideous experience; the pedagogy in the US is—well I'll get to that later when I discuss a German medical examination, which is one of the most hideous things, that can be done to a human being—but in US geometry, you are drilled in the following way: You give a theorem or a 'problem' and the first thing you have to do is to develop a solution-concept for this problem or this theorem. Then, that being a brief part of your classroom or related activity, if you're in a typical US secondary school, you go through the literally anal process of detailing a proof, detail logical argument. Now in this process, there are two phases: In the first phase, in getting at the solution-concept, you access self-consciousness and get what you might regard as an intuition of a solution. You play with this intuition until you are virtually certain, that at least as a hypothesis this is a satisfactory solution. Then you turn your mind off, and you get down to writing out the proof. There is no reflection—in what you do for your grade in that class—there is no reflection of actual human mental activity. Because you do not reflect—in what you write—you do not reflect the fact that you actually accessed your powers of reason and developed an intuition of a solution-concept. What you report is simply the anal process of detailing this logical proof, something which is done in the ego-state.

The case of medical examination in Germany

I'll go to that German thing: We had a problem in Germany among our members there, that we found that—we have a significant number of members who are medical students, it's a fluke which one of the individuals here is partly responsible for—and we found that as they had to take their examinations, they would take off for six to three months to prepare for an examination. It didn't make sense, not to me. Then we found that after having the examination, that the individual was in a poorer state of mind, in poorer emotional health, exhibited more acute neurotic symptoms, was less able to think, than before taking the examination. Well, I was curious as to what had happened, and I found out when I got to Germany and dug into it with them. We did some sessions and found out the horrible things they had done to them. Now, the first thing about this three-six

months periods, was that during this period of three-six months, the people taking the examinations—that is, absenting themselves from politics and actually all other kinds of intellectual activity—had plenty of time to whore about and perform what would normally pass for students recreations. But precisely all of their recreations were of the most banal and degraded sort. There was no real intellectual recreation. Really bestialized forms of recreation. A number of them who went through this tried to do political work during the period that they were preparing for the examinations, and found that they could not prepare for the examinations. What was the reason for this? When you look at the content of the preparation for a German medical examination—it may not be much better here, I just know the case in Germany, I don't know the case in the United States—it's strictly drill. It's the more extreme version of the same kind of problem which you run into in preparing the geometry proofs that in the secondary school in the united states. Now the mind will not tolerate the kind of memory drill required to prepare for such an examination if your self-consciousness is turned on. It's too degrading. So what the student was doing in absenting himself from political work—and it wasn't just political work, it was any kind of intellectual stimulating activity, the student had to cut himself off from all intellectual stimulating activity and reduce his life to merely grinding and drilling in memory for this medical examination. And otherwise keep himself on a fairly bestialized level in his social life and recreations. Then, of course, would come the end of this preparation process, he'd go into a room, generally put on—buy a suite for the occasion and go into a parlour-like room, a dozen or so, or half-dozen of them, sit around with one or two examiners. Two or three questions would be thrown at them, out of the hundreds, for which they had prepared themselves. And then the student would leave the room, and would generally have a real letdown and begin to manifest rather acute neurotic symptoms, as well as a general inability to do intellectual work. Well, we got into the dept of some of this stuff, and in effect, if you begin pulling up—and I'll be getting into this later—if you begin pulling up, in analysis, what had happened to these people, on the unconscious level, the effect was as if a large, slightly more than man-sized black beetle had performed sodomic rape on them. In other words: there was an acute sense of degradation in going through this kind of experience. And then, as we got into this with some of the physicians and medical students who had gone through this process, we located a relationship between what is done to medical students in Germany and the sadomasochistic relationship among doctor, nurse and patient in the hospital.

The Madonna-whore complex.

So in general in capitalist life, people who have any kind of intellectual activity access their self-consciousness, that is, their reason. They are somewhat aware of what they are doing, what the ego is doing, but they are not able to do much about it. In the article on “The Sexual Impotence of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party”³, I outlined this in some detail in the case of the macho-sexual pattern. An intelligent Latin American macho or Italian pappagallo—which is a feathered macho—finds himself in the presence of a woman under certain kinds of relationships and in these cultures there's a Madonna-whore pattern to which women and men are both subjected. That is when a man is playing the whore pattern, as the pappagallo or macho, he is often aware that this is a degrading thing; he's degrading himself, he's degrading the woman. She is playing the same game; she is being either a Madonna or a whore, and is aware of her degrading role at the time she's performing it. Yet neither of them, though they are aware of this on a self-conscious level, are able to stop themselves from doing it. They're like an alcoholic: and the alcoholic says: “I shouldn't be drinking all the time.” The alcoholic has liqueur in front of him, drinks it, gets drunk, says: “I shouldn't be doing this.” and afterward said: “I shouldn't have done it.” but he still does it. His self-consciousness is not able to intervene to prevent the ego from controlling his or her behavior. So that's the second

3 The Campaigner, Vol. 7, No. 1. November 1973.

entity, this self-consciousness which in a healthy individual—that is what ought to be a human being—would be the location of the sense of identity, and then the ego.

Self-consciousness: The Fundamental Emotion

Now, this self-consciousness, the self-conscious “I” is properly associated with a very special kind of emotion and its derivatives. I call this emotion “the fundamental emotion”, and we will get to this a little bit tonight, qualifying what it is. Normally—that is among any native people who are looking at this emotion or experiencing it from the standpoint of locating their sense of self in the ego—this emotion is experienced as what is sometimes called “an oceanic feeling”. It’s an overwhelming, intense feeling, which is usually experienced as a religious experience. It’s what happens to people when they get into these evangelical orgies. It’s also experienced more rarely, in what people often call: “an overwhelming feeling of non-erotic loving”. Now the reason they call it non-erotic is because people generally identify what they mean as “erotic loving” with a sexual impulse associated with the elation of object possession. And they find that in this case they are experiencing an overwhelming feeling, which they identify as some kind of feeling of love, but they identify this as being different to, and opposed to, the ordinary banal erotic feelings. This same emotion, this oceanic emotion, is sometimes experienced as a feeling of impending insanity or death, it’s sometimes known as the love-death emotion. In Freudian analysis nonsense is perpetrated, not as bad as Herbert Marcuse’ (1898–1979) version of it—Herbert Marcuse is a quack from all standpoints, both philosophy and analysis—but in an attempt to dichotomize this fundamental emotion, or this so called oceanic feeling, and report that there are two such emotions: One; an overwhelming feeling of love; and a counterpoised overwhelming feeling of death—they happen to be the same emotion, it’s just the sense of love and death are experienced in different ways. For example: In an evangelical orgy—that is, one of these fundamentalist religious sects is having revival, and in a baptist sect for example, or Methodist sect—and they get the people wiped up, and they evoke this kind of alienated expression of this fundamental emotion, which comes over these people as an oceanic swarm of intensity without shape and so forth, just a swarm. Or they feel it about to come. Now here’s where this trick of baptism is cued: because of the nature of the emotion, it’s easily identified with the ocean—that’s why it’s called oceanic—it’s identified with water, the idea—in these revival services—the idea in the mind of the individual, that he or she is about to subject themselves to immersion in water, helps the individuals to release this emotion, that’s why baptism developed. This is an alienated experience of this type of emotion.

However in a more or less healthy individual, that is, one who can locate the sense of identity in self-consciousness, this emotion is experienced in a less overwhelming manner, it’s experienced as a normal kind of emotion, this emotion and its derivatives. In which case it becomes the normal emotion of loving and also is the effective state, which correlates with creative thought.

Third entity: The Witch

There’s a third entity of importance in this, in your mind, which, in most cases, in analysis would come up, rather quickly, as the image of a witch. This image is associated with the ego, that is, it’s in direct relationship to the ego, and usually you will identify it with the mother. Now the image of the witch is not—we’ll get to this a little later on in the session—is not an image, or a product of the existent mother, but it’s a product of an alternated and infantile relationship between the infant and young child, and the mother. And it’s this relationship which is alienated and distorted because the child has a dependency relationship on the mother which is established in infancy and continues usually through early childhood. The mother image, of course, is the dominant figure, in the sense of infantile ego identity in the child, and in the later adult. But because of the reflection of bourgeois relations in family relations, the image of the mother, or the image, which is associated

with the mother, it's not a picture of the mother—and I'll qualify that in just a moment—usually comes forth as the witch. The believe in witches is a projection of this. Now, normally this witch image—and there are some others, which I won't go into here—one can say that the paintings and sketches of Bruegel <the Elder> (1525–1569), <Hieronymus> Bosch (1450–1516) and <Francisco> Goya (1746–1828), particularly Goya's dark period, were not inventions, but they were drawn from life. They represent the type of images which people will get very readily under extreme stress, in which the contents of their unconscious processes come into consciousness, or in analysis, these kinds of images come poring out easily. The witch is a third category.

Now, normally, the witch is not able to take over the personality directly, however in certain psychotic states, that is, extreme disassociation, the individual will find even the ego will be blocked from direct control of the person and some other person is controlling the behavior, directly or indirectly: The Witch.

The transition from ego to self-consciousness

So these are the three entities which we will primarily deal with, and the emotions, in dealing with the mind. Our concern—as I've already indicated by this outline—our concern is to understand the fundamental emotion, to understand the problems of self-consciousness and, of course, from a clinical standpoint, to understand how to enable people to begin to make the transition from being alienated people dominated by their infantile egos into people who have more or less subordinated their infantile ego's and have effectively located their sense of self in their self-consciousness, that is, in which the power to act, the power to control what the body does, is located in reason, in self-consciousness, in which this fundamental emotion is used to control—to activate what the body does, as opposed to the infantile ego's rather banal and hideous greedy little infantile operations.

I'll just make one reference, again, to an other essay of Shelley's "On Life". Shelley says this:

"Let us recollect our sensations as children. What a distinct and intense apprehension we had of the world and of ourselves! Many of the circumstances of social life were then important to us which are now no longer so. But that is not the point of comparison on which I mean to insist. We less habitually distinguished all that we saw and felt, from ourselves. They seemed as it were to constitute one mass. There are some persons who, in this respect, are always children." and so forth.⁴

In my experience, most people who have any talent as adults for creative activity generally had a fairly strong identification with this kind of fundamental emotion, up until the time they were about two or three. And then in the process of stultification they generally lost the connection with this fundamental emotion. And they were increasingly reduced—as they grew older—to banalized creatures, who were capable only of these three infantile emotions, which I indicated earlier. That is of sensing them. The fundamental emotion is always working in a distorted way, at least. But in terms of direct types of emotional behavior, only the three banal types of infantile emotion were experienced.

⁴ The paragraph continues: *"Those who are subject to the state called reverie, feel as if their nature were dissolved into the surrounding universe, or as if the surrounding universe were absorbed into their being. They are conscious of no distinction. And these are states which precede, or accompany, or follow an unusually intense and vivid apprehension of life. As men grow up this power commonly decays, and they become mechanical and habitual agents. Thus feelings and then reasonings are the combined result of a multitude of entangled thoughts, and of a series of what are called impressions, planted by reiteration."*

You get this in music in particular. For example, in Germany, in dealing with the problems of sexual impotence among a group of extraordinary talented people—not ordinary emotional imbeciles, but very talented people—never had they experienced a deep and intense emotion, related to the fundamental emotion, or like the emotion of Wagner's famous “Liebestod”⁵ duet. They never experienced that in a relationship with a person of the opposite sex; never experienced it in a love relationship; had never experienced the emotion of love in a love relationship! But they had a weak feeling of love for a person. The minute they began to approach the bed, this banal feeling of infantile object possession took over, they behave like a couple of animals, and so forth. But they never experienced the emotion of love in a love relationship. They had experienced it weakly or otherwise in an other location: In music. One of the few places that people experience this kind of emotion, normally. And we find it characteristic among musicians, that early in childhood, up until about the time of puberty, they would approach music with a feeling of this kind of emotion, which they would begin to lose in puberty, and would lose their real musical insight, and would have to substitute their formal skills—virtuosity, or what not—to maintain themselves as musicians. They had become, in effect, emotionally castrated musicians. Common problem; in puberty the loss of this emotion. So our concern is to identify what this emotion is, and define its relationship to this creative process.

Discovering “Man as Man”

And I should just review what I covered in the article in this respect: Prior to capitalism, the emergence of capitalism, there was no positive conception of “Man as Man”. That is, in no culture, prior to the emergence of capitalism is there a distinct positive conception of “Man as Man”. There are essentially religious feelings, which reflect man's perception, that he is qualitatively different to the animal. But man is unable to account for this. It's simply something he feels and believes and ferociously attempts to defend. But it's only with the emergence of capitalism that man has begun to discover a positive conception of man; that man is absolutely different from the beast. This emerged—and I've used a concentrated circumstantial basis for explaining this: That is, from approximately the middle of the 16th century into the middle or latter part of the 17th century, Europe went through an orgy of depopulation and misery in general—which I'm afraid, if capitalism continues, we're on the verge of now, or the like of which we're on the verge of now—there was general depopulation, cannibalism and so forth. Yet at the same time, in a number of centers; England one, the low countries another, certain parts of France another, and a few other pockets, there was a flourishing development, a flourishing material progress. Now, in every case, as in the case of Tudor England, and under the Tudors from the accession of Henry VII to about 1589, the Tudors and others expended fairly substantial sums for such type wards, on fostering technology. In addition, the London merchants and others also contributed heavily to this. So that in the prosperity of England and the prosperity of the low countries and other regions, there was a direct connection—perceptible to all of the educated layers—a direct connection between the relative prosperity of these regions, as against the misery of the others, and the fact that these regions were centers of invention, invention not only in the ordinary sense of technological inventions, but inventions in social and political forms. There was obviously a direct connection between creative innovations by individuals, innovations which, being actualized by the surrounding society, advanced that society.

So, man in that time discovered a connection between the necessity of his existence—that is the misery of the world if you didn't make changes; if you tried to go on in the old way, the world collapsed—as opposed to the progress, the improvement of the human condition, which was associated with these innovations. Now despite the fact that these innovations were actualized through collaborative social effort, through production and so forth, each of these innovations could

5 Richard Wagner (1813–1883), *Tristan und Isolde* (Opera), Act III, “Dolce e calmo”

be attributed to an individual mind. And thus, in this kind of setting, man, for the first time, was able to locate a direct connection between *the very essence of continued human existence in general* and the creative potentialities of an individual human mind. Therefore the conception of “Man as Man”, as a scientific conception, first emerged in this period.

The notion that the business of humanity—that *humanity was distinguished by the fact that its members, its individual members were capable of creative thinking, creative thinking from individuals, which was essential to the existence of society as a whole—that is the essence of humanism!* And therefore society had to be concerned with, first of all, fostering those conditions, which resulted in creative innovations by at least a certain proportion of the individuals of that society, fostering the conditions under which these inventions could be realized, which included fostering the educational material conditions of life, so that ordinary labor could employ this new technology, use the printed word and so forth. So the whole humanistic conception developed from this.

Johannes Kepler

This is embodied in a concentrated way in the work of <Johannes> Kepler (1571–1630), who said this most hubristic of all things. He said: “*The universe as a whole is rational!* Since the universe as a whole”—and he took the solar system, the astronomical system as his frame of reference, as the empirical location of totality—“*this whole is rational, therefore it can be comprehended by man, it can be comprehended by me!* There's nothing God can do that I can't understand. Therefore I shall set out to examine this astronomical evidence, this astronomical totality, and I shall adduce from the totality as a totality, I shall adduce a fundamental law, the fundamental law of the universe”, which, in a sense, in his own frame of reference, is precisely what he did!

René Descartes

But the first effort to understand this creativity, and where it comes from, was Descartes, particularly the two theorems I cited. Now, I'll just go over them here in some reform, because there's a fundamental point, fundamental psychological point, among others, to be made.

First theorem: Cogito ergo sum

Now the first one, the “Cogito”: “I think, therefore I know—therefore I am.”—I don't have a blackboard, so I shall painstakingly recite this—can be represented symbolically in the following way: The symbolic form can be described as follows: “For every particular knowledge, perception etc. which I have of the world about me, this knowledge does not occur as knowledge in and of itself, but occurs as a subject or predicate of a process of thinking. Without the activity of thinking, there is no knowledge. Therefore if some knowledge, in particular, is real, then thinking is as real as anything else I know, and it is more real than anything else I know.” Now, thinking, the “I think” is not in the same category as the perception of objects. “I think” is not an object, not in the ordinary sense. It is a subject for a category of predicates. I'll give a crude example of this, what I mean by this relationship: The concept “number” is not a number. I can describe all kinds of numbers, can give lists of all kinds of numbers, give rules for enumerating whole arrays of different kinds of numbers, and I can say that what I mean by all this is “number”. But “number”, as the category which includes all possible numbers is not a number. Similarly the category “I think” is not one of the elements of thought, of ordinary thought or ordinary knowledge.

Second theorem: Perfection

Now, the second theorem is a theorem of perfection. Man at any given point has certain knowledge, knowledge which is practically demonstrated to be real and appropriate. However,

through the development of knowledge, man's knowledge of any particular category of experience is improved, so that his behavior becomes more appropriate. There is a change in his knowledge. Now, this change is the effect, obviously, of creative innovations by individuals, socialized creative innovations by individuals. This knowledge is not the result, however, of merely existent individuals. You, as an individual do not create new knowledge all by yourself. The problems which confronts you are created by society, the culture in which you start, in solving a problem, is provided to you by society. The entire contemporary society is involved in the development of knowledge, directly or indirectly, but non the less necessarily involved. Preceding humanity, it {break in recording} to this, Descartes applies the concept "Perfection"; that the process of thought in respect to knowledge is perfecting itself. There is progress, there is advancement in knowledge. Now here's where the gimmick comes, and here's where the problem arises: We could say that the subject of Descartes theorem on perfection, that the subjects are the different knowledges, which can be had in the same category of experience at successive stages of development. But that is not the case.

The subject, the primary primitive phenomenon of "Perfection" is not a particular form of knowledge. The primary primitive phenomenon is the process of change connecting two successive states of knowledge. That is, the existent thing, is not knowledge in the ordinary sense, the existent thing is a process of change, connecting two successive states of knowledge as the primary fact.

Lets go back to the geometry example I gave earlier. When you develop a solution-concept to a problem, you do not calculate a solution-concept: it is incalculable. There is no logical procedure, by which "gestalts" can be innovated in the human mind. Logic will not do it. Logic can not permit you to discover anything. Discovery is based on accessing reason, self-conscious reason. And when you do this from the standpoint of the infantile ego of capitalist society, the beneficial result you get from this, you call intuition. It's the process of reason but you call it intuition. After you have, so to speak, "intuited" a satisfactory solution-concept, then logic begins. You try to fit your new discovery consistently into the existent plenum of knowledge, of formal or logical knowledge. But the process of logically analyzing a concept to demonstrate its consistency with a body of knowledge is *not* the process of discovery. The process of discovery of knowledge is what we vulgarly call intuition. Same thing for Descartes theorem.

Knowledge cannot be logically defined, and to the extend that you can logically compare two successive bits of knowledge, you have not gotten to the point of Descartes theorem. What Descartes is concerned with, is the process which we would vulgarly call intuition, by which man progresses from one state of knowledge to an other, therefore the empirical phenomenon to be considered is not the knowledge in particular, the primary, primitive phenomenon, the empirical phenomenon is the process of intuition by which two successive states of knowledge are realized.

Can you conceptualize a self-reproducing, self-changing continuity: Negentropy?

Now, if you take that, what I said seriously, and don't simply take it from me as a plausible edifying explanation, then most of you are in trouble! Because any of you who locate your identity primarily in the infantile ego, are incapable of conceptualizing what I've said. Because to the extend that your sense of identity is located in your ego, there is no available referent to you in your own mind, by which you could locate something inside your head, which you would deem corresponding to what I've just described to you. That is, to the extend that you are in an ego-state, it is impossible for you to find anything inside your head to correspond to the phenomenon I've just identified. You can only isolate what I said, take the words I've said, repeat them, paraphrase them, but you still will not understand what I've said. You can, so to speak, draw a circle around what I've said, define what I say in terms of that I don't mean this and I don't mean that, negating logical knowledge. But you can not positively identify the concept which I have just identified.

I'll just illustrate—without going into it here, I will presumably have a blackboard next week and I'll go through this again, this particular concept—we know necessarily that the so called physical universe is not made up of what is normally thought of as energy. That is, the universe is not made up of simple homogeneous quanta called energy. The physical universe is necessarily composed of a continues process, for which the term “negentropy” would have to replace what we call energy. This has been indirectly and implicitly recognized by a great number of people. <Albert> Einstein (1879–1955), in his last years before his death, restated something, which he had stated before: that this problem of defining unified field would require a complete change in mathematics. That is an essential superseding of existing mathematics by an entirely new conception of mathematics. The difficulty in doing that is not formal. The difficulty is, that the kinds of concepts required to solve those kinds of problems, demand that the thinker who is trying to solve them, be able to access in his own mind, some category of mental behavior, which corresponds to the phenomenon in the external world, which he is trying to understand.

To put it an other way: If I ask most of you to identify what you know in any field, what will come out of you is more or less a catalog of facts or things which are like fixed objects, facts, together with a set of rules or procedures by which you organize these facts. That is, your mind, normally, is capable of regarding as positive knowledge only two things: First of all what we can regard as object-images, discreet images. When you try to become contentious of something, you normally become conscious of discreet images. You combine this with notions of what we can call relationships, which you would represent, ordinarily, by procedures or rules. You can define that kind of knowledge. That is logical knowledge, or alienated, or, better perhaps, anal⁶ knowledge. But ordinarily you have no referent in your mind for conceptualizing directly and deliberate process-concepts.

To give just a list of historical cases: <Baruch> Spinoza (1632–1677) attempted to define this, and did to a certain extend successfully define this notion of a continues process, and did that specifically in his “Ethics <Demonstrated in Geometrical Order>”. Joseph Schelling (1775–1854) attempted to understand this, that is, Joseph Schelling tried to conceptualize a universe which was continues, as opposed to a universe made up of desecrate particles. But he could conceive of only a linear continuity, that is, homogeneous straight lines, homogeneous sheets and so forth. He could not conceptualize a continuity which was self-changing. That is, when you think of something, a continuous line, you say: “Well, it's a homogeneous line”, you can cut it up, it's always the same, it's like butter, you keep slicing it, it's always butter. What you cannot conceptualize is a continuity which is self-reproducing, self-changing. A line, which changes itself as it moves. Something which changes itself with respect to time, and is not composed of parts as such, but which necessarily creates desecrate things. Schelling couldn't. And therefore, because of this failure, Hegel said appropriately that Shelling's philosophy—his conception of infinity and continuity—was of a “night, in which all cows are black”⁷. That is, Shelling could not account for the existence of discrete objects in a continues universe, and therefore he simply had to assume, that there was this wonderful continuous essence, which somehow permeated everything, and therefore everything was

6 “The Anal retentive personality”: According to Sigmund Freud (1856–1939), the child goes through various fixations. The second, “anal” stage (age two-four years) is characterized by fixation of the anus. If to much punishment is applied during toilet training, the personality will develop one of two characteristics: 1) the “retentive” is characterized by **a manic insistence on order and tidiness**. 2) the “expulsive” by a lack of self control, messiness and carelessness. Generally, when reference is done to “anal” behavior, it means to signify “the Anal retentive personality”.

7 Hegel, *Phänomenologie des Geistes* (1807), p.12: “Dies eine Wissen, dass im Absoluten alles gleich ist, der unterscheidenden und erfüllten oder Erfüllung suchenden und fordernden Erkenntnis entgegenzusetzen,—oder sein Absolutes für die Nacht abzugeben, worin, wie man zu sagen pflegt, alle Kühe schwarz sind, ist die Naivität der Leere an Erkenntnis.”

like cows, as Hegel said, in a black night. Hegel did have such a conception. Feuerbach tried to get such a conception but failed. Marx did develop such a conception. His notion of “expanded reproduction”, specifically his criticism of the physiocrats in the first part of “Theories of Surplus-Value”, is an illustration of the fact that Marx did have such a concept. The famous “freedom-necessity” passage from section seven of volume three of “Capital” is an other example of this, that Marx did have such a concept. That is, Marx was able to locate in his own mind a quality of the type which I have suggested that most of you could not find in your own mind, and Marx could conceptualize continuity.

That's the essential point here; is, to preform deliberate creative mentation, to conceptualize processes as processes—that is, real positive processes—it is necessary for you as thinkers to free yourself to a significant degree of the type of mental behavior, mental life, personality or character, which is given to you by bourgeois society, to free yourself from slavery to the infantile ego and the witch. If you do not, you cannot conceptualize these types of processes.

An example: Fragmentation of the organizing process

Now this recently—just to indicate how real and concrete the problem is: We've had to deal with the problem of food. We are now confronted with dealing more intensively, programmatically with the question of energy on a world wide scale the same way we have dealt with food. But we have terrible problems, even within the Labor Committee, in effecting an understanding of a positive connection between this food campaign or the energy business and other kinds of political work. People will say: “Well, we have a food campaign” or “We have an energy campaign” or “We have an anti-slave-labor campaign” or “we have an election campaign” or “We are doing contact work.” You know, this kind of fragmentation, in which there is no understanding of the direct connection, the integral relationship between the food campaign and all the other work. The problem here is of the same type. It's that, what does the food campaign involve, conceptually? It involves communicating to a working person a different sense of personal identity than he has experienced heretofore in his life, except, perhaps, when he was two or three years old. Since then he has lost entirely this conception of identity. Instead of seeing himself as an isolated heteronomic individual, who, if he gets enough money, will be able to get food, and therefore sees food simply as a matter of how much money he has, and sees how much money he has as the social status of his position in life and so forth. Instead of seeing that, he now has to see the production of food, his food, as being willfully determined on a world-wide scale by an interrelated network of productions which involves most of the people in the world, directly or indirectly. Therefore he has to see *his* situation and *his* existence in a new way. He has to see himself, not as an isolated individual against the world and against nature, but he has to conceptualize himself as a spinozan person. He has to conceptualize himself as in positive relationship to the rest of his class on a world-scale. Has to think in <these> terms.

Well, obviously an individual who thinks like that cannot be a trade union chauvinist, cannot be a black nationalist, cannot be heteronomic in any other sense. An individual who understands the food-program, really, is a revolutionary socialist, he has got to be. Therefore, what's the dichotomy between this and any other kind of work. It's the most sophisticated, most direct kind of political education imaginable.

Well, there are some problems that come up, and I'll just identify what the problems are, and you'll find that among workers, we reported one in “Solidarity” a couple of weeks ago. You go up to a man, a worker, and discuss food with him, he says: “Well, I don't know, my wife takes care of that, but I'm worried about it, but my *wife* takes care of that.” Total alienation! He assumes that food is somehow something magical that his mother and wife provide for him; he gives his mother or his wife money and she provides him food, it's a magical relationship. You start to discuss how food is

produced, how he's gonna get it, and he's blocked!

But even among us, we find the same problem. We find difficulty in conceptualizing this kind of relationship. Well, the way Eric <Lerner> (1947–) and others have laid this out, even so far, you can see that what the production of food involves is not a simple matter of having a fixed technology of food production, having enough people work at it, the problem is we have to develop new technologies—and will continue to have to develop new technologies—to meet human food-requirements. So, the question of food programs is not a package of technologies and recipes like a production program, that's only the beginning! But once you start that production program, you have to recognize that with the existent technology, without new technologies, there still won't be enough food to meet the requirement that we have for the human race as a whole. Therefore to meet the requirements of man as he exists today, we will have to increase technology, and as we increase technology, we will find new barriers, we will have to increase technology still further, to raise the human standard of living higher, and to reduce to total amount of human effort required to produce food itself. That is to reduce the ratio of effort just to find enough to eat. Therefore, this is the kind of process which people can get at algebraically by piece-by-piece, step-by-step methods, but when they attempt to conceptualize this as a process directly, they find themselves blocked in it, both as a concept, and they find that there are relationships to their neurotic problems which are connected to this.

And that's exactly it! If we treat the fact that people have an infantile ego, which they haven't freed themselves of, that this ego is essentially under the control of a witch,—who in catholic theology is known as the Virgin Mary or the Whore of Babylon, they are both the same thing, the Virgin Mary and the Whore of Babylon are the universal for the witch—if they were not subjected to this, then human beings would be able to operate on the basis of self-consciousness. Their self-consciousness would access this fundamental emotion willfully, and they would find that there's a direct correspondence between the basic content and form of this fundamental emotion and the types of processes that we have to conceptualize of the type I indicated.

Therefore, the inability of any human being, to be a creative genius, that inability is entirely neurotic. The only reason that any human being—who is not physiological traumatized, any biologically normal human being—the only reason that any such human being is not a creative genius, is that he has severe neurotic problems! And the fundamental neurotic problem is bourgeois ideology itself, which is like a universal religion in respect to which peoples private neurosis are like private religions, which they have in addition to the universal religion.

Future work of the NCLC

The way in which we are going to approach this in the organization and outside is this: First of all we are producing a series of articles, some of which I am writing, which will explicate the process, almost by case-study method. And the first article, “Beyond Psychoanalysis”, outlined the background to the approach. The second article, which is appearing in this months Campaigner, is “The Sexual Impotence of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party”. It's a case-study of a particular kind of problem: Why Latin American revolutionaries are impotent, in particular. Which is merely an exemplary case for a problem which is rather pervasive throughout capitalist society. The case of the macho or the pappagallo is only a more acute form of the sexual impotence which is commonplace throughout capitalist society. In the December and January campaigner, there is a case-study of Feuerbach, which, in addition to dealing with his systematic problems, locates the route of his difficulty in a neurotic problem, which is very evident in the contents of “The Essence of Christianity” itself—that is, Feuerbach himself comes right out and details his neurotic problems for you in the pages of “The Essence of Christianity”—which is a way of getting at the relationship between these neurotic problems and the general problems of religious believes as the conscious

reflection of the general neurosis of capitalist society, that is: Christianity. Beyond that, we are doing a study of the cult of Trotskyism as an exemplary case of sexual impotence in the form of a political movement.

I will deal, in a published article, substantially with the case of R. D. Laing (1927–1989) whose blunders in this respect are most interesting, precisely because Laing is a clinical worker and therefore—even though his interpretation of his evidence is wrong and his procedures are worse than wrong, nonetheless—Laing is clinical and therefore his material has some merit for treatment as opposed to Cretans⁸ Such as <Louis> Althusser (1918–1990), who is also part of the pro-insanity movement among structuralists and existentialists in Europe. Oh, that's quite serious, there is a “pro-insanity” movement⁹ coming out of the structuralists in France and others in England. This is understandable from the standpoint of the French form of the problem. <Albert> Camus (1913–1960) Expresses it perfectly in his idea that the world is absurd, this was also expressed by <Michel> Foucault (1926–1984) in his book on folly¹⁰ about 15 years ago. And recently in the case of the clinical schizophrenic, Althusser.¹¹ These and others are pushing a movement which is advocating insanity. In their own cases, they've succeeded.

We will also do a study of some of the last period of Malcolm X (1925–1965), which is most instructive. In his last period—what he was doing in his addresses, particularly at the auditorium of the town, where we had the RYM¹² conference, was to actually use analytical methods, in a sense, to try to deal with the characteristic problems of the black cultural nationalist, to try to convert them into something else.

In addition to that, we are doing a considerable amount of clinical work, as much as the handful of qualified people available can handle, and therefore it's limited. But as this work progresses—because it intersects our general political work—the result of the work with a few, has been transmitted to more in two ways; first of all by making the results of the findings available, and an other aspect of this, which I'll get into in the next few weeks more intensely.

The reason we are able to do certain things in clinical work within the Labor Committee, with success, where we could not get the same success outside, is that, in order to—obviously in order to transfer the sense of identity to the self-conscious self from the ego, it's necessary that the self-conscious self have the objective perspective on identity, which corresponds to what it's trying to reach. You say: “I wish to become a self-conscious person.” Well, to be a self-conscious person,

8 Probably a reference to Epimenides paradox since Althusser relies on concepts of contradiction in his Marxist theory.

9 What Mr. LaRouche could not know: In November, 1980 Althusser strangled his wife to death and was committed to Sainte-Anne psychiatric hospital in Paris until 1983.

10 Michel Foucault, *Histoire de la folie à l'âge classique - Folie et déraison* (Paris: 1961). Later translated into English by R. Howard from the Tavistock Institute. *Madness and Civilization* (London: 1964).

11 Foucault studied under Althusser at the École Normale Supérieure.

12 Revolutionary Youth Movement. This was the youth movement of Lyndon LaRouche from the 60's and until it was renamed The LaRouche Youth Movement (LYM). Here is an account from Roger Moore: “We organized in every ghetto, black and hispanic, on the east coast and into the midwest, Buffalo, etc, the Street Gangs, the kids with Jeans jackets with cut off sleeves. We were largely white kids in our early twenties, with some security training, and went into their turf asking to speak with their leader. We'd tried to get them focused on the injustices in the banking system, (the NYC debt bubble which became a major issue in 1975—Felix Rohatyn, Big MAC), 'don't think small, take it all' i.e., change the system. Zeke Boyd, a former Black Panther, would try to get them interested in chess, etc. During Tony Chaitkins mayoral election campaign, we did a march-rally through the projects in the Lower East Side of Manhattan with the local gang providing us protection. When some kids through bricks on us from a roof top, they went in and stopped the problem. The room you mention was the Audobon Ballroom and Broadway in the middle of Harlem. Malcolm X was assassinated there in 1965. We have perhaps a hundred or so gang reps from around the east coast. Out competition at that time was a foundation funded project, Inter-City Roundtable for Youth, ironically run by Ramsey Clark!! He was focused on ending the gang wars among the youth going on all over NYC (if you know the West Side Story, you can get an idea of what was going on.)”

to make that convincing to yourself, psychologically, you have to organize your life to act in a self-conscious way. But to act in a self-conscious way—as we shall indicate—to act in a self-conscious way, means to act as a human being, a self-conscious human being, which means *you take the existence of future humanity as the essential criterion for your own existence!* That is, the criterion of your own existence is to develop yourself, to express as activity, those kinds of acts which are necessary, to ensure the future existence of humanity as a whole. Now, unless the individual is actually *committed* to acting in that way, it is impossible for him to tell himself, that he is becoming a self-conscious human being. You cannot become self-conscious if you say “I want to improve my mental state so that I can have a better relationship with my girlfriend”. That won't work! That's not a self-conscious relationship. Your sense of identity is not self-conscious, then. So therefore, it's only among people who are *politically committed*, who locate their very meaning of their lives and the criterion of *every day of their lives* in developing themselves and in acting for the furtherance of the future existence of humanity! *Only among such people is it possible to actually effect, systematically, progress from this infantile alienated ego state to a self-conscious self!* Therefore, what we can do within the Labor Committee, particularly among the most committed people, in dealing with this problem, is something we could not do, we could not replicate, with John Doe and Jane Doe from the street, who said: “help me with my psychological problems”, it couldn't be done. They have not accepted the *task-oriented precondition* of really making a breakthrough. In such a case, we'd say: “Well, go to any psychoanalyst, they charge various rates, and they would probably do a fairly good job for you. We can't do anything more for you, we can only do something for ourselves, to the extent, that we are applying this knowledge on the basis of this special leverage, this tool, this political commitment.”

The necessity of liberating the creative potentialities of the organizer

There's a corollary to that; it's the reason we have to do this, this is not simply something to improve our functioning, we *have* to do this! Because we find among ourselves extraordinarily gifted people, who are unable to mobilize the resources they have to do the acts which they want to do. Someone says: “I want to understand this! I want to teach a class to these workers, I have to work with these kids in RIM.” Well, this individual has all the essential mental gifts, that is, all the culture, the ability to handle the elements of culture, the dedication and so forth, to do their job but can't do it competently. Why? Cause he can't control these kinds of processions. Now, this is particularly significant in dealing with workers generally and in dealing with the youth in RYM. These youth have terrible problems. If you can't cope, if you can't develop insight into the relationship between their emotional problems and their problems in life generally, you can't deal with them. You can only deal at them an hope that some of it sticks by luck or by accident. Every worker in general, every typical worker, who is drawn into NUWRO¹³, drawn into activity, is going

13 National Unemployed and Welfare Rights Organization. Mr. Moore: “This was a united front effort <by Mr. LaRouche and associates> to bring the unemployed together with welfare recipients, largely single black mothers, to demand productive jobs, not merely low paid forced work (like Hartz IV). The youth group of the Communist Party, Young Workers Liberation League (YWLL) was actually interested in the campaign, as we also did strike support work (the Baltimore bakers strike and others). What turned out to be FBI agents/informants in the leadership of the CPUSA then launched physical attacks on our members. That led to our demand that they renounce the policy, which became Mop-UP. At the founding NUWRO conference in a Philadelphia ghetto they actually went through the poor neighborhoods with a sound truck saying that white racists, the KKK were holding an event in the ghetto, trying to get people to attack the conference but nothing came of that effort. After Mop-UP the Communist Party USA (CPUSA) was no longer a factor in the U.S.”

“This was also the time—as we later found out—that FBI informants in the leadership of the CPUSA were instigating the party to conduct an assassination of Mr. LaRouche. Through Freedom of Information Act access, we got the FBI agent report of the controller's discussion with his informant in the CPUSA. During the Columbia University strike and building occupations, Spring 1968 and into the Fall, the FBI authored an anarchist leaflet

to usually have a problem with his wife. The minute he tries to be politically committed, if you can't understand his problem, and if you haven't got the competence to begin helping him free his wife from her oppression, her self-induced oppression, then you can't build a movement among workers that's worth anything.

In organizing masses of people you depend upon precisely the qualities to which I've referred. To be an effective mass-organizer, means to become, at least to some degree, self-conscious; to be able to locate your identity in larger masses and in terms of long-term processes, the future of humanity, rather than the immediate situation. You cannot operate as an effective political organizer, if you are controlled by the opinion—or what you imagine to be the opinion of you—by the people among whom you are acting. If you are influenced by public opinion, in the short term, at all, if you are influenced, that controls your judgment, and you are no good as an organizer. If you say: “Well, people don't like us if we do this.” If that controls your judgment, you are no good as an organizer. That's your ego saying: “I've got to get my goodies, I've got to be petted, I've got to be liked, or I can't function. If people give me funny looks, I can't work.” But that's typical of people, a typical organizer among our own members, knows perfectly well what he wants to do, he starts to speak before a group of four or five people, and something happens to his mind, something gets turned off, and where there was a clear conception the moment before, there is just Schwärmerei. Thoughts, fragmented thoughts come buzzing about, various kinds of feelings and emotions, conflicting emotions come buzzing about. He get's himself together with rage and tries to express a formal argument for his case, which is really a banalized, {inaudible, 30:47} version of our politics, which he is saying because he got up to speak, but before he got up to speak, he had a clear conception of what he wanted to say, but the minute he got up to speak, his mind gets turned off, he cant think clearly. A typical member confronts a couple of workers, the workers show a little hostility, resent or begins to exhibit their neurosis. A moment before, that member was perfectly clear on what he wanted to say to the workers, confronted with this kind of emotional display or reaction of the workers, this member's mind gets turned of, he goes through one or several rituals, and there's no effective communication between him and that worker.

So, we are compelled to deal with this problem among a leading strata in particular of our membership, because if we *don't*, we cannot fulfill the task to which we are committed, or only a handful will do it. And the great problem which relates to what I said in the beginning, even from the standpoint of a revolutionary organization: In socialist movements in the past—and this is the mystery of the Bolshevik Revolution in a sense—entire mass-based organizations, at best had a handful of individuals in them, who where capable of doing thinking and organizing. The majority of members of so called socialist organizations were merely *errand boys* of one sort of an other working around a handful of *actually qualified leaders*, that's the mystery of the Bolshevik Revolution.

You take Lenin and a handful of other individuals, and the rest of the Bolshevik party, from the standpoint of political quality, was absolute crap! Look at <Grigory> Zinoviev (1883–1936)! A totally bumbling fool! <Lev> Kamenev (1883–1936), an absolute fool! <Joseph > Stalin (1878–1953), a degenerate philistine lout! His qualities were essentially those of a well organized stickup neck¹⁴ {general hilarity}. No, this is true. This is true, and this was recognized among the Bolshevik leaders. There were a handful of qualified leaders. You cannot make a socialist transformation in an

attacking the SDS (Students for a Democratic Society) Labor Committees, the famous Mousecrap leaflet, which tried to incite the Weatherman Faction of SDS (which later went underground becoming a pathetic version of the terrorists groups founded in Germany and Italy in 1972 (Baader-Meinhof Gang-Rote Armee Fraktion (RAF), and the Italian Red Brigades)). This info we also got during later trials through FOIA.”

14 Stickup neck is a collar style, characterized by a high, tight collar. In public Stalin would sport such a well ordered collar almost without exception.

advanced country with that kind of organization. Unless you are engaged in a process where you take committed ordinary people and enabling them to liberate that potentialitie within themselves to become effective organizers, you have not got the striking force necessary to organize workers.

Every time we meet a group of workers at a plant gate or elsewhere¹⁵, there is a critical opportunity, and if in the contact and follow up of those workers at those plants, we had qualified cadres, that is, people who are intellectually developed, along the lines I have indicated, we would not miss those opportunities. But because our members are only an approximation of what they themselves intent to become, they make the contact and they goof it up. Not because they don't understand workers, that's bunk, not because they don't wear a leather jacket, not because they don't carry a lunch pale, that's not their problem. The problem is not that they are not proletarianized, the problem is that they are not able to mobilize what physiologically is their potential for creative intelligence. They are not able to overcome their own ego reactions, to rise above the interpersonal ego situation,¹⁶ to look into the worker and try to understand what is going on inside him, and try to locate, within him, that to which they have to address themselves. So, unless we do this, there is no hope for the human race! OK, I think we should get to the questions.

Questions and answers

Mr. Perlman: OK, I'll call on people and they can then proceed to the mike. Questions and comments, please? Are there any? Ah, I see one in the back, yes?

Mr. Perlman {silently asking someone}: Is he the only one?

Male: 35.29 A visionary myself, I've been doing some research into Kachin¹⁷ ideology, Kachin as {inaudible} agent social structure {inaudible} mats and {inaudible} of reading a CIA final for something ornery {inaudible} and {inaudible} address at the, the {inaudible} investigation of this ugly {inaudible} soul, who had {inaudible} them into {inaudible} psychiatric characteristics indeed. Now, what I wanted to {whisper: we should make some {inaudible}} talk to the {inaudible} where the psychiatrists—the traumatic oriented ones—was unable to—who was not able to conceptualize what he called a door between the swarm physically emerging infantile period, and suddenly the patient, individual being borne into a {inaudible} world which he couldn't deal with. And particularly, the <Maurice> Bloch (1939–) {inaudible} this idea of development as opposed to a complication to a nation. Now, the question is this: Could you discuss the synthesis—the—what we {inaudible} the most sophisticated bourgeois souls on this subject are capable of reaping and comparing that with possibly the soviet world, just compare that.

Mr. LaRouche: Well, first of all, let me say one thing. I don't think the project is a very good one. First of all, you'll see that more clearly when you read the PSP article and think about it, and think about how it was put together. To get at the mental life of any section, subculture or culture of humanity, requires a certain qualification beforehand. And you are not going to get reliable results unless you bring those qualifications beforehand to the work. It might seam a good rational study and so forth, in comparison of sources on methods would get the result, it doesn't. Because in any

15 Mr. Moore: “We did a lot of factory gate organizing in those days through the East Coast and Midwest, making many contacts. But you always knew in follow up phone calls when the wife was monitoring the call, as the contact would start to give lame excuses for why he couldn't do anything. You could easily imagine the wife telling him: 'Don't get involved you are going to risk your job, think of the family... just behave.' It was the same as what Lyn experienced after WWII.”

16 This is what the editor calls 'to perceive interpersonal relations as a game of billiards'.

17 The northernmost state of Burma. It is bordered by China to the north and east.

kind of psychological study, what the investigator is working with, is his own mental processes, and what he cannot confront and locate within himself, he cannot see. That is, if there are aspects of one's own nature, from which one is blocked, or if you cannot gain access when you need it to, in a sense, "ethnoize" with the inner mental state of the people you are investigating, you are going to come up with very bad blunders, it's commonplace.

At this point, just to be sure, I want to stress the fact that—as a leader of political organization—the fact that I, with a few others, am undertaking this kind of work does not mean that I am advocating in any sense, the passing out of a license to practice psychoanalysis to a bunch of laymen! Either from the standpoint of clinical work, which can be absolutely deadly—that is, a person who is blocked running around trying to lead group sessions or individual counseling is a menace! An absolute menace! And it's only less dangerous because it will probably end up as largely a waste of time to attempt to investigate a culture—I'll just cite this PSP thing: Why was I able to put this question of the PSP together? Because I had the clinical experience with actual cases dealing with this kind of phenomenon, in general to be able to *understand in detail* the inner life of the Latin American. It was clinical qualifications. I could not *possibly*, from text book knowledge or college classroom education, or a degree in psychology or any of this other crap, I could not possibly have competently attacked that problem! You have to be able to see and feel inside the people you are analyzing. If you have not gone through the confrontation, in which you yourself have gone through what we call depth analysis, that is where this fundamental emotion has been brought up, where you have had your sense, the first time, of your own depth inside yourself. And until you've learned to cope with that, when that's no longer dangerous to you, when you don't faint, vomit, choke up or the usual phenomenon, when this stops—or jump into a baptistery font—only then can you do any analysis, because you never know, I never know, I generally get a hint of when it's coming on, but I will never know in advance, when someone says: "I want to talk with you." I will never know that, within two or three hours, if I say: "I'm going to talk with you for two hours." I don't know that in the course of that time this person is going—really brought up something, and then I've got to deal with this kind of crisis with that individual. If I don't know what I'm doing, If I don't know what this emotion is, how it behaves, if I don't understand how their mind works, I'm as dangerous to them as a plumber!

Now, let me suggest—as I say, I'll qualify this. Under no cases, in my view, should people be attempting to launch projects on the psychology of the population, until they are qualified to do individual analytical work, which means having gone through depth analysis, having recognized the roots of your own sexual impotence, recognized the problems of formalism and all the other correlatives.

There are things that can be done, and one of the efforts we make is to chop out—from the few of us who are able to get at the basic problems—is to chop out pieces which people can work on. I'll give you just for an example or two examples, two kinds of examples of what we are doing, that fills those qualifications. For example, the case of the German medical student: We have a number of our members in Germany, including some of the medical students and physicians themselves, who are qualified and who are therefore continuing the preliminary analysis that we did with the population of these students to develop the complete clinical case on "What is the psychopathology of the German medical examination system?", that's going to be published. All right, these people are qualified—they have gone through some—all the way down to the bottom, they have gone through depth analysis and they are qualified to do this kind of work, some of them are matured clinicians. In Italy, we are doing an article on the case of Antonio Gramsci (1891–1937), which includes a study of Gramsci and of the Socialist Party Executive Committee of the 1919-1922 period, the minutes of these meetings are published. In the proceedings of The Socialist Party of Italy during the period of the general strikes in 1919-1921, the minutes of these meetings

are the most *ugly display* of political impotence you ever saw outside of The Spartacist League¹⁸. Here is a general strike, there's a revolution, and these “revolutionary leaders” these clowns are sitting at meeting after meeting trying to pass the buck on ongoing executive responsibilities for activities, including Gramsci himself. Now, in the case of Gramsci, who had a hideous mother, a hideous childhood; he was hung up on a sealing on a board to try to straighten out his back, you know, crucified as a kid, tortured as a child, all—he comes from Sardinia, a hideous place to come from! {general hilarity} I mean in terms of the circumstances, it's backwardness, you know, {inaudible 45:51}. Well, the person who is doing this, principally, along with others, are people who have gone through depth analysis, they are qualified to work on the case of Antonio Gramsci. Other people are qualified to do peripheral work. Then we have other projects, which are being done in Europe and being done here, which are on specific problems of epistemology. What we do in this case, is for people who have not gone through that—have not qualified in the broader sense, but who have special c {break in recording}.

{...} from two standpoints, first of all from the history of the various main philosophical currents in France today, their incompetence and their development, along with an examination of French family life, descriptively. We discussed this with the people in France, and they are going to put together—along the outlines of our discussions with them—put together a documentation of what is significant in French life, where one Frenchman really never knows another, they meet, the more often they meet, the less they know each other, which is why the French believe the world outside is absurd. Because it doesn't exist, they are never in it, they don't know any other people. And they are also doing something which they started on their own, but which we are furthering. Apparently in translating into French, we find that an advanced conception, which can be identified in one sentence in English or in German, will require several paragraphs in French, and there is a similar problem in Spanish. But the reason for this is partly The Immortals¹⁹—that the French language has been conceptually degenerating for the past three centuries. It is demonstrated that if you use a modern French vocabulary, but otherwise use the former French as exhibited by <François> Rabelais (c. 1494–1553), that you can express modern conceptions in French, which you cannot do with conventional French of The Immortals. So people who are qualified are doing that.

But this business of people running off and taking an area of culture and trying to do a psychoanalytical job on a people is a mistake. The only way we get at this sort of thing is the same way we get at the PSP phenomenon. You actually dig into the problem psychoanalytically, with people who are representative of that culture, you dig into the literature, you learn what to look for.

Oh, just one example: the Madonna-Whore pattern; that, and this is not only true in Spanish culture, the typical man and woman—or the typical son and daughter see their mother as simultaneously a Madonna and a whore. This is true throughout Latin culture. There's a reason for it. On top, she's a Madonna on the bottom she's a whore. As a matter of fact in Porto Rico they have a precise saying for this. The face of Madonna, the body of a whore. This is also true in Italy and it tends to be true in other cultures. In a sense, a Latin man, a typical macho, must have two women. He must have a Madonna, his wife, to whom his relationship is one of rape, essentially, and he has a whore. He must have to women. This is not restricted to Latins, restricted to Italians, it's a common problem, particularly in these days, when impotence is increased in the culture that I know in The United States, in the past 25 years. The present generation of sexually liberated youth are qualitatively more sexually impotent than their fathers, their parents, as a result of this whole suburban culture and the impotence of the culture.

18 A Marxist revolutionary movement organized in Germany during World War I.

19 Les immortels are the 40 members of Académie Française. Established in 1635, this academy is France's official authority on the usages, vocabulary, and grammar of the French language.

But the significant thing here is that in order to deal with this kind of thing, you have to recognize these phenomenon, and you have to be able to go through the literature and other phenomenon of the society, to see that you actually are dealing with a phenomenon throughout society. So in general I would say on that: Don't get into those kinds of projects! To get into such a project, you have to have people involved who have gone through the kind of prequalifications with which to solve the problem. In these various areas, the research should be restricted to the groundwork, within which, at a critical point, a more profound or depth analysis of the problem can be made.

Mr. Perlman: Further questions/comments? Yes!

Male: I just want to ask a question on the background material {Mr. Perlman: Do it louder or use the mike} Let me just-- {inaudible} I just want to plan out two things to land on this which you dealt with in the paper. One is, from where or how does the infant get this feeling, this fundamental emotion? Loose that to? I can see somewhat how the... {people yelling "Louder", "Go to the mike."}. {Discussion about procedure of questions. Mr. LaRouche: Line 'em up!} {inaudible} from where does the infant, or how does the infant get this fundamental emotion? And the other thing, why does it appears in the love-death emotion {inaudible} why {inaudible} emotion at all?

Mr. LaRouche: OK, well, the infant gets it from his physiology, essentially. As I indicated—well, let me just back up and say one thing about progress, where, in the article on Feuerbach: “The Case of Feuerbach”—part one is a period which deals essentially with Feuerbach's neurosis as such, and its significance—is appearing in the December issue of the Campaigner and will be accompanied by a two part piece on the case of Alfred Schmidt (1931–2012), who is the leading pornographer of the Frankfurt School. And that's literally the case, Alfred Schmidt is a pornographer. He is the professor of philosophy of Frankfurt and is the leading disciple of <Theodore> Adorno (1903–1969). The two part thing—first of all, there is an article, which in a shortened version is being published, which is by Helmut Böttiger (1940–), which was delivered at a Feuerbach referatat held at Bielefeld this last September 7-8. There's an introduction to that, which is being prepared. In the confrontation at Bielefeld, Alfred Schmidt left the session, his session in a state of rage, saying: “I will not be subjected to this.” What he was being subjected to was a criticism, which is published.

So those two things are complementary, but in the January Campaigner, together with the second part, which deals with the epidemiological implications of Feuerbach's blunder, there will be a companion two part thing, first of all, an English translation of Georg Cantor's (1845–1918) 1883 “Grundlagen <einer allgemeinen Mannigfaltigkeitslehre>”²⁰, together with an introduction by Thomas Maerz, which is a summary of the significance of Cantor's contributions in terms of the general development on a certain line of work done by <Bernhard> Riemann (1826–1866), Cantor, Felix Klein (1849–1925) into Einstein.

We will have—there's an other project, which is in ways, which relates to that, which is a general project grounding anthropology and ecology on a new basis. As a matter of fact, it's as a byproduct of that project that the food and energy materials have been produced. When these projects have been carried further—and some of the people in Germany wanted to get into the physiology of this thing as well—we will be much more explicit, with the aide of these materials in qualifying and elaborating certain things.

But the point which is made in the article is the essential point. That is: The fundamental emotion is the characteristic physiological feature of mentation, which is developed through, in this psycho-physical parallel sense, in early development in infancies, developed automatically. This

²⁰ The Campaigner, vol. 9.1-2. January-February 1976.

emotion—because it is developed, elaborated in social relations, and is fundamental—has the quality of love, that is the effective name which goes with the emotion. But the emotion is nothing but the elaboration of the fundamental physiological feature of the processes of mentation. What happens, then, is that, in the first or infantile period—probably during the first week or two after birth is the most frantic rate of development of the infant, even in hours—then in the first period of infancy, in most families, the infantile relationship of the mother to the child is the least damaging and probably most positive in this culture. And during that period, this type of emotion develops to a certain degree and generally continues to be experienced—unless there is a particularly brutal type of early bowl training—it generally seems to continue in a weakened form into about the age of two to three. That is, people can recall experiences and can recall the exact emotional experience that goes with the experience, back to two and three, where they recall such things, and then recall a diminutions of this afterward, and usually there's a whole history that can be developed, which accounts for the particular way in which this capacity to feel this emotion was aborted. But in most reasonably healthy family relations, particularly one in which there is a positive relationship between the mother and father, or mother, father and siblings, and the infant, most children develop a fairly strong preliminary experience of this kind of emotion up to the point of two or three. Then in the process of socialization this is rapidly attenuated. There is usually a crisis point somewhere about five or six years of age, at which there's a very sharp attenuation of this, and then there's an other sharp setback in the capacity to feel this kind of emotion which generally occurs at about the point of puberty, before or after. It's not puberty as such, it's social effects which are determining.

So, why this feeling of death? Well, it's an epidemiological point, that the ego cannot tolerate this emotion. What happens is essentially that if this emotion is experienced the normal sense of ego is lost. If you do not have a sense of self-conscious identity, then the effect of the emotion is complete oceanic disassociation, that is a loss of the sense of identity, loss of the sense of ego. Only if you have a self-conscious identity is there any preservation of the sense of “I” under the impact of this kind of emotion. Now, therefore, in a love relationship in which the relationship among people is particularly intense, and this can be among parents and children, or it can be between young, loving people etc. When this relationship involves self-consciousness of the others self-consciousness—we will get into that later in the sessions—that there is an intensified sense of “I” in self-consciousness. In that case, when this—if this emotion starts bursting forth, you get this kind of phenomenon which Wagner was trying to celebrate in the “Liebestod” duet. You get this intense outpouring of emotion, what is experienced as love. Otherwise the outpouring of the emotion is a feeling of death or a feeling of insanity. The same thing.

An other aspect of this is that this emotion is counterpoised to what's called “mother love” that is what people identify as mother love is not love! The idea of mother love is the idea of possession of a mother. Now, I'll tell you an ugly secret: There is no such thing as an “Electra Complex” {Audience: “WHAT?”} an “Electra Complex”. That is, you know, Freud postulated there was an Oedipus Complex of the man's relationship with his wife or his girlfriend or what have you, or his boyfriend, as the case may be, as being an extension or projection of his relationship to his mother, that is an acting out of a repressed, unconscious desire for coitus with his mother, his existing mother. Well, that kind of Oedipus Complex is in a sense true. In the ego state, the normal individual, so called, in society, when he is performing coitus with his wife, if you could perform depth analysis on him at that time, you would get his mothers face as the object of his sexual lust. This is what we mean by the Oedipus pattern; that virtually every man performing coitus with his girlfriend is not performing coitus with his girlfriend, but is using her as a surrogate for the image of his mother in his unconscious mind. And only when he gets to be self-conscious does he stop doing that.

Now, it's assumed, the Electra Complex assumes that now the girl, naturally, when she is in

bed with a man, is using the man as a substitute for father. Not so! It ain't true! And it ought to be obvious. When a woman is performing coitus, she usually has a male image, fantasy image, consciously or unconsciously, which she identifies with the person she is using at that time, and the usual sexual relationship is using an other person to give credibility and sensibility to a fantasy. You are not making love to somebody, sexually, because you love them. You have a fantasy. You want to actualize that fantasy. So you use a person in the same way that a playwright uses actors on the stage. OK. Now the woman will have such a male image, usually. But if you go a little bit deeper and peel away the male image: her mothers face! When a woman is in bed with a man, she is making love to her mother, not her father. As a matter of fact, to the extent that there is an Electra pattern, which is more superficial, what it involves is that the woman's identification with the father is the idea of sharing her mothers bed, that is using her father.

Like a typical homosexual fantasy, with two men using the same woman or two women using the same man, which is just a slightly disguised homosexual relationship. A typical pattern of suppressed homosexuality, for example, is the male, who is only interested in women who are having a sexual relationship with an other man, and therefore he tries to seduce them. A form of homosexuality. Or a woman who tries to seduce men who have a relationship with other women. It's just a form of homosexual behavior. You have to recognize it. So, there are these involutions, but essentially, this is the pattern.

Now, in general, through all life, all psychological life, the ego state is dominated by these mother images. Mother image is not mother, it's a synthesis which is created out of the basis of attachment, dependency primarily on the mother, but older sisters, maids, nurses, all kinds of people from the early stages of life generally gets flooded in, in making that image. For example: Your parents brought in two or three nurses at different stages in your early childhood. Your mother image has got these nurses mixed up with your mother in building up this kind of mother image.

Just to make it, perhaps, clearer, that in dealing with people, you ask them to describe their parents, mothers and fathers, how do they feel about them, what are their parents like, they will describe the person. Then you probe the thing further; you begin to get a case history, a sort of picture of what the parent is like, out of this person. Say “What did your parent do in such and such a case?” and so forth. And you get a completely different picture than the person gave in the first place, and yet the person still feels, even after disclosing all this and having it fed back to them, they still feel that their parent was the way they felt about them before. It just demonstrates, in a crude way, that the existent parent is not—the mother image is not a copy of an existent parent, but is a synthesis, which is primarily fixed on possessing the mother. But the normal kind of love, or what is called mother love, is the idea of sexual or sensual, more strictly, *sensual possession* of the mother. It's a banal, infantile greed relationship: Posses the mother, posses the mothers attention, posses the mothers feeding, posses the mothers good wishes and so forth.

But this is generally confused as being love. Feuerbach makes that kind of blunder. It's actually the opposite to the real emotion of loving. And all you have to do is see the difference between degraded sex, the kind of thing a lot of people do, you know, where they go out and get their sex for the night. Or the brutal sadistic or sadomasochistic relationship which pass for mating relationships. And you contrast the emotion—the degrading emotion which is associated with that, which is mother love—contrast that with real love, and you see the difference.

Experience of the fundamental emotion from an ego state: Summary

But, in general, therefore, because this is a suppression of the ego, it's a swarming of the ego, overwhelming of the ego, a drowning of the ego, and a suppression at that point, of the mother image, therefore it's experienced as death; “I am losing my identity”. The effect of bringing forth the emotion can be blackouts, fainting. In general the first experience of this kind of emotion, or the

experiencing of this by most people is experienced as pure terror. Therefore, to sum it up: On the one hand this emotion can be experienced by a normal individual in the way that Tristan and Isolde supposedly experience it according to Wagner. And that's under unusual circumstances. Normally the emotion is experienced with a sense of death or pure terror. It's the same emotion, the same feeling. But the difference is that the love feeling is when there is some intensity of the self-conscious "I" location, and the feeling of death and terror is the feeling of the death of the ego, the infantile ego is being obliterated at that point.

Mr. Perlman: Let me get a number of people to line up by the mike. Are there anybody else? Yes, OK, so why don't you step to the mike? Yes, over there. Anybody else {male: over here}, yes, OK. So why don't you step to the mike {inaudible}? And yes, over there. Good. OK.

Male: Lyn, my question is if we continue with this squeal of this past answer in relation to Laing's notion of developments, his psychoanalytical notion around ontological despair or ontological insecurity. I'm clear that...

Mr. LaRouche: Yeah, this is cute, Laing is really cute. Generally when I run into these existentialist psychologist I just shrug and say: "Well, here's an other filthy fraud, faker, a charlatan." But Laing is not a charlatan. He's wrong, but he's not a charlatan. That is; he has actually done some work. What Laing does, and this is a—let me just back step one minute. There's a problem here. It is that if one performed analysis, psychoanalysis from the conventional standpoint, saying: "Well, this is the normal form of society." not recognizing the problem of ideology or the alternatives, one would assume that the infantile ego represents *a normal location of the sense of identity*. That this is the normal, modal form of natural, normal human existence. It doesn't! So, psychoanalysts generally have a tremendous problem in this orientation just this account: They assume that the prevailing phenomenon of the location of the sense of identity in the ego itself—the infantile ego—represents a natural state of mind rather than a pathological state of mind. Now, this is the *root* of Laing's problem. Now, Laing makes an other error. The other error is, he confuses—he recognizes that there are entities apart from the ego which are attempting to control the ego. In a sense, there are two principle entities trying to control the ego. On the one hand: Self-consciousness, which is burbling and bobbling and to some degree wishes to control the ego. It stands opposed to the banality of the ego. On the other hand, the witch is trying to control the ego, the internalized mother image. And in addition to that, there's a whole gallery of all kinds of shimmers of the type portrayed by Bruegel, Bosch, Goya etc. and usually seen in paintings of Saint Jerome (c. 347–420), generally. Monsters! Rats! Beatles! what not! So these are "others" to the ego. Now, if you could strip away these alien controlling devices and let the ego run on it's own without self-consciousness and without the witch, then the ego would really locate itself in its immediate, sensual relationship to the world around it.²¹ But that's absolutely nonsense. That's absolute idiocy, it is literal idiocy. It results in schizophrenia, what happens when you try to do that? Let me back step again and describe one thing, which is very interesting to me.

It is that in histories of individuals taking LSD, the ironical thing was that people who were schizophrenics would frequently show no significant external effects of taking a dose of LSD, whereas a person who was only a fairly reasonable neurotic and not a schizophrenic would go through all kinds of hell, visibly. You say: "Why is it, that under these conditions, the schizophrenic seems to show more mental health outwardly than the healthy person? What is this, are schizophrenics healthier, is everything wrong? The schizophrenics are really sane, they can take the

21 Cf. Friedrich Schiller, the savage.

LSD and the rest of us can't?" NO! And this shows up in the history of people who have taken a lot of LSD, who were simply neurotics; they begin to get to a point where they no longer seem to show visible effects of LSD dosage, they build up a schizophrenic pattern. What's involved here?

Disassociation.

In extreme pathological states, that is, when you are driving a neurotic up the wall, driving the witch up the wall, clinically you'll get the following kind of phenomenon: You are looking at a person and imagine a sudden, total personality change. That person is no longer there. Their voice is no longer there. The voice that you hear is not their voice, not their inflection. The pitch of the voice has changed. The intonation pattern of the voice has changed. Speech has changed, that is, the idiosyncrasies of speech have changed. Cliches have changed. Facial expressions have changed. Bodily movements have changed. It is though—somehow the same physis, the same physiognomy had been transformed to be a different person, as if somebody had inhabited that person and taken them over.

Well, what has happened mostly in that case—you are usually accurate if you say “that's their mother!”. You are looking at their mothers face to the extend that their mothers face could be approximated on their physiognomy. It's a parody of their mother's face, usually in the state of extreme rage. Either cold rage or hot rage. Their mother's tone of voice, or something of that sort. Or, otherwise, it would be their tone of voice back in the age of four or five when their mother was harnessing them. That sort of thing. You'll find that in listening carefully to the sense of “I” at that point, that the “I” no longer refers to the ego or the self-conscious self. But that the person speaking make slips of the tongue which indicate to you that a third person, who is nether the self-conscious self, nor the ego, is doing the speaking: the witch has taken over.

Now, to a large degree that sort of phenomenon happens in schizophrenics or in disassociation, where the ego and the self-conscious I are both sitting inside the head, watching a performance over which they have no control. The witch is running the body. It's like if the mother came in and said: “Get out of here, I'm running this household.” and takes over the body. And then you bring the person back out of it, and they will report exactly the phenomena they went through. The disassociation of the ego and the self-consciousness, both, at that point. You can watch this thing. Once you become used to it you can see it. It's an empirical reality, it's a gestalt. There's no question about it.

Now, what Laing does, is, he becomes totally confused about this and assume that you can get the ego all by it's alienated heteronomic self functioning in direct relationship to society. The fallacy of that is that the ego itself is a synthetic character. The ego is not a little hard ball which you secrete at the age of one day or one hour or whatever. The ego itself is a social product. It's a product of an infantile form of social relationships. It's a construct in that sense. It's a product of social relations and cannot exist without social relations. One qualification on this, which we will get to again later but it has got to be clear here.

When you think, you may imagine that you make logical decisions. Bunk! You *don't* make logical decisions. What you do in effect is scan the internal of your mind, and you go unconsciously down to a gallery, into a pit, where there are a lot of opinion makers of which this mother image is dominant. And you say in effect: “What will be your opinion of me if I say this, do this, think this, act this?”. And they hammer at you and therefore you, very cleverly, in this sort of perpetual trail—<Franz> Kafka-like trail of the ego. You perpetually are trying to propitiate these bastards down in this pit. And if you do something bad you feel depressed because these monsters shot down your ego. They deflate your ego. Usually in direct proportion to the emotion involved in the error you make according to them. So, everything you say, everything you think, in the ego state, is controlled by the monsters in this pit. For example, we find this in the socialist movement, in the relationship of young people to their parents. They are afraid that the movement will do something which will

offend their parents. Their political behavior and judgment is trimmed by what they think are the limits of tolerance of their parents for their organization. This is particularly the case at Swarthmore <College>. {Female from audience asks for an elaboration}. Yes. At Swarthmore, typically, Swarthmore by the way is known as Mother Swarthmore by its—this was not developed by us, this was something which grew up naturally. And of course the Swarthmore mother is a wealthy or petty bourgeois suburbanite, typically. Which means that she has been demoralized, castrated and her life has been made meaningless in the postwar period in which nobody does anything of any importance, they just do a lot of things and they get status, but they don't do anything useful. Some of them were x-workers, you know, a worker has *potency*. A worker is *useful*. He *creates* something, he knows that role in the outside world contributes to the world's wealth. But what the hell kind of an identity can he have if your father is a salesman, what use is that? Or if he's a paper shopper, it's a meaningless life. So, the young fellow from Swarthmore goes home to his mother and says: "Mother, I'm in a revolutionary movement." and she probably will say: "well, that's nice." and goes to a republican tea and laughs about it, you know in her {female: louder} laughs about it in her own way. But then, the point comes at which something—at which the—because she conceives of his being in a socialist movement as something which you do when you are at college, or something you may do when you are at college. I'll give—what happens in Latin America, for example, in Columbia. In Columbia, at the university you can have radical activities on campus, but if you go off campus and you begin to organize workers you get shot! So, mothers think it's safe, as long as you are going through this, sort of either on campus or if you are just in this sort of radical socialist periphery which does sort of meet around the streets at a war demonstration and things like that, that's all right. But if you actually start to go out and organize workers in a serious way, if you begin to confront the potencies, like you say: "look, mother, we are having a campaign against Rockefeller!" She says: "You mean, you are running sort of a token candidate?" "No, we are attacking Rockefeller directly, and he is mad about it." Then her reaction becomes quite different. This is no longer play! This is no longer a childish prank. And what happens, you find typically, that these people have great problems precisely at the point, that the form of political behavior of the organization can no longer be rationalized in fantasy as equivalent to a childish prank, they can no longer explain it to their mother as a childish prank! Then they get frightened, they become depressed.

In self-consciousness, the self-conscious identity, instead of being dependent upon a body of opinion, of internalized social opinion, you are dependent upon the social value, your rational determination of the social value of your act for humanity. That, which you deem useful to humanity elates you, that which you consider as a danger to humanity and its interest depresses you. But in this case, the location of your identity is still social, it's real society! In the infantile ego state you are dealing with a different society, an internalized gallery of these internalized images, dominated by the mother image.

So in both cases, the sense of identity can be maintained only, the "I" can exist only, on the basis of relationship to society. So the idea of an ego being in the world all by itself is pure idiocy. And what happens is something quite different than what Laing thinks happens. But why does Laing say this? This is where Laing commits fraud. Laing in his "<The> Divided Self"²², which he wrote as a young man, I think he was 25-26, something like that, started as an existentialist structuralist, it's his profession, he professes to be an existentialist structuralist, he professes to be a student of <Jean-Paul> Sartre (1905–1980) and others. And therefore, what he does, is he at that point rationalizes his approach to psychoanalysis from the standpoint of his prejudice, his heteronomic prejudices, respecting Sartre and structuralism as well. And therefore he rarefies {?} or

22 R. D. Laing. *The Divided Self. A study of sanity and madness.*, Tavistock Publications: London, 1960. Laing was around 33 years at the time of publication.

reinterprets the phenomenon, which is nothing more than reducing the individual, by various degrees, to an “Id” like state. That is the stripping away of ego ideas. A desocialization, which will finally result, if you carry it far enough, in complete disassociation and can only result in total schizophrenia or an equivalent syndrome. That is, it can only result in *insanity*. And that's the significance of Laing. I'll deal with that in more detail in this article that I am dealing with. But the essential thing is, he fails to recognize that the external controls over the sense of self are not controls over one “I” but there are two different “I's” there's a self-conscious self and there's an ego. That, in the dynamics of the ego, there is both the self-conscious self externally, seemingly, trying to control the ego, and there is also this gallery of witches and other monsters trying to control the ego. Therefore he completely rarefies and confuses the question and makes the case muddy because of his own obsession with this existentialist or extreme heteronomic conception of what the human mind is.

Bob: Could you get in to the {inaudible} problem? First of all you said most of the time in your presentation talking about—this actually covered {inaudible}—the notion during your presentation talking about—talking about love, talking about death and generally how does that intersect the discussion about task-orientation and, you know, {inaudible} and elaborate on why you think that they are separate, I mean, why do you think the emotions—or why they can't have this, they can't have—intellectually they can't be in a set of thoughts?

Mr. LaRouche: No, not really. The problem is that the task-orientation cannot be understood, as I exemplified by the problems of people dealing with the food-campaign, which is a very clear task-orientation, which is made very clear again and again and again, and people were saying: “Well, there is no concept of the food-campaign.” when there was a very clear concept which had been elaborated over a period of six weeks! What was the problem? There was a neurotic block to admitting that a clear concept had been elaborated. The problem, as I identified, the problem is that task-orientation is not understood precisely because of a neurotic block, therefore, in order to get at the task-orientation, you would return to—it's a perfectly dialectical thing: You start with task-orientation, which is almost like on an ego level. It's a simple task-orientation and you find there is a block to effecting it, so you get away from task-orientation to become self-conscious of the response to task-orientation. Having become self-conscious of it, then you return to task-orientation, which now appears in a new guise. And that's the point.

Bob: OK. My point was in socialist society; the point is: task-orientation will exist to a degree, for everyone, but building buildings does not account for socialist society. It's the fundamental feeling. And you in the presentation distinguished between task-orientation and the fundamental feeling? {Mr. LaRouche: No, no} And in fact of the matter seems to me that it should—in any actuality that the terms do exist, they'll be identical. Not *identical*, but they will be...

Mr. LaRouche: That's absolutely correct, Bob, but the problem is this, and the problem is just exactly the problem I identified: I'm not dealing with abstractions here, I am dealing with real people who have one problem in general. The one problem they have, is that if I identify continuity in which the fundamental feeling and the task-orientation are one and the same thing, they can't conceptualize it, therefore, what do I do? I identify the two elements which have to be put together as a unity. They are identified as two elements. What I do in the program in the series is to increasingly identify this process and to say: “These two things are the same thing!” However I cannot directly communicate them as the same thing. Because to directly communicate them as being one and the same thing, I would have to have the result of the process already achieved. That

is, I would have to have people who had already accessed—who had already become self-conscious in their sense of identity and who had direct access to this fundamental emotion. Such people could immediately understand what I am saying, but I wouldn't need to say it to them. The point here is to identify the two elements, which have to be put together, so that people can recognize in the inability to immediately perceive the unification of the two concepts as one, to perceive exactly what the task is to understand that. Because, the point is, these two things cannot be put together except from the standpoint which I am saying has to be achieved.

Bob: Well, part part of this is—you, you—I {inaudible} physiology {inaudible}, and I said: “well, OK” we have seen an expansion on the other projects, and then you said tonight, you said explicitly that the source of the fundamental feeling is in physiology. Now, you said at the {inaudible} event, that—I mean it defensively has a lot to do with part of the {inaudible} physiology but, it seems nominalist, seems nominalist. Why would you locate that the love {inaudible} that is centered in biochemical?

Mr. LaRouche: I know exactly, what you are referring to, Bob, on this. {Bob: What?} On physiology. Now what I am telling you is that the standpoint from which you studied neurophysiology was reductionist and wrong. That's where the problem is. That's where the problem is immediately with you. Others would have the same problem in a less informed way, you have it from an informed standpoint, therefore you can focus it more accurately, others have a vague sense that there is something—“Hey there's something fishy here, something—what is this guy doing?” All right. Now, if we demonstrate that the human mind in forming gestalts, in creative activity is doing something, then the physiology of mind is doing that. What's doing it? The holy ghost? {general hilarity} The physiology is doing it. What we've demonstrated, if we demonstrate that this is the fundamental quality of mentation, then this is the fundamental quality of the mental physiological apparatus. But physiology says: “No, this ain't true!” and it uses the authority of genetical mechanics etc. etc. back to inorganic nature.

Bob: Well, that is just fine, but the question—the question is: From where do you get the sense of self, the higher sense of self?

Mr. LaRouche: This is just what Feuerbach identified: The sense of self is {Bob: but...}—or, all right, look, I get what you are getting at. It's very simple. First of all, this is physiological, but how does it operate in the infant? What's the infant's task as a physiological thing? What's this poor, little baby's task? It's born, what has it got to do? Survive? Well, that's not the answer. How is it going to survive? It has to—it survives on the basis of appropriate development of its powers to develop. That's how an infant develops! That's what's fundamental. Now, when is the infant able to do this? Can the infant act for itself? It can't! When is the infant able to act? It's able to act principally when its mother is present. That's when the infant can act! Which means that the emotion is turned on by the mother. When the mother is away, this emotion is turned off, it's depressed.

I'll give you the kind of thing to look for: Take a child, a young child, infant, three-four months old. Now, have a stranger trying to care for that infant. And the infant will either withdraw, become depressed, scream etc. or, when the mother returns it will scream, it will scream at her. Why? Because the infant is trying to learn how to control its world. It controls it primarily by immediate control through the mother. A father who is home occasionally finds that the only way he can deal with the infant is to find the pattern of the mother's behavior with the infant, and as long as he follows something according to that pattern, the infant can respond to him. If he tries to impose a different pattern upon the infant, the infant will be enraged, terrified. In this way there is a

relationship between the positive presence of the mother and the infant. Now, an other little thing. The mother herself can become an other person. Mother is not always herself. A woman who treats an infant normally in one way and then varies the behavior, to treat the infant in a completely different pattern is the same thing and worse than an ugly nurse coming in and starting to be cruel to the infant. A child who is raised by a schizophrenic mother is in real trouble, if this was impressed in some effective way in infancy. So, this physiological process, which is this physiological process of self development of the mental apparatus at this early stage is focused on the adult society which cares for the infant. The adult society represents, primarily, in the normal case, the mother. Therefore the onflow and regression or suppression of this emotion is initially associated with the image of the mother. You see a baby, where it begins to recognize its mother. The mother comes into the room, what happens to the child? The child is elated! If the mother ignores the child or rejects the child at that point, the child is depressed! If the mother does not respond in a normal way, from the infant standpoint, the child is depressed. If this goes on to long, the child is absolutely terrified. If the treatment is inconsistent the child is terrified. It's in this form that the infant as such develops and encounters this emotion {break in recording} the alienated or infantile aspect of this relationship becomes apparent. And the emotion is suppressed. It's a—in other words, it's a stopping of development, which is the way in which this emotion gets shot off. Is that what you...?

Bob: The question is, in the early experience, in the first—I don't know how you can put it {inaudible} phase two, I'm talking about phase one, {Mr. LaRouche: Yeah, that's what I am talking about} when the parents actually extends love to the kid.

Mr. LaRouche: Oh, I see what your problem is, Bob, I got it for you. {Bob: right} Your problem—I see what you are getting at. You are saying that the fundamental emotion—you are assuming that the fundamental emotion is homogeneous. It's not, it's not linear. It's not a homogeneous quality with a coefficient, where you get more or less the same quality. *The emotion must necessarily change in internal quality as the child develops.* The quality of this emotion is that it's a self-developing emotion. *Self-developing!* It isn't something that's the same all the time. The character of the emotion is, it is *self-developing*, it is not linear. It is not a magnitude, an essence, where you turn on the faucet and gets so many ounces of it. It's a self-developing thing. It has a quality of life itself. It's self-subsisting, negentropic.

Bob: I'll register that.

Mr. LaRouche: OK.

Mr. Perlman: Yes, next.

Male (Lyn?): Who is that?

Mr. Perlman: Oh, it is Shawn {inaudible}

Male (Lyn?): Good.

Shawn: I just wonder if you {inaudible}

Mr. Perlman: Could you speak slower and more discrete. Louder.

Male: I wonder if the reason to this {inaudible} the fundamental emotion {inaudible}. I'm--I'm concerned about finding out the relationship between {inaudible} and I don't know {inaudible} and that emotion {inaudible} exceptional works, which {inaudible} I want to find out what is the actual relationship between these {inaudible} emotion that you describe and I'd like to find out, also, {inaudible} the actual possibility for increased raw material for some fantasy. And I'd like to {inaudible} the procedure by which an individual {inaudible} between this development of an increase in {inaudible} fantasy and the, you know, and consciousness of actual {inaudible}.

Mr. LaRouche: Well, first, on the first thing, Uhm, the elation of actual discovery of an idea is generally—I mean you could generally say—that is an expression of this fundamental emotion. It's not a direct expression of it, it is an indirect expression. It's—the direct expression occurs in two cases: the direct expression occurs either in going at—that is, trying to get a referent, directly, for a negentropic conception of the type I have indicated, or in the emotion of loving, that is, actual loving, which is a direct—what you might call the infinite for of the emotion. That, in any creative activity, that is, the formation of new “gestalts” by what we call reason or what you might call intuitive reason, the formation of these gestalts is accompanied by emotion, which, to the extent that that's what's involved is an expression of this fundamental emotion. The elation of discovery of new ideas, which is really an elation of an enlargement of the cognitive capacities of the mind as a whole. That is, you never really discover an isolated thing. Any discovery involves the entire cognitive processes of the mind.

The difficulty in answering something like that in respect to a particular case, is that, in the case in which the solution to a problem results in the anticipation of the infantile possession of an object, the very solution to the problem can become the elation of object-possession. For example, let's take the chess player again, the poor, unfortunate chess player, who sees a combination by which he is going to slaughter his opponent, it is very difficult in that case to determine exactly how much of the elation that may be due to a small amount of discovery and how much more of the elation may be due to the possession of the opponents pieces. That's the kind of difficulty involved: one has to consider the actual situation to really judge what this is, but in general one can say safely that the emotion of discovery—of discovery of new cognitive powers is an experience of the fundamental emotion.

Now as to the problem of fantasy, there is only one criteria, and that's a revolutionary one: To the extent that one's efforts are directed to directly solving a problem of insight, that is, creative insight, or to the extent that one's activities is creatively or cognitively related to the actual processes of the world, then, that's not fantasy. Once—the best way to get at this conception, however, is perhaps not by someone discussing it, except to call your attention to the way to locate it in order to experience it. It's not difficult, once you begin to get a certain amount of self-consciousness, to realize that you flipped down into an ego state of fantasy. Mind-wandering is perhaps the term for it. What is difficult to do, is to communicate to a person who is living in fantasy, totally, that they are in fantasy. For example: undoubtedly, most of the people who enter the acting-profession are totally dominated by fantasy. Most people who have a professional involvement with English literature for example, are totally dominated by fantasy. Because, what is this whole business? Plays, drama, so forth? It's pure fantasy. It's merely patching up more fantasy material, you know, so people can masturbate better, because their old fantasies aren't working out. But the only way that one can directly know what is fantasy and what isn't, is by comparing the two states, which is particularly perceptible when one's mind wanders and one finds this wandering is destructive of the process to which one is committed, and then in turn looks back and sees where one's mind was wandering to, and then, you begin to find out “what is the underlying relationship”, why do you go to that particular form of fantasy at that point, then, what does the fantasy conceal as

a deeper fantasy, etc. etc. So the real way to distinguish—the distinction of reality from fantasy is a process. It starts from what might be called purely rational criteria. That is, what is a rational form of the individual's behavior in the interests of humanity as a whole. And in certain respects, that kind of decision is clear and one can distinguish the state of mind in which that decision is made. Now, working outward from that to subordinated tasks, which—otherwise it might be muddy—one can find where fantasy, fears, depression etc. are interfering with performing tasks of which one should be intellectually capable. For example, anyone who can't study, can find immediately the reason they can't study, they will find a fantasy, which prevents them from creative—prevents them from getting into creative study. There's no such thing as a person who can't study. There's no such thing as a person who—organically or otherwise—can't do intellectual work. If you examine what's going on in the person's mind, you'll find that something happens whenever they try to study, whenever they try to do intellectual work. You'll find some form of fantasy. It's either immediately in the surface of their mind, or it is buried. You'll find their mind wandering to certain things, and if you look underneath that with them, you'll begin to find out what their mind is wandering to, and you'll begin to uncover fantasy. So, ultimately, the—while we have certain clear indications of “what is reality as opposed to unreality”, that the ultimate test of—that is, the ultimate psychological truth from the standpoint of one's own self-knowledge is then an ideological approach, that is, you examine your own pattern and begin to recognize how your witch behaves.

I'll qualify this as I did once before: It is that in dealing with the witch, and the assorted horrors of the pit, that one learns—in working with people—one learns very quickly, that these damn things have a pattern, just like a personality. And once you get the hang of them, you begin to recognize them. You can—you find that you can recognize what the person is thinking simply by looking at them, because you recognize what the pattern is. Once you begin to recognize your own pattern, you can begin to smell the witch, you can smell her up to her tricks and you can ferret out fantasies. See, as I said, just to end this, the one problem of fantasy, of distinguishing fantasy states: *Among most people they are not aware of the fantasy occurring. They are unconscious of the fantasy as an occurring fantasy.* Their attention has to be *called* to the fantasy before they recognize that it's occurring. In many cases, not only are they unconscious of the superficial fantasy occurring, but the actual fantasy is buried much more deeply in the unconscious processes, and one would have to dig for that. And usually it comes out as a real horror. But once you find that horror, once you dig it out, smoke it out, get it in a cage, look at it, learn its tricks, then you know what the difference is between fantasy because you know—you know how the damn thing works, and what it is up to.

Male: {inaudible} prehistory, you had, uh, {inaudible} for, uh, the inorganic world, the three parameters and {inaudible} like—like the third parameter must be a {inaudible}.

Mr. LaRouche: Ah-ha-ha-ha. Good. That's exactly—that's exactly the problem of continuity, which I was referring to, which I am sure is what you're identifying. The best way to see it, without going into questions of different modes of—of thermodynamical processes, is to go backward from the case of biological evolution, species variation, and recognize that the same pattern occurs in the evolution of inorganic processes, so called. There a differentiation of different qualities in a certain relationship to one another.

The third parameter is—well, let's say a special kind of vector, to keep it as simple as possible. And the value of this vector is an exponential tendency, which is increasing in value, for an increase in negentropy, which is negentropy. That is, an exponential tendency for the increase in simple negentropy, which is the notion of negentropy which we are getting at. And the state of negentropy is the actualized effect of this tendency upon the whole universe or the whole phase of

the universe we are dealing with. Now in animal species or plant species the increase—I'll use this one and work backward—the increase of one species or the increase of the population of a species or the introduction of a new species means that more energy, in effect, is consumed from the entire process around it. But this is not merely consumed as raw energy, not as undifferentiated energy, but it is consumed as negentropy, that is, it occurs in specific forms, like an animal will eat certain kinds of plants and animals and so forth. These must be present in certain abundance for a certain mode of behavior which is characteristic of that animal, or of its “technology” so to speak. Therefore, the precondition for the existence of this species in a certain density in population is initially a number of preconditions. These preconditions in themselves express, stratified—a stratified moment of negentropy. Now the question is this: Does this increase in the population of the species under consideration result in an increase or decrease in the negentropy of the ecology of the biosphere as a whole? If it results in a diminution of the negentropy of the biosphere as a whole, then the proliferation of the particular array upon which this species depends, there will be a diminution of this resource, then the species itself will tend to contract through its reaction to the holistic reaction to the environment. Now, in inorganic processes, essentially the same thing occurs in the evolution of layers of what you might call, roughly, thermodynamical modes. It is that a process is feeding on an existing process or a combination of processes in the surrounding universe, or that phase of the universe. The question is: What is the effect of the process which is being maintained, upon its context. If the effect of the process is to increase the negentropy of the whole system and the elements on which its existence is dependent themselves reflect increased negentropy, then it is going to tend to perpetuate itself up to the point that a further differentiation is required, that is, a new species to complement it etc.—a new process, to bring the whole thing back and keep the process of negentropy going. In a crude way, that describes exactly what the problem is of conceptualizing a unified field, is that, we start from a certain level of actualized negentropy. At that point we can conceptualize the introduction of a new process, a special quality of process, out of these preconditions which represent negentropy. If this process represents a mediation for the further increase of negentropy, the initial effect is to tend to reinforce its own existence and amplify its own existence. However, it is not so simple, because its expansion itself alters the structure and thus tends to demand a complementary differentiation which supersedes it. Thus we can say that the complexity of systems in terms of their apparent number of modes, their apparent number of kinds of discrete events, that this complexity of the system will tend to increase in its particularities with respect to an increase in negentropy. Thus the—since the whole system only connects, in the way I have described it, when we consider this, to put it simple—simplified terms, this vector or this exponential tendency for increase in simple negentropy, when we consider that the whole system connects and becomes self-subsisting. And every feature which would be determined by the two preceding conditions is automatically subsumed as a predicate of this notion of negentropy. Therefore, once you have got into the third, by these two preceding approximations, you no longer need the previous two, therefore the third now accounts for every phenomenon which you previously would have accounted for in the other two phenomena.

Male: I would like to ask two questions: {inaudible} two. The first one concerns self-consciousness {inaudible}. If you have a mass strike appear—a mass strike ferment and we behind it decide that the {inaudible} working class {inaudible} of workers who are self-conscious {inaudible} poor. {inaudible} see members of the Labor committee {inaudible} what appears to be self-consciousness, which then appears to be {inaudible} evidently, it's there, and {inaudible} but it's negative in sense of {inaudible}. Now, we think about our contacts this way a lot, {inaudible} you know, they {inaudible} work with us {inaudible} they become {inaudible}. Now, I'm—I'm thinking directly about our own organizers, {inaudible} myself and others I know. What do you think

happened in that case? Is it that they {inaudible} of what he is doing? Or is it that other people in the organization don't realize {inaudible} about that person, they don't realize the point at which they have to intervene?

The sec—second question is much briefer {inaudible}, the second question is: Do you think that if you have a particularly sadistic family background, that dealing with the actual person in your family, personally, subsumes solving the problem in terms of {inaudible} way?

Mr. LaRouche: Yeah. Well, let's take the second one first, cause it *is* shorter. No. The object of analysis is not to make you healthy by your going back to, uh—somehow improve the family models on which you base your capacity for functioning. That the relationship to the existent parents, for example, or settling accounts with the memory of the existing parents, is essentially a matter of understanding yourself in part, it is also getting the garbage out of you, that is, you are establishing a human relationship with existent human beings and thus freeing yourself of the crap of having a neurotic relationship to existent human beings. In other words, the relationship of the adult person to its parents is not one of need for their id—giving him identity etc. The relationship to the adult parents is simply a matter of having human relationships wherever you have relationships. Whether they are actual relationships with existent people or whether they are your understanding of your past relationship to the existent persons, it's simply a sanitary thing.

Now, apart from its analytical significance, the pathetic thing, the ultimate form of ideology—or, let me back off and explain it this way: People will say to me “Well, gee, you know, I saw my father, I saw my mother, I talked to them, we now have a more human relationship, but, gee, my father's still a failure, my mother's still somewhat of a sadist and a dummie. With a father who is a failure and a mother who is a dummie, how could you expect me to do anything?” that is a sort of a hereditarian genetic kind of nonsense, which is really a real fraud. This is the real, ultimate rationalization, “since my father is not well educated and my mother is something or other, therefore, what can you expect me to do?” blaming their parents for what they should do with their existent gifts. The amazing neurotic gimmick is saying “I am able to do nothing except as my parents and other people in this pit give me the sense of identity for doing it”. The function of analytical development, at least in our context, is to free oneself from all of that crap. That what you are capable of doing has nothing to do with what your father or mother were capable of doing or not doing, or whether they had {inaudible} or whatever it was. This has nothing to do with your responsibility. Your relationship to them, analytically, is, first of all, clearing up, analytically, your past relationship to them, and, secondly is, is they are also human beings with whom you have close personal ties of one so<rt>—past or present. Therefore you want a human relationship with them, whatever they are. Eh? But that's completely independent, except as a sanitary thing, from the fundamental task, which is to free oneself from any sense that what you are able to do has anything to do with what your parents did or didn't do.

All right, now, the other thing. Self-consciousness is normally accessed, as I said, from the ego. It is that, when you are being self-conscious you are not really being self-conscious, in the sense of locating your sense of identity in self-consciousness. You are locating your sense of “I”—and Feuerbach says this—the “I” is located in the ego. “The Thou is the other”²³. That's self-consciousness. And you use self-consciousness as a *mirror*, in which the ego can see itself. Therefore the ego becomes more intelligent. Now, how does the witch come in on this? Well, if you have got a good mother-image, you know, a sort of a “good” witch, the—not the wicked witch of the “West type”, but the “good witch” type—then the “good” witch lets you get “manna”, a sense of

23 “Nur an dem andern wird der Mensch sich klar und selbstbewußt; aber erst wenn ich mir selbst klar, wird mir die Welt klar.” (Only through Thou is man aware of himself and self-conscious; but only when I become aware of myself, will I become aware of the world.) - Feuerbach, *Das Wesen des Christentums* p.165.

elation, from being—having favorable intercourse, and I don't mean, necessarily, sexual intercourse, but favorable intercourse in general, with people, so, the young radical gets into a mass upsurge, finds that certain ideas which corresponds to reason, self-consciousness, that these ideas are associated with activities in which a larger number of people are viewing his activities favorable “Oh, gee, a bunch of workers think we are pretty good people, and they associate—I associate what I do that the workers like before, with my being reasonable.” In that sense, the importance of the mirror has increased as a determinant in judging, mediating, what you'll do. But you always refer—first of all, check with mommy. You don't—you are self-conscious. Yeah, you look at the mirror of self-consciousness to determine what reason says you ought to do. But before you actually do it, check with mommy, and if she says it is okay, fine—with the mother-image. And that's the way it works. Now, what they find is, immediate opinion attenuates, workers aren't around padding you on the back anymore “Oh, well, that didn't work.” So, the fact that there is an ebb as a result of the experience itself, indicates that this was done in the ego state all along. Because if the “I” was located—or had been shifted to self-consciousness, the fact that you had one such experience would be treated by reason as a scientific vindication of the method by which you got to that experience, and the attenuation of the experience would not be—would not be an ebb in your consciousness, but would be recognized by you as only an ebb in the situation. And that's the phenomenon we are dealing with. We are dealing, in the Labor Committee, with people, who are essentially, most of them, are essentially in an ego state, who are distinguished from, say, such imbeciles as the SWPs²⁴, they are distinguished by the fact that they are using the mirror of self-consciousness, that is, active reason, to guide their behavior. They generally have the subtle accounts of what they feel able to do, by arguing out the rightness of doing this with the internalized mother-image. But in reality, there would be no need for this.

Now, the same thing is true in the workers. But in a real workers movement, where the seizure of power is the goal, this changes. It actually does produce self-consciousness. Maybe not the strongest kind of self-consciousness, but it does. And that's something I'll get to later, but I'll just identify it now, is that, the image of the father in religion is not the image of the existent father, it's the image of Nelson Rockefeller (1908–1979). That is, religion, and the family regard the existent father, if he's a worker or something, they regard him as a poor schlep²⁵ who, maybe, is a good provider, but he's a schlep. The real man, in the image of the cuckold—unlike the typical worker, who is—in the catholic theology, of cause, is associated with a cuckold, Saint Joseph, the guy who stood outside the door while the angel Gabriel blew his horn on the Virgin Marry {general hilarity}. The real father is Gabriel, the angel Gabriel, the guy who blows the horn {general hilarity}. Who is he? Is he the worker? No, he is not the worker, he is Nelson Rockefeller {general hilarity}. He is the angel Gabriel. He represents *potency* in the outside world. The figure that has control of the lawful *order* of reality outside the family life itself. Well, the worker really become self-conscious when he decides “this bastard's got to go!” Not that we are going to make *demands* of Nelson. Not that we are going to demand that The Congress get rid of <Richard> Nixon (1913–1994), but we are going to demand that Congress packs Nixon in its bag and leave! When that—where that kind of determination is made, that's a shift to self-consciousness because the worker, *at that point, has made a self-conscious decision*, said “*I take responsibility* for the world wide existence and development of the human race.” That's the precondition of self-consciousness. The characteristic of self-consciousness is hubris, where he says “I don't give a good goddamn what anybody thinks, I'm going to do—fulfill my responsibility to the future of the human race, and that's what I'll do! If I'm absolutely alone, I'll do that!” *that's* self-consciousness. What the--

24 Socialist Workers Party

25 Yiddish: A clumsy or stupid person. A sloppy or slovenly person. A boring person, a drag.

Male: this ebb—just one thing—this ebb of self-consciousness, that is, you are letting something cause you to stop looking at how you are changing the world around you and start looking at apparent changes which are going on thoroughly inside you, saying “I have to—I have to accelerate this change {inaudible}?”

{crosstalk}

Mr. LaRouche: It's like the operation “Mop up” thing. What psyched people up in operation “Mop up”. Few bruises? No, the communist party has been passing out bruises for years. Communist party goon squads have been dishing out bruises all over the left for years. The SWP has been dishing out bruises in recent years, using goons. It has been going on all over the place. The cops do it all the time. The liberals order it done all the time. I mean, you can imagine the Columbia administration being upset about little, you know, a little—few bruises, with what—the blood that they've ordered? No, this is—that's nonsense.

What upsets people? The key to self-consciousness. What upsets people is that the fixed order of reality in which the Communist Party had to be an existent institution on the left, as it's major fixture, that this thing—we are saying, we are going to end that! We are going to *change* reality. We are expressing potency, and people, in their own words, got freaked out! by that! They were freaked out—they were freaked out by the fundamental—what's the first commandment? What's the first commandment? written by this guy Ezra in the year 558 BC, I think it was.

Male: “Thou shalt not {inaudible}”²⁶ {general hilarity}

Mr. LaRouche: That's right, there shall be no other gods before me. And they got a story that goes along with that about how Lucifer got kicked out, you know, but that ain't true. Lucifer is really Karl Marx, and he is coming, they just hope, you know.

Male: {inaudible} self-love, thence, you can hear yourself compromise {inaudible} you can operate {inaudible} value {inaudible}. {inaudible} in terms of organizing workers {inaudible} these lines {inaudible}.

Mr. LaRouche: Yeah. Okay, well, it's very simple. Freedom and necessity. Say “Well, if you don't do this you are gonna die.” that sounds like mother saying “if you do not do this, you are not going to get your supper tonight.” Right? Telling a worker he's gonna die if he doesn't do make a revolution. He doesn't know what a revolution is! The essential thing—the necessity is clear, so the worker really knows about the necessity, he has the existent knowledge, which he hasn't put together, he's seen food prices, he has now heard about the energy crisis, he has heard about all kinds of things, he is told “the world is going to pieces, it's a disaster, it's a question of how many minutes he's gonna have his job” and so forth, he knows all about disaster! All the motivation, the necessity for doing something is very clearly there. But he is—he is inert, he is dumb, he is numb “Well, somehow it will work out. Somehow it will work out.” Well, that's pure magic! He believes in magic. God is gonna intervene, or maybe those flying sorcerers are going to come down and save us. Or maybe they'll deliver groceries by a flying sorcerer, you know, it's cheaper—anything would be cheaper than the ENP (?). What he lacks is “the other”. So, when you are really confronting the worker—you are not confronting him when you—when you attack him by “we've gotta make a revolution or there's gonna be disaster.” That is merely a necessary qualification of the evidence that you are putting together for him, that's merely a predicate of the process. Well, you are really confront the

26 King James: “Thou shalt have no other gods before me.”

workers the same way the “Mop Up” confrontation involves a confrontation. You tell him, *he* has the ability to do it!

Now, well how do you define his ability? You have to discuss with him the process of organizing. Because what is going to say? “Well, how many people have we got in the organization now?” You say “Oh, maybe a few hundred?”, “Eeehhhhhhh, I don't think we'll make it.” So, that you are n—you haven't pr—if tell somebody to join NUWRO, now, on the basis of “We're gonna make a revolution.” you really haven't said *anything* to him yet. You've said something which is true, at least it's formally true, and absolutely true, but you haven't communicated to anything inside him which makes that a positive conception. You say “Look, first of all, fact one: If there isn't a socialist transformation the next five years or so, there ain't gonna be any human race. That's fact number one. Now, there's nothing around, which is organized and has the strength to do it. Now you know the other workers around here, they are pretty bad, aren't they, they are pretty backward.” He'll say “of course, gosh, not like me.” {general hilarity}, “Well, see, what we have got to do is—what we need, obviously, is a handful of people who will start the organizing process, so we can get this organizing process going at a rapid enough rate on a large enough scale so that we can begin to organize a sufficient mass. Now, if you cop out, you son of a bitch, then we've lost the dike here, because you are maybe one out of 500 of 10.000 who is ready now, able to make this step. If you cop out and more people in your situation cop out, then we'll never get the 10.000. Therefore, if you make the decision to cop out now, you're selling out the human race right now.” That's the way you present it to him. You present it to him by presenting the process in which he is a vital element. You go up to some guy and say “Look, we need another ranking filer for the revolution!” he says “How many ranking filers you've got now?” {general hilarity} You recruit that guy when you show him—and that doesn't mean one meeting with a fast pitch, that means going back and back and back and bringing the guy along until he is up the point that he understands enough to make a commitment, it mean sustained organizing, not emergency mobilizations to go out and meet your contacts once every sixth month, I mean, once a three month contact-rampage doesn't do a damn thing, oh, the next time you see the guy, he has forgotten everything you said to him the first time, it's consistent work—you show the guy that *he himself* has something extraordinary inside him! that he's not a ranking filer!

We get—we get this damn kind of thing, for example—the example of NUWRO is a good example—we get this sense that NUWRO is somehow a different organization, different from the Labor Committees, which is parallel to the Labor Committees like a broader organization, which is a lot of crap! {female: Louder!} It's a lot of crap that NUWRO is a separate organization from the Labor Committee. It is in only one sense: Only in the sense that there are a lot of workers who are not ready to make a commitment to the Labor Committee, and therefore, if you want to do something with them, even organizing, you have to allow them to function on the basis of reduced level of commitment so they don't have to sign—they can only sign away two arms, they don't have to go throw their torso and legs in. That's essentially what it is. It's the same thing with RYM, RYM is a somewhat different proposition. These young kids have to go through a somewhat different process of development—teenage kids. But this is the same kind of process. The way you recruit somebody is by—not by telling them that they are good ranking filers necessary to the revolution—the way you recruit somebody at this stage it's obvious! You want to recruit ranking filers? Wait till you got a big strike on your hands and you've gotta get everybody out. When you've got a big force, you say “*Everybody* out!” then you've got ranking filers. Or when you want to make a revolution, well, you want everybody out for that “No, this is not the day to go fishing, we are making a revolution!”

But otherwise you recruit, particularly at this stage, only to the extent that you show the individual that that individual has something exceptional. That does not mean going down the street

and saying “Here's a guy. Hey! You know, you've got something exceptional about you?” {general hilarity} No, it doesn't mean that at all, because he may not be exceptional! Chances are 9.999 out of 10.000 that he is *not* exceptional! Not in that sense. You have to *find* the exceptional person. How do we *find* the exceptional people? It's a process! by which we know, there's somebody standing up in front of us, he is actually an exceptional person and should be told this. This should not be kept secret from him any longer. What's the process? We distribute, out of our distributions, eventually, if you do it in a sustained way, so many guys respond. Okay, you've got a certain number of people, you begin talking to them. Then you find so and so is a well meaning dumb-head, so and so is good, but his problem is too acute, so and so has 15 children and two wives, not exactly in the best shape. And in that process you get down to one or two people out of a whole area of work, who you realize are really exceptional people. You realize that they are intellectuals. And, of course, students sometimes have trouble recognizing that a worker, who is not well educated in particular, can be an intellectual, a real {inaudible} intelligence. If you listen you can hear that, you can hear the guy whose mind actually works conceptually, who is fascinated by process, who is fascinated by kinds of things, and his mind is constantly working, working, he's *frustrated* at the stupidity of people around him. You find such a person, you say “Look, don't you realize what your problem is? Don't you realize why you feel like the black chick, like the ugly duckling in this mess? Cause you are different, you are a revolutionary. You are never going to be at peace until you make that commitment, and here is why you've gotta commit, and here is how we are going to do it!” That's the way you do it! That's self-consciousness! That's confronting someone. Confronting them with a truth about themselves in their situation, but it has to be the truth, and it takes a little time to get the truth across, lies you get across immediately, truth takes a little longer.

Mr. Perlman: Are there further questions, comments?

Male: Okay, when I hear {inaudible} there is—there is the idea, first, and through the process of {inaudible} when the idea becomes conscious of itself, and {inaudible} and I get this sense of something really creative, and it seems like me, you know, {inaudible}, you know, that {inaudible} that's the way I'm {inaudible}, that's the way it comes down to me, and I want to believe, you know, it's magic, I don't feel like it's really magic, but everything I see, I can only conceptualize like {inaudible}, it's still like daunting me, it's still like this {inaudible}.

Mr. LaRouche: Very beautiful. It's beautiful, because that's exactly the way the problem poses itself to most people. {inaudible} Feuerbach referred to that {female: Speak up.} Feuerbach refers to that, that's one of Feuerbach's perceptions, is to understand that aspect of the problem. The—there is no idea—Spinoza was ahead of Hegel in this respect. Spinoza recognized that the form, that is, the creative principle and the substance is one and the same thing. Creativity is not a *quality* of substance, but creativity and substance are one and the same thing. And when we say that particularities are the predicate of substance, we are saying exactly that: that particularities are a predicate of substance. That the materiality of the universe is not—see, the difference is this: The conception of materiality, of corporeality is of things which are made up of packets, of quanta, of energy, as a homogeneous, linear quanta, energy, simple scalar. But we've reversed this relationship. That we say that quanta exist, but only as predicates. They are only aspects, momentary aspects of a process. It is the process itself which is substance. Now, and this is what Feuerbach recognized. Feuerbach did two things, one of which was half legitimate, one which was fraudulent. Half legitimately, he recognized that Hegel's--Hegel's “understanding” and the logos is one and the same thing. And in that respect, he said that unless one oneself is able to reflect the understanding in this form, then the understanding must appear to one as nothing. That the absolute, that is, that which is

all, that which is primitive, appears as nothing. And that's exactly what the problem is. And the problem is, is that, first of all, to have a positive conception of something, one must be able to reach into one's own mental processes and find a referent which corresponds to empirical demonstration of the existence of that thing in reality. That is, no matter how many times and how many ways one demonstrates, empirically, the existence of this primitive self neg—this negentropic self-subsisting positive, that unless the individuals who are hearing this demonstration and seeing it have a referent in their mental processes which correspond to this in form, then they cannot positively conceptualize what they experience, they cannot integrate it. They can only retain a circumferential knowledge of its existence which is circumferential knowledge of all the details of the empirical demonstration. But then, when they try to get *at*, directly *at*, what they—within the circumference, they can't get in it! because they can't go in the circle, therefore the circle seems empty to them, because they can't get into it. And that's exactly what the problem is. The appearance of nothingness is the inability to deliberately access the fundamental emotion as a referent for the empirical evidence of continuity. And thus, the function of dealing with this problem is to locate, and enable people to systematically overcome—because you can't do it overnight, it's a growing process, developing process—to systematically overcome the neurotic obstacles or bourgeois ideological obstacles more specifically, which prevent one from getting direct access to the emotion. Once you get direct access in a self-conscious way to that emotion, then the referent exist for conceptualizing these kind of processes.

---end of tape---