



LYNDON LAROUCHE: “RIGHT THEN, RIGHT NOW.”

For our Canadian Labor Committee members
By Pierre Beaudry, January 12, 2015



INTRODUCTION

“Nothing under heaven is more pliable than water, but when amassed, there is nothing that can withstand its force. That the soft overcomes the hard, and the yielding conquers the unyielding, is a fact known to all men,...yet, no one utilizes it.”

Lao Tzu, *Tao Te Ching*

In this last month’s strategic assessment, Lyndon LaRouche had this message for Russia and China, and for the rest of the world to take note of:

"What we've got before us, is that we have a super-BRICS connection waiting to swell up in Asia, in Europe, in some parts of Africa, and in the U.S. and in China, and other locations -- India for example. The challenge is that we are on the edge of going to war. Now, war can be two-fold. It can be a thermonuclear war, organized by the British and their fellow travelers, or by the idiots, shall we say.

"Or, on the other hand, we can stimulate among nations which have a leadership, which know intrinsically what it's going to do in terms of the BRICS concept. And what we have to do, for example, we have to define what the United States role is in its participation in a BRICS operation. In other words, we bring together nations like Brazil, and others, such as Egypt, nations, such as in Asia, we bring these forces together in a converging way, a convergence of concern. Because we actually have, right now, the situation which can create a victory for mankind – a victory for mankind like nothing that has ever happened to mankind before. We have the ability to do it, if we do the job that we have to do. And you have to organize: you have to

organize the process, by getting people into activity which energizes them intellectually, makes them happy! And that's what we have to do.

"We in the United States have to understand that our job, as the US, is to say: Okay, we've been waiting for you. And say that to many nations on the planet. To China, for example. China is an old nation; it's been around for a long time. It's not some stranger to history. But, you can make China more effective in its own effort, by helping to cooperate with them. And so forth and so on. And therefore, that's what we have to do. The idea is to activate the imagination of people and nations, and activate them to recognize what the opportunities are for their progress.

"We stand at the footsteps, at the basement, of the greatest change in the character of mankind on this Earth, a change which is something that is greater than has ever existed before. We, in the United States, as a catalyst, with a certain historical development, we must actually focus our attention on bringing together nations such as the BRICS nations throughout the world and use what we have as influence and means at the same time. And that can bring us a great revolution, a great political revolution throughout the planet." (Lyndon LaRouche, *Morning Briefing for Thursday, December 18, 2014*)

The point that Lyn is making with the BRICS initiative taken by Brasil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa is that mankind has entered a period of history in which the great majority of human beings will be called upon to eliminate the violence of war and replace it with development of their fellow human beings. This is a simple but difficult task to accomplish, primarily, because people tend to prefer playing the geopolitical game of *reacting rather than reflecting* on what the situation is when they come under attack. As Xi Jinping put it: "The only policy to adopt, in a conflicting situation, is a win-win policy." In this process, Russia is giving us a lesson; and most emphatically, President Putin in particular.

However, the elimination of the violence of war can only take place with the discovery of the true self as being different from the criminally vengeful ego. What I propose to do, therefore, is to reflect on the present strategic situation from the vantage point of a 53 year old paper written by Lyndon LaRouche on the nature of the development of the true self.

"HEAD SHRINKERS" VERSUS "HEAD FIXERS"

"It is a dialectical irony that man can only begin to believe he is an individual at the point in history when man's ancestral prototype has ceased to be an individual."

L. Marcus, *"HEAD SHRINKERS" VERSUS "HEAD FIXERS."*

As Lyn put it recently, we have not entered into a period of Christmas, but into the period of a "Crisismess." The danger this period represents is the return to a "Bastille" sort of violence, a police-state violence aimed at maintaining the general population in obedience with the present corrupt political system. This means that it is axiom busting time for everyone. However, most people ignore what axiom

busting means, because the society they live under does not prepare them for it. Nevertheless, there are ways you can prepare yourself for axiom busting, if you adopt the method that Lyndon LaRouche has been promoting for more than fifty years in his criticism of psychoanalysis.

This Christmas, I have received in the mail a wonderful gift that was quite unexpected. A friend sent me a 1962 report written by Lyn Marcus [Lyndon LaRouche's "nom de guerre"] on social psychology and psychoanalysis, which I had never read before, and which I consider to be most appropriate for this period of time, because it forces people to reflect on the true nature of the human personality and on the present danger of war. The conclusion of Lyn's paper is most apt for understanding and dealing with the politics of violence of President Obama and of his British backers. His conclusion reads as follows:

“Finally, the assigned task of the psychologist is limited, by the capitalist authorities, to readjusting the ‘abnormal’ or potentially abnormal person to normal bourgeois life, reconciling the disturbed individual, the victim of oppression, to a state of reverence and obedience toward his oppressor. It demands that psychoanalysis sell out its essential ethics and its scientific principles in the interests of ‘adjustment psychology’ and the reconciliation of the oppressed to his oppressor.” (L. Marcus, [“HEAD SHRINKERS” VERSUS “HEAD FIXERS,”](#) Internal Memorandum, June 12, 1962, P. 56)

This means that if you accept the lies that you are being told by the media and peddled by your family and friends, you will be considered as normal and your head will be “fixed”, but you and your family might not survive until next month. What Lyn was reflecting on, in June of 1962, was based on an article of the June 3, *New York Herald-Tribune*, by science editor, Earl Ubell who wrote at the time: “At this moment, the practitioners, of person-to-person treatment cannot point to a single strictly-controlled experiment – an objective evaluation – that proves psychological treatment changes psychological illness for the better.” As Lyn remarked, Ubell was absolutely right and the reason is that psychoanalysts do not know what they are measuring.

Lyn was referencing the common delusion of an underlying assumption that for something to be considered scientific, the results have to be stamped with a “statistical” measurement. From this standpoint, it is not hard to believe that the so-called acceptable behavior in a society, at any given time, has to be the response of the highest number of individuals having the same reaction to the same stimulus. Therefore, statistics will show that the only scientific truth of human conduct is *going along to get along*. Right? Wrong!

Lyn had a beautiful insight into this fallacy when he reflected on the usefulness of the battery of psychological tests. He said: “The so-called intelligence test does not measure what the test’s designers represented it as measuring, precisely because the designers began without the meagrest competent notion of what intelligence might be. So-called personality tests are a notorious and lucrative fraud created by the same psychological numbers racket.” (L. Marcus, Op. Cit., p. 4) Thus, not only is science incapable of understanding the human mind, based on so-called statistical measurements, but so-called psychologies are just as incompetent. Where then, are you going to turn to find the truth about mind? This is where Lyn has a true bombshell up his sleeve. The answer is to be found in religion.

Don't get me wrong. Lyn is not suggesting that you join some religious group. What he is saying is that what must be done to understand the human mind, in its proper domain, is to study the relationship between the human mind and the Mind of God. Here is Lyn's axiom busting proposal:

The evidence of the true basis for the individual "mind" has been locked up for at least tens of thousands of years in religious belief; it is the analysis of religions, first by Feuerbach, then by Marx, by Durkheim, by Freud, etc., which has brought that fact into the domain of conscious, scientific comprehension. The individual personality, consciousness – like individual language – is from top to bottom, and in every respect, a *social product*. The old religions reflected that fact in the belief in the 'Holy Spirit,' the 'Logos' ~ the 'Word' of the Gospel of St. John, or, in more primitive societies, the 'Mana' of the Melanesians, the "Wakana" of the Sioux, etc. In modern capitalist illusions, the fact that the human mind is a social product is reflected in the belief 'in 'natural law,' even in the faith in the jury system, etc. Where the old religions believed that the mind was something immaterial, spiritual, like the 'Holy Spirit,' 'soul' or 'conscience,' historical materialism discovered that *this 'soul' has a physical basis*; not the individual organism, but all of the organisms – at once comprising society as a whole." (L. Marcus, Op. Cit., p. 6)

This is where the social role of the individual human mind comes into conflict between the group and the individual, between the physical and the spiritual, between the perceptual and the mental. This is also where the communist ideology went wrong in making believe that the individual mind could be sacrificed on the altar of the community of goods. Remember this old communist joke:



“- Comrade, after the revolution, everybody will have borsch with cream.

“- But Comrade, what if you don't like borsch with cream?

“- Comrade, after the revolution, everybody will like borsch with cream.”

Although old religious beliefs reflected the nature of things in the form of illusions between matter and mind, nonetheless the idea of amatterofmind slowly became accessible as a physical reality in the form of a *socialized activity of mankind*.

As Lyn put it, “once that concept is mastered it follows that social relations – distinct from animal relations – are the unique, sufficient and necessary basis for the coming into being of human consciousness, the human mind, human personality.” (L. Marcus, Op. Cit., p. 8)

Figure 1 Totem Pole from Ottawa, Canada.

French social psychologist, Émile Durkheim, identified this concept metaphorically as the “*Totemic*” system; that is to say, the belief that a group of people, a family, a clan, or a tribe, requires an analogical or metaphorical thought system as an efficient way to cope with its particular mode of life.

According to Durkheim, an advanced industrialized nation has a complex situation whereby social inequality is a reflection of a division of labor based on merit of creative capabilities of its individuals. To some degree, therefore, the productive power of labor is considered the basis for moral and economic regulation of society as a whole. Correspondingly, therefore, the legal system of such a socially organized solidarity will tend to be oriented more toward restoring order rather than punishing criminality. (See Émile Durkheim, [*De la Division du Travail Social : étude sur l'organisation des sociétés supérieures*](#), Felix Alcan, Paris, 1893.)

The problem that society is faced with today, however, is that the complex social division of labor, which allocated work according to productive merit, has failed to the point that social equality, or simply natural equality among individuals, has completely broken down. There is no longer any economic regulation, or solidarity ordering principle, where people are capable of taking care of their differences peaceably, because the governments of the trans-Atlantic nations have enforced shock therapy on their own people as an artificial way of life. What government leaders forgot to tell you, however, is that this way of keeping people in check is the way to kill society altogether. Modern society, in general, has been condemned to death simply because a society cannot survive by imposing chaos, conflict, and disorder as a way of life.

However, the important aspect of religion in this matter is not dependent on the vibrancy of its priesthood or to the greatness of its divinity, but on a God who is a spiritual being, a Mind. If you want to understand mind, you must read Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, not Freud. Durkheim observed that one of the fundamental characteristics of all religions is that the gods are attributed “consciousness,” and that, in more advanced religions, it is that relationship of consciousness which determines the relationship, either in the form of invocations, prayers, or offerings. As Lyn put it: “A detailed [totemic] system was accomplished by the greatest sociologist, as such, Émile Durkheim. Because the individual’s survival depends upon his comprehension of the activity of other individuals who are at the same time compelled to comprehend his activity, there emerges the idea of self. This idea of self is the central phenomenon of a whole array of concomitants, including the ‘subconscious,’ consciousness.” (L. Marcus, Op. Cit., p. 9)

When this “whole array of concomitants” breaks down, people lose their sense of self and are left only with their egos to deal with the “Crisismess.” This is what has happened to the generations of Americans who were born after the assassination of JFK in 1963. This is where people tend to become confused about the difference between their true self and their ego, between the nature of the collective soul and the nature of the individual mind created in the image of God as a product of society. The difficulty arises for two reasons, ego and perception. Most people do not see the difference between ego-stripping and the necessity of subordinating the individual mind to the necessities of the social objectives, because oligarchical society has put a premium on how a *persona* is perceived as opposed to how a person is actually creative. The nature of a society oriented toward perception is also axiomatically oriented toward destroying the creative powers of its individuals. This is the underlying truth behind Lyn’s 1962 criticism of psychoanalysis.

What is most interesting about Lyn's old paper is the discovery that the purpose of the cure is to restore the neurotic individual to the authority structure of oligarchical society; that is to say, to restore individuals to the "law-abiding wage-slave" status as reflected by the idea of company manners controlled by the family. The irony, however, is that this purpose is a fallacy of composition, because the true cause of mental and social disorder is what appears to be the normal condition of "*going along to get along.*" Indeed, the cause of mental disorder comes from the fact that children are trained, at a very early age, not to tell the truth when confronted with a wrong, so as not to get into trouble.

An example is the classical setting of the family Christmas dinner and the obnoxious presence of Uncle Joe at the table. Company manners forbid everyone, and most emphatically the children, from saying anything but polite generalities during the meal. However, after uncle Joe left the house, it is not unusual to hear the father or the mother say to each other: "*What an idiot this Uncle Joe is. Thank God we only have to see him a couple of times a year.*"

The reason for such a theatrical charade to be exhibited in front of the children is to break their natural sense of frankness by making them total obedient slaves to the lies of company manners. And, the reason why children cannot tell the truth about Uncle Joe at the dinner table is the secret to maintaining order in society. This is how company manners teach children to lie or to remain silent in front of lies, in order to make them believe that a sane society is based on *going along to get along.* When they are grown up, the same children will make sure to keep their mouths shut in order to avoid getting into trouble. This is the source cause of all neurosis. This is what psychoanalysis has neglected to consider as the most evil form of degradation of the human personality. In fact, it is to that axiomatic obedience to company manners that psychoanalysis intends to restore the neurotic personality to society, after it has been distorted by lies.

Therefore, it is an illusion to think that the neurotic personality of an individual is cured once it has been rehabilitated to function "normally" within society. It has merely been taught to lie better than it did before. However, psychoanalysis is not all bad. There is something truthful about psychoanalysis that Lyn identified with surgical precision. It is the social function of the *persona*. What psychoanalysis accomplishes, in a so-called cure, is to provide the individual with what Carl Jung called an adapted *persona*.

"From this point of view, the conscious personality looks to us like a more or less arbitrary segment of the collective psyche. It owes its existence simply to the fact that it is from the outset unconscious of these fundamental and universal characteristics of humanity, and in addition has repressed, more or less arbitrarily, psychic or characterological elements of which it could just as well be conscious, in order to build up that segment of the collective psyche which we call *persona*. The term *persona* is a very appropriate expression for this, for originally, it meant the mask once worn by actors to indicate the role they played. If we endeavor to draw a precise distinction between what psychic material should be considered personal, and what impersonal, we soon find ourselves in the greatest dilemma, for by definition, we have to say of the persona's contents what we have said of the impersonal unconscious, namely, that they are collective. It is only because the persona represents a more or less arbitrary and fortuitous segment of the collective psyche that we can make the mistake of regarding it *in toto* as something individual. It is, as its name implies only the mask worn by the collective psyche, a

mask that *feigns individuality*, making others and oneself believe that one is individual, whereas one is simply acting a role through which the collective psyche speaks. “When we analyze the persona we strip off the mask, and discover that what seemed to be individual is at bottom collective.” (Carl Jung, [*Collected Works of C. G. Jung, Volume 7: Two Essays in Analytical Psychology*](#), Bollingen Paperback Printing, Princeton, N. J., 1972, p. 281)

Jung’s idea of *persona*, however, is incomplete. Where Jung is correct is in identifying the existence of the *persona* as a mask, but where he is in error is when he does not realize that the *persona* is the destruction of society by way of *going along to get along*. The lie of the matter about the social formation of the *persona* is that it is also the source of false authority in society. This is the fallacy that keeps a society artificially alive, only for a certain period of time. The fallacy of an oligarchical society is to make believe that it can survive only if it maintains authority and control over the “make-up” of individuals who embody inherent tendencies to accept the consensus of general opinion through the formation of their *personas*. The truth of the matter is that if public opinion makers succeed in their task of controlling public opinion, society will break down, because, if it is *persona* which assures the adaptation of individuals to society, it is also *persona* which destroys the creative powers of individuals. Thus, adaptation is death: *Going along to get along buries its undertakers*.

Next, look at the inversion between the Biosphere and the Noosphere from this vantage point. Vernadsky demonstrated clearly that the principle of adaptability of Darwin was wrong. Change is the principle, not adaptation. While it is the integral system of biorhythms of living organisms which ensures the dynamic change in the Biosphere between living organisms and their environment; it is, for human beings, the breakdown of such an adaptation to a social system which ensures the future of the Noosphere. In other words, contrary to every other aspect of life on this planet, it is the *dissymmetrical imbalance* between a few individuals of the human species and the social environment of public opinion makers which ensures the future of mankind. If symmetry provides stability and harmony in the living Biosphere, dissymmetry provides increases in energy-flux-density in the Noosphere.

What Lyn has proven here, with great irony, is that the validity of a scientific discovery does not depend on the proof, but on the process which leads to that proof. And that process has always been compelled to exist in the human mind in a sort of “illegal form” because it is critical of consensus seeking of public opinion, and would otherwise be rejected if it were to be stated openly. This is probably why Lyn’s ideas may never be fully recognized for the truth that they hold while he is alive. Thus, Lyn has this amazing conclusion for people who discover new ideas:

“It is those laws of thought, the dialectical process of synthesis of fresh concepts, new ‘synthetic judgments,’ which are concealed by the practice of presenting a new idea only in its legalistic, empirical form. It is not only a suppression of the ‘evil’ dialectic, but even a less subtle kind of dishonesty, self-deception, through which the inventor shows himself to be at great pains to conceal the means, the true source of his invention. He introduces it to public scrutiny not as he found it, but as he patched it up, deformed it, and concealed the nakedness of its birth. The history of important ideas as they are presented for public view and the history of ideas as they are created are two distinct histories with a meager likeness between the two. [...]

“For this reason, because the actual processes of creative thought are denied recognition in social currency, they are regarded as impalpable and termed generally ‘intuitive.’ Now, it is also true that lumped into the class of intuitions so-called are all the dark wishes and suppressed motivations which society or the individual regards as ‘illegal.’ This cohabitation of creative thought processes with “criminal” tendencies only suggests, and legitimately so, that creative thought processes are regarded by society in some way as ‘criminal’ tendencies” (L. Marcus, Op. Cit., p. 41-42)

In point of fact, since a creative thought is always an act of breaking with the laws of the universe by introducing new ones, it is not surprising that a creative mind were to be considered as a criminal mind by society. The “criminality” of the creative thought acts, indeed, like a “purloined letter” on the leaders of society. Most people think wrongly that to be creative implies that you have a touch of madness and that the power of ideas lives in the dark side of things, on the edge of illegality. It is the nature of such an underlying assumption which made Edgar Allen Poe’s Paris Prefect of Police a perfect imbecile in his quest for discovering the truth about the missing letter of the Minister. Most people cannot see the truth in plain sight because it is not located where they would have hidden it.

Lyn’s reflections on this process are crucial, because one might think that the “criminal” part of the creative individual is anti-social. That is wrong. That “criminal” part, suppressed by society, is not simply the rejection of one of the opposites of a contradiction; it is the necessary synthetic inclusion of the unity of opposites at a higher level of thinking, like Nicholas of Cusa demonstrated in his [*Learned Ignorance*](#). As Lyn put it: “Contradiction does not properly imply that the affirmation of one side of a contradiction is the denial of the other – we have, in this feature of the personality, an exemplary illustration of the *interpenetration of opposites*.” (L. Marcus, Op. Cit., p. 42) The “*interpenetration of opposites*” means that two opposite tendencies become identical when they are generated from the top down and produce, as in an axiomatic galactic change, an increase in energy-flux-density throughout society.

It is by ignoring this crucial fact that society fails in its attempt to save itself by creating an elite student body based on *persona*. This is how society undermines its own chances of survival by rejecting creativity within its own body. And the reason why society has become incapable of fostering creativity among its own people is because it has focused all of its individuals entirely on money. As a result, it puts the youth into the hands of incompetent and moronic teachers who identify creative individuals as criminals and expel those “trouble makers” whose purpose is to change society in order to guarantee its future.

This social paradox is very important to grasp, because it contains within the “unity of opposites” the key to the creative process of society as a whole. The critical factor resides in the fact that most people think, wrongly, that creativity is the expression of the neurotic components of the human personality. The word is: “Do your own thing!” This is where artistic composition has gone wrong for the last two centuries. Actually, the manner in which children are being gratified as little geniuses for their scribbling is anti-creative at best. Encouraging neurotic behavior in children is counterproductive. The greatest obstacle to creativity is the age-old resistance of human beings to face a painful truth. A child were better to confront his own failures as early as possible, so that the earlier he discovers that creativity is nothing but hard work, the sooner he may become creative.

As a famous American psychoanalyst once said: “Not many of even the gifted and potentially creative students survive the impact of drill and grill. We do not know how many survive and how many fail. We know only that a heavy toll is paid. Those who are destroyed constitute wastage of creative manpower caused by a method of education which destroys creativity and the freedom of our preconscious functions.” (Lawrence S. Kubie, *Neurotic Distortion of the Creative Process*, the Noonday Press, 1975, quoted by L. Marcus, Op. Cit., p. 45) Indeed, this may have been the case in the 1950’s, but now, the inverse is true. Nowadays, the victims are those who are told that it is their neurotic *persona* which is their creative genius. In the end, the result is the same, because unless the *persona* is identified as the culprit, the result will be destructive.

Indeed, the instructor-in-chief plays the role of the high-priest and establishes a system of marks – good or bad – through which he forces the consensus of the classroom to punish or reward the student in accordance with the totemic system of his day. The social opinion of the classroom becomes the basis for the individual student’s self-esteem; thus, determining what the *persona*-power of individuals will be shaped in accordance with the reaction of others in the classroom.

And, it is this criminal ego-power which will determine the student’s means of action in society, not his creativity. As Lyn put it, if such a high-priest fails, he becomes a true “*Head Shrinker*,” if he succeeds; he becomes a true “*Head Fixer*.” Whichever way you choose, you lose. This is why it is high time to change the rule of the game. Lyn concluded his paper by saying: “That is the meaning behind editor Ubell’s challenge to psychoanalysis: it is only a demand that ‘head shrinkers’ degrade themselves, prostitute themselves to the role of ‘head fixers.’” (L. Marcus, [“HEAD SHRINKERS” VERSUS “HEAD FIXERS.”](#) Internal Memorandum, June 12, 1962, P. 57)

So, you might want to ask: “How do you win?” The only answer is by losing your *persona*; that is, tell your ego to get lost. This is the win-win solution of Xi Jinping.

FIN