



‘HOMOOUSIOS!’

The Idea of a Fusion Principle in the *Livingmatterofmind* of the Universe

by Pierre Beaudry, November 25, 2013



FORWORD

When you look at the continuum of the universe in a Platonic manner, that is, from the top down as opposed to from the bottom up, you realize that your conception of the universe is very different from what most people around you think. People who have based their knowledge on the Aristotelian belief of sense perception, that is, who think from the bottom up, have based their knowledge on false underlying assumptions and don't know how to get out of that. The problem is that the two conceptions are not only incompatible; they are also irreconcilable.

For example, it is generally accepted by Aristotelians that what they know comes from their individual sense perceptual apprehensions of particular things, which, by accretion onto other individual apprehensions, form statistical notions they think are universal. What happens when you turn that process around and begin to conceive that what you know comes, in reality, from the top down and is generated from true universal principles as opposed to particular things?

Not only a revolution takes place in your mind, but the individual mind becomes fused by consubstantiality with the principles of the universe; that is, by means of the idea of **homoousios** (*ὁμοούσιος*), which means, **of the same substance**. Thus, the human mind discovers that it is made up of the same *livingmatterofmind* material as universal principles. This report has four parts:

1. ON THE ORDERING OF THE NOOSPHERE, BIOSPHERE, AND LITHOSPHERE
2. ON THE THOMAS GOLD DISCOVERY OF ‘*THE DEEP HOT BIOSPHERE*’
3. THE OLDEST FOOTPRINTS OF LIVING PROCESSES ON EARTH
4. *HOMOOUSIOS*: THE PARADOX OF THE CONSUBSTANTIALITY OF THE TRINITY

1. ON THE ORDERING OF THE NOOSPHERE, BIOSPHERE, AND LITHOSPHERE

Firstly, take the case of the Vernadsky notions of the Noosphere, the Biosphere, and the Lithosphere, and ask yourself: how do these three integrated dimensionalities of our Earth relate to one another, conceptually, as a single creative process? The mental habits of most people is to conceive of these three “spheres” as being distinct and separate from one another in a time sequence going from the past to the future; that is to say, in a time-line sequence fashion of going from what sense perception apprehends as coming from the most ancient to the more recent, such as Lithosphere, Biosphere, and Noosphere. If this ordering sequence were true, then you would have to admit that both life and mind come from rocks. Does this sound absurd to you? It is not because rocks appear to have come first in the creation of the universe that life and ideas must be derived from them in linear space and time. What if all three were created together and were progressing together at the same time?

Now, turn this time sequence progression around. What if you were to say the opposite, which is, that rocks come from ideas? How does that sound? Why does that also sound absurd, but less so than before? Is it because you think that whatever is created must first come from a model exemplar of some sort, like in the case of Platonic Solids as the exemplars of rocks? Therefore, ideas such as exemplars, conceptions, or intentions must come first, because they represent models or plans of how things are generated, and what is generated cannot be the cause of exemplars, conceptions, or intentions. If that is the case, then you can be fairly certain that it was not the apple falling on Newton’s head that made him think, because nothing in what he has written demonstrates that he was ever able to conceive of an exemplar or an intention behind the visible universe. Like Aristotle, Newton was only capable of tasting the fruits of sense perception.

In other words, the reason why it is wrong to think that the Noetic comes from the Biotic and that the Biotic comes from the Abiotic is because what is wrong is the *ordering measure of change*. In other words, things are not generated from the past, but from the future. Time reversal is the reason why evolution does not proceed from the past to the future, but rather from the future to the past, and so the ordering process must be first the Noetic, then the Biotic, and finally the Abiotic, in that order. Mind comes first and from the top down. However, if this should be perplexing to most people, it is because it doesn’t make sense to your sense perception habits. Check your instruments and try to think in a completely different way.

The Noetic, Biotic, and Abiotic domains are not subsequent phases of the universe. They are three universal states or properties of existence progressing in the simultaneity of a universal continuum as opposed to the relativity of perceptions. Therefore, there is no such a thing as a beginning of life on Earth, or from any other extraterrestrial beginning for that matter, because mind, life, and non-life are three universal properties which have always existed, as long as the universe has existed. In other words, those three states of existence do not evolve separately from each other; they evolve together as three universal components of *a single livingmatterofmind process increasing by energy-flux density in the simultaneity of eternity*. Although this idea may not be apprehensible from the standpoint of sense

perception, it is not a difficult concept to understand, if the reader eliminates from his mind his prevailing falsified Aristotelian notion that things exist in and of themselves.

In other words, our simple apprehension of the process of evolution of the universe is wrong, because people have been mistakenly looking at the three domains as sense perceptions following one another in space and time as opposed to an idea where the three are being simultaneously woven together in galactic-space-time. In a sense, those three Vernadskian properties of the universe may appear to be separate, but our understanding of them must be that all three domains are necessary for each other's existence as a whole, as Vernadsky demonstrated in the biogenic migration of atoms. In fact, not a single one of the three could exist without the other two. And what you have to be thinking about is not about these things as separate entities, but about the discontinuities that take place in this constantly evolving process of change. What is the underlying principle that causes these discontinuities to change the continuum of the universe in an upward manner and moves it from the top down? That is the central question of this paper; and that is the way you want to think of the universe as a shadow of the creative process of God understood as the fusion process of the Holy Trinity.

While this process of biogenic *livingmatterofmind* on Earth proceeds from the top down, the aging layers of living processes have left traces which appear to have been generated from the bottom up in chronological time; that is, from the state of hydrocarbon to photosynthesis, but it is actually the opposite that took place in terms of causality from the future to the past. The traces of a process always lie in reverse order to how they were created. That's how time reversal pertains to the creative process. Then, these footprints cause an interesting epistemological paradox to emerge, which is: how can we establish knowledge of the process of *livingmatterofmind* in a universe which appears to have changed from the bottom up when it actually progressed from the top down?

2. ON THE THOMAS GOLD DISCOVERY OF 'THE DEEP HOT BIOSPHERE'

"We could be privileged to be among the earliest intelligences, standing in the dawn light of life in the universe."

Krafft Ehrlicke

On September 5, 2006, Chevron announced a successful test in the deep waters of the Gulf of Mexico, an achievement that was reported as "the biggest breakthrough in domestic oil supplies since the opening of the Alaskan pipeline." ([Major U.S. Oil source tapped.](#)) Again on March 25, 2013, [Fuelfix.com](#) announced that Chevron had struck oil 6 miles below sea level. Actually, these breakthroughs were the greatest since the discovery of the Biosphere by Vernadsky, because the point to emphasize is not the discovery of oil, but the discovery of a deeper layer of the Biosphere under the surface of the Earth. In reality, at issue is not the discovery of oil, but the discovery of a state of perplexity that tells you that what you previously believed about life no longer works and that such a state of perplexity is the crucial precondition for making any discovery of principle.

From that standpoint, the Chevron discovery is more similar to the discovery of the doubling of the square in Plato's *Meno*, than the discovery of oil in Alaska. The discovery calls for a different and more appropriate *measure of change* to understand this principle of discovery. Moreover, the Chevron discovery makes idiots of all Oil War scenario strategists, because it demonstrates that the deep drilling in



the Gulf of Mexico could potentially generate 500,000 barrels of petroleum per day, providing another proof that the British-Dutch scenarios of war in Southwest Asia are not oil wars but depopulation wars.

Figure 1 Chevron deepwater oil well of the coast of Shetland Islands, UK.

The irony, however, is that in the “apparent real world,” the announcement of the news brought the price of Chevron shares up on the stock market, while in the true real world of creative ideas, a professor of geochemistry at Cornell University, Thomas Gold, reported that the Gulf of Mexico discovery meant much more than what was publically stated. It was the confirmation that the truth of such a discovery demonstrated the existence of a deeper domain of discovery of principle. In 1992, Thomas Gold was the first scientist to report on this amazing discovery in a short five page article, entitled: [*The deep, hot biosphere*](#), in which he stated:

“There are strong indications that microbial life is widespread at depth in the crust of the Earth, just as such life has been identified in numerous ocean vents. This life is not dependent on solar energy and photosynthesis for its primary energy supply, and it is essentially independent of the surface circumstances. Its energy supply comes from chemical sources, due to fluids that migrate upward from deeper levels in the Earth. In mass and volume it may be comparable with all surface life. Such microbial life may account for the presence of biological molecules in all carbonaceous materials in the outer crust, and the inference that these materials must have derived from biological deposits accumulated at the surface is therefore not necessarily valid. Subsurface life may be widespread among the planetary bodies of our solar system, since many of them have equally suitable conditions below, while having totally inhospitable surfaces. One may even speculate that such life may be widely disseminated in the universe, since planetary type bodies with similar subsurface conditions may be common as solitary objects in space, as well as in other solar-type systems. (Thomas Gold, [*The deep, hot biosphere*](#), Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA Vol. 89, pp. 6045-6049, July 1992, Microbiology.)

This new layer of life, discovered around 1980 through the cracks of ocean floors called “ocean vents,” rapidly became a new area of investigation for the generation of life on our planet whereby the

energy for living processes was not derived from the Sun through photosynthesis, but from interactions with chemical processes mixing through liquids and gases that came up from the bottom of the oceans or from other cracks in the planet floor discovered since then. This, again, raises the question of life progressing from the bottom up or from the top down. The new domain of investigation led Gold to some crucial axiomatic questions regarding differences and similarities between the two types of biospheric layers, notably, the following two:

“If there exists this deep, hot biosphere, it will become a central item in the discussion of many, or indeed most, branches of the Earth sciences. How much of the biological imprint of material in the sediments is due to surface life and how much to life at depth? Do the biological molecules of petroleum and coal indicate now merely the additions from the deep biosphere to materials of primordial origin, rather than indicate a biological origin of the bulk of the substances themselves?” (Thomas Gold, [Op. Cit.](#), p. 6046)

This discovery reveals the nature of life before the advent of photosynthesis on Earth and the significance of abiotic chemical interactions with living processes generally. This is a case where the recognition of the discovery of abundant microbial life in hydrocarbons deep in the Earth’s crust forces an axiomatic change in our conception of the relationship between life and chemistry in the universe as a whole. This raises an interesting question that Gold identified as the “Oil Paradox:” Indeed, if petroleum exhibits traces of organic molecules synthesized by life, how could such molecules have been built up inside of a non-biological process? In his 1999 book, Gold solved this paradox in the following manner:

“I spent years puzzling over the conflicting evidence of petroleum formation. For reasons explained in the previous two chapters, how could the abiogenic theory be squared with equally strong evidence of biological activity? As it turned out, the problem had become a paradox only because arguments on both sides contained an unrecognized hidden assumption.

“There are no real paradoxes in science; the apparent paradoxes are merely nature’s polite way, *sotto voce*, of informing us that our understanding is incomplete or erroneous. With respect to the petroleum paradox, the unrecognized assumption on both sides of the debate was an unquestioned belief that life can exist only *at the surface of the earth*. None of us had considered that a large amount of active microbiology could exist *within the earth’s crust*, down to the deepest levels to which we can drill.” (Thomas Gold, *The Deep Hot Biosphere*, Copernicus, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999, p. 81)

This is where the question of the axiomatic difference between the two biospheric layers comes up as opposed to two different biospheres. How do the differences between the two layers express a definite increase in energy-flux density between the two? On the one hand, Gold identified clearly how the deep hot biospheric phase thrives on chemical energy which is largely supplied by the environment in the depth of the earth where life extracts carbon dioxide from hydrocarbons, while on the other hand, life on the surface biosphere depends entirely on converting solar energy into chemical energy by also relying on unoxidized carbon that is extracted from carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. What Gold was looking at is the same carbon cycle process and not two different ones. Oxygen is also required in both cases, although with greater difficulty in the subterranean domain, but is this enough to explain the change in energy-flux density between the two domains? Should there not be some singular discontinuity between

the two, something like an incommensurable difference and not simply a difference in degree and intensity, which would explain the more advanced and more complex form of life on the surface?

However original and important Gold's investigations may be, they come short of asking the necessary axiomatic questions, primarily because of a single underlying assumption, which is based on the belief that life comes from non-life, and that non-life preexisted life. If one were to approach the universal process of change as a *livingmatterofmind*, then, might one not have a better chance to solve such paradoxes? For example, take Lyn's question on "the willful intention of life" that is attached to the living chemistry of human beings and apply it from the top down to the other two universal properties of the universe:

"As the relevant chemistry of 'energy-flux density' demonstrates, human progress evolves along an evolutionary track of biochemistry: *that of higher rates of concentration of energy-flux density*. The evolution of the chemistry of the human evolution along such a track of roughly rising energy-flux density, has been, in turn, willfully driven by the absolutely essential role of **the human noetic quality of will**. Somewhat analogously, living processes generally, and also their evolution have the form of an expression of willful evolution of species. Contrary to all reductionist opinion respecting living processes, continued human existence is, most explicitly, *willfully* "upwardly" evolution-driven." (Lyndon LaRouche, [ART, SCIENCE & SENSE-PERCEPTION](#), LAPC, October 21, 2013)

Notably, the point that Lyn is making implies that mind, life, and non-living chemistry move upward together by being pulled upward from the same intention of progress. All three universal properties form a single triply-connected track of upward progression of change that transforms all three domains from the top down. Gold comes close to raising this same question by implying that the chemistry involved in living processes must also exist on other hard body planets of our Solar System. How useful would it be to know this from the standpoint of life on Earth? Although those planetary bodies may not have the surface conditions for the kind of living processes that we have on the surface of the Earth, other planets are likely to have sub-surface life attempting to pierce through to the surface. As Gold put it:

"With the possibility of subsurface life, the outlook is quite different. Many planetary bodies will have temperature and pressure regimes in their interiors that would allow liquid water to exist. Hydrocarbons clearly are plentiful not only on all the gaseous major planets but also on the solid bodies (the large satellites, numerous asteroids, the planet Pluto, comets and meteorites); and there is every reason to believe that hydrocarbon compounds were incorporated in all of the planetary bodies at their formation. The circumstances in the interior of most of the solid planetary bodies will not be too different from those at a depth of a few kilometers in the Earth. The depth at which similar pressures and temperatures will be reached will be deeper, as the bodies are smaller than the Earth, but this fact itself does not constitute any handicap for microbial life. If in fact such life originated at depth in the Earth, there are at least 10 other planetary bodies in our solar system that would have had a similar chance for originating microbial life." (Thomas Gold, [Op. Cit.](#), p. 6048)

There is no doubt that a Space Program could discover such a presence of life on other planets, by means of unmanned exploratory vehicles like Curiosity on Mars, provided we adopt the LaRouche mission of acting on the planets galactically from the vantage point of our Solar System, that is, not by going there ourselves, but by mastering the process of discovery from Earth with non-contaminated vehicles. As Gold put it: “Only very clean unmanned space vehicles going to planetary bodies that have not previously been visited by contaminated vehicles would qualify to bring back meaningful samples of a biology that resembles that of the Earth.”(Thomas Gold, [Op. Cit.](#), p. 6049)

3. THE OLDEST FOOTPRINTS OF LIVING PROCESSES ON EARTH



Figure 2 A rock surface displaying polygonal oscillation cracks in the 3.48 billion years old Dresser Formation, Pilbara region, Western Australia. ([Nora Noffke/Carnegie Institute](#))

[FoxNews.com](#) reported on November 14, 2013 that in the remote Pilbara region of Australia, where some of the oldest geological formations in the world can be found, a great number of footprints of microbe bacteria have been found dating back to more than 3 billion years, thus, showing traces of the oldest sign of life yet on Earth. According to researcher, David Wacey of the University of Western Australia: “There was plenty of life from the 3.4 and 3.43 billion-year-old mark – this is pushing it further back. **(Figure 2)** We don’t see the microbes themselves but we see the large scale structures that the microbes constructed before they died.” (*The Telegraph*, November 14, 2013) Even though most scientists are still caught in the fallacy of trying to decide which came first, the chicken or the egg, it is obvious that you will find life on this planet as far back as you wish, because life has been here from the

very beginning of this planet's formation. Thus, the question is not: what is the origin of life, but what are those anomalies that permit life to increase the energy-flux density of the universe at different levels of growth in the simultaneity of eternity?

French paleontologist, Jean-Michel Dutuit, reported on the Gold hypothesis in our own French Fusion magazine in the October-November 2006 issue. He said, using the words of Gold, that only “*a metered flow of energy*” permitted a development of life during hundreds of millions of years. The implication of this hypothesis is that this primitive form of life is generated from the same energy-flux density as are the more advanced forms of *livingmatterofmind*, but at different level of space-time density. The most fascinating aspect of this hypothesis is that it is coherent with the idea that life is a universal property of the universe which could be found on any planet in the universe that has suitable temperature conditions for life to exist below the surface but not on the surface.

This new top down *livingmatterofmind* orientation is the essential place to start from, because scientists have to stop thinking that life in the universe is some exceptional form of contingent and probabilistic phenomenon. *Livingmatterofmind* is the way the universe goes to the future as a whole, and that is why it is time to reexamine entirely our conception of life in light of this new concept which is that life is a property of the lawful ordering of the universe as a whole. Dutuit wrote:

“One of our minor differences with Gold is that we don't think he should distinguish so dramatically the “surface” biosphere (where we live) from the sub-surface biosphere. And, he gives, himself, a fundamental reason: the genetic unity (of origin). To separate these two adaptation domains (in time and space) from the living process means that you are using the same way of thinking as those mechanistic dogmatists who first look into life for limits and oppositions and then, believe that by fragmenting conceptually the continuum of the living, they can access the succession of forms and of transformations. The process of global evolution is then misunderstood and falsified because the benchmark discontinuities that they think they have located are not significant, or they merely represent their arbitrary perceptions. They have then failed to search the continuum in depth, and to look for the fundamental law of growth which expresses the *ordering of its body within unique singularities*, in time as well as in space.” (Jean-Michel Dutuit, *La Théorie de la biosphère chaude et profonde*, Fusion 112, Octobre-novembre 2006, p. 6. [Translation, Pierre Beaudry])

This idea of searching “the continuum in depths” leads me to jump ahead and enquire about the nature of the plasma universe and of the universal thermonuclear fusion process as an axiomatic moment of change in the flow of universal progress. How, then, do you go about investigating the universe with an “*ordering of its body within unique singularities*,” and how does the idea of thermonuclear fusion fit in? This ordering also begs the question of how a thermonuclear fusion process might express itself by demonstrating footprints of interactions that reflect a triply-connected process of integration such as the classical artistic composition form of music, for instance, like the one that Kepler investigated.

THE PLANETARY ORBITS AND THE EQUAL-TEMPERED MUSICAL SYSTEM							
by WILLIAM BOHDAN							
PLANETS	ASTRO. UNITS	Log. 10X	ADDED CONSTANT	MULTIPLE CONSTANT	CYCLE EQUIVALENT	MUSICAL CYCLES	PLANETS
MERCURY	(P) 0.310	0.5086	+2.496	x 128.8	255.97	C = 256	MERCURY
MERCURY	(A) 0.470	0.3279	" "	" "	279.25	C# = 271.22	MERCURY
VENUS	(P) 0.715	0.1457	" "	" "	302.72	D = 287.35	VENUS
VENUS	(A) 0.725	0.1397	" "	" "	303.49	E ^b = 304.44	VENUS
EARTH	(P) 0.983	0.0074	" "	" "	320.52		EARTH
EARTH	(A) 1.017	0.0073	" "	" "	322.42	E = 322.54	EARTH
MARS	(P) 1.379	0.1396	" "	" "	339.46	F = 341.72	MARS
MARS	(A) 1.661	0.2204	" "	" "	349.86		MARS
ASTEROIDS	(P) 2.2	0.3424	" "	" "	363.32	F# = 362.04	ASTEROIDS
ASTEROIDS	(A) 3.6	0.5563	" "	" "	393.13	G = 383.57	ASTEROIDS
JUPITER	(P) 4.95	0.6946	" "	" "	410.95	A ^b = 406.37	JUPITER
JUPITER	(A) 5.45	0.7364	" "	" "	416.33		JUPITER
SATURN	(P) 9.006	0.9545	" "	" "	444.43	A = 430.54	SATURN
SATURN	(A) 10.074	1.0032	" "	" "	450.69	B ^b = 456.14	SATURN
URANUS	(P) 18.288	1.2622	" "	" "	484.05	B = 483.26	URANUS
URANUS	(A) 20.092	1.3030	" "	" "	489.31		URANUS
NEPTUNE	(P) 29.799	1.4742	" "	" "	511.36		NEPTUNE
NEPTUNE	(A) 30.341	1.4820	" "	" "	512.37	C = 512	NEPTUNE

Figure 3 Astronomical distances of the Planetary Orbits and the Equal-Tempered Musical System.

For example, what is the nature of the F# dissonance in the well-tempered musical system established at the Verdi tuning of C-256 Hz? Why is it that when you partition the span of the Solar system from Mercury to Neptune, using astronomical units and musical cycle equivalents, you get a division of the octave into four Lydian intervals C, E^b, F#, A, and C, corresponding to the respective aphelion-perihelion-vibrato orbits of Mercury, Venus, Asteroids, Saturn, and Neptune, respectively, and those intervals of action correspond to dissonances that John Sebastian Bach used to express change in his Preludes and Fugues? Why is F# located at the asteroid belt? My purpose in raising these questions is not to present an actual formula, or a musical design to be applied in the physical domain, but to call upon a certain state of mind which includes the principle of classical artistic composition into astronomy, and especially when you investigate the Solar system for the Defense of Earth as an expression of the well-tempered motion of the galaxy. The point is to pay attention to the dissonances of the system. Take, for instance, the case of the paradox of consubstantiality.

4. HOMOOUSIOS: THE PARADOX OF THE CONSUBSTANTIALITY OF THE TRINITY

The real paradoxical issue to be resolved about the universe as a whole is the Christian idea that Jesus is Man-God; that is, consubstantial with the Father. What is the significance of this theological question for science and for the future of mankind? This is a most important question because, from the standpoint of epistemology, it means that human knowledge is created for the purpose of becoming consubstantial with universal principles from the top down, and most people don't even know it.

Therefore, it is important to go back to the historical sources of this question which was best developed by Lyn in his 1981 paper entitled: [*The Strategic Significance of the Ecumenical Negotiations*](#). In that paper, Lyn gave us a very solid historical background on the necessity to master that question if one wished to think strategically. As he put it, in his introductory remark:

“In the deepest meaning of strategy, the most important strategic discussions occurring in any part of the world today are being conducted neither in Washington, D.C. nor Moscow, but in connection with ecumenical negotiations involving the highest circles of the Vatican. The strategic issue being discussed, a discussion which might prove to decide the very existence of civilization, or even the continuation of the human species, itself, takes the form of the doctrine of the perfect consubstantiality of the Trinity.” (Lyndon LaRouche, [*The Strategic Significance of the Ecumenical Negotiations*](#), EIR, July 28, 1981, p. 20)

The point that Lyn made on the question of the ecumenical negotiations of the Vatican is that there is no fundamental difference between the doctrinal issue of consubstantiality of the Trinity of the Catholic Church, the doctrine that Philo of Alexandria had elaborated for Judaism, and the Protestant view of the leading members of the Commonwealth Party of the American colonies. This has immense resonance with the successful Mozart *Requiem* performance that the Schiller Institute just had in Virginia on November 22, in commemoration of the Presidency Principles of John F. Kennedy. Lyn further added the following crucial point of intention:

“Our primary concern in this report is not to discuss in full the doctrine of consubstantiality itself, but rather to make clear to the reader the practical implications of that doctrine's influence, and to prove in terms which are generally accessible from today's observation and experience, that abandonment of that doctrine by Western Christians would tip the balance in society in such a way that the continued existence of the human species would itself be in doubt.” (Lyndon LaRouche, [*Op. Cit.*](#) p. 21)

In the same spirit, the point I want to make, here, is not to discuss the pros and cons of the doctrine of the consubstantiality, but to go back to Lyn's emphasis that this doctrine is a fundamental tenet of western civilization, which must be understood from the vantage point of epistemology rather than from the standpoint of theology, because the important thing to keep in mind, when you investigate history, is not to look for what you expect to find, but to look for what has been missing in carrying out the task of moving the minds of human beings upward into the future. The anomaly that is missing since the Council of Nicaea, and most emphatically today, is the epistemological resolution of the paradox of consubstantiation and its relevance for solving the conflict between Plato and Aristotle.

In other words, if you wish to move mankind forward and upward, in the present period of history, you have to look for what historians have missed and did not understand, or have discarded as not being significant in the past from the vantage point of the future development of the human mind. Therefore, you have to look for what is not there, and the method to use is that of time reversal which Friedrich Schiller established in his Universal History lectures (*Friedrich Schiller, Poet of Freedom*, Schiller Institute, Volume II, Wash DC, 1988, p. 267).

The strategic question is located in the paradox which has been identified, historically, as *homoousios* (ὁμοούσιος), meaning “**of the same substance**,” in opposition to *homoiousios*, meaning “**of a similar substance**.” This is not an easy question to deal with, because it calls for uncovering the wrong



underlying assumption behind the historical war between Christianity and Paganism. And, this underlying assumption is nothing else but the fact that oligarchism has been reducing man to the lower status of animal by having him believe that truth is based on sense perception.

The key to solving this paradox of *homoousios*, therefore, is not to address the matter of faith, but to solve the epistemological and political problem of sense perception domination as it is represented in the conflict of the irreconcilable difference between Plato and Aristotle, which is precisely the missing historical point that I had been looking for. This paradox has appeared at every renaissance period in past history, but has never been solved on political grounds; that is, as a matter of statesmanship. Today may be the last chance we have to solve it. So, let me just briefly reestablish the doctrinal point of the matter and look at it as an epistemological question.

Figure 4 Icon of the first Council of Nicaea (325-381)

The paradox of *homoousios* pertains to the debate over the divinity of Christ, as it was introduced and solved during the debates of the Council of Nicaea and Constantinople, from 325 to 381 A.D. But the problem was solved only on religious grounds as a matter of faith, not on epistemological grounds as a *livingmatterofmind*. The debate was centered on the Arian controversy which claimed that Jesus was similar to God, but was not God. He was elevated to the status of divinity by being adopted by God as His Son. Thus, the difference in sense perception between being God-like and being Man-God became the centerpiece of the controversy. (See my report on [THE TWO CONTRADICTORY LIKENESS OF GOD](#) in [THE ULTRAMONTANE PAPACY, PARTS I](#)) After almost sixty years of debates, the Councils of Nicaea and of Constantinople finally declared that Jesus and the Father were of the same substance, therefore, establishing historically the original Platonic theology of the divinity of the Holy Trinity.

One of the practical issues that was to be resolved in the consubstantial question was that of the role of the Spirit in its function of unification between the Father and the Son. This was realized when the idea of the *Filioque* (the Spirit proceeds from the Father and from the Son) was introduced in the Nicene Creed as it was subsequently adopted by Saint Augustine to civilize the barbarians of Africa, and later restored to the Carolingian Creed by Charlemagne for the same purpose of evangelizing the barbarians of Europe). The principle of the *Filioque* was later obfuscated by the grandsons of Charlemagne at the despicable Oath of Strasbourg of 842.

So, the time has now come for this historical truth to be made public in Europe, today; otherwise, there is very little chance that the evil root of the historical French-German conflict will ever be severed. Although, the Carolingian creed was officially adopted two hundred years later by the papacy, in 1014, it was rejected by the Orthodox Church to mark a similar break between the East and the West. Lyn noted the more profound reason for this conflict:

“St. Augustine and the Western Fathers, struggling at the outskirts of the Empire to bring barbarian tribes into civilization, could not afford to make such a compromise on penalty of seeing their evangelizing work fail; the practical issue concealed behind consubstantiality, *homoousios*, and its corollary matter of the *Filioque*, was: how to draw man into civilized life by inspiring him to strive to become "godlike" through imitation of the incarnated Christ, the God-Man who is *homoousios*, consubstantial of God.” (Lyndon LaRouche, [Op. Cit.](#), p. 22)

As Lyn emphasized, this is when the Roman imperial oligarchy recognized that the real epistemological issue behind the “divinity of Christ” was the Platonic question of developing human beings in the Image of the creative process of the Composer of the Universe. The question of developing the mind with a method of discovery of universal principles like Plato developed in the *Timaeus* in opposition to the Aristotelian *Ethics* was magnificently illustrated by Raphael in *The School of Athens*. Therefore, the difference between a Christian and a Pagan originates in that difference between Plato and Aristotle, because it pertains to the domain of the mind in opposition to sense perception, otherwise characterized by the axiomatic difference between man and animal. This is the same question that the apostle Paul identified when he said: “We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places.” (*King James Bible*: St. Paul, Ephesians 6:12) However, fortunately for the world today, pure evil has caught up with those “principalities” and “powers,” and therefore, now, more than ever, the time has come to stop humanity from submitting to it.

This fight against principalities and powers is also the Achilles’ heel of ecumenicism among Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, at the same time that it poses the Promethean question of understanding the epistemology of a thermonuclear fusion economy. This is why *consubstantiation is fusion*; in the sense that it is the human mind fusing with universal principles. However, this new era of human development cannot be achieved unless we put an end to this British-Dutch form of oligarchism and the danger of thermonuclear war that it poses to the world.

The idea of consubstantiality between the human mind and universal principles is, therefore, the key to solving the fusion problem through a handful of historically critical individuals such as Plato, Philo of Alexandria, Saint Augustine, Charlemagne, Ibn Sina, Nicholas of Cusa, Leibniz, with the assembly of whom Lyn has been able to communicate in a unique way. As he reported:

“This rigorous focus upon the ecumenical principle exemplified by Cusa, Philo and Ibn Sina does more than demonstrate to us the basis for ecumenical fellowship among such Christians, such Jews, and such Muslims. The notion of consubstantiality common to all points out to us a connection between that notion and the efficient ordering of everything which merits the name of civilization.

“From this vantage point we are able to understand why the entire history of Byzantium was nothing but a struggle between the followers of Plato and the opposing followers of the evil Aristotle. We understand why Christianity, Philo's Judaism and ibn Sina's Islam were Platonic (or, Neoplatonic), whereas every evil cult of Europe in 2,000 years has been spawned by the collaborators of the tradition of Aristotle.” (Lyndon LaRouche, [Op. Cit.](#), p. 25)

I have discussed this *livingmatterofmind* before in my Synarchy reports, but there is much more work to be done in this area, especially since Charlemagne reintroduced the *filioque* in the modern creed. For some of the basic text references, see my piece on ALCUIN AND THE POWER OF REASON: PART II, in [ALCUIN AND CHARLEMAGNE](#). I would add that the present crisis in the Catholic Church is precisely a reflection of the abandonment of this central question of human identity between Plato and Aristotle, and that unless the current Pope Francis goes back to the crux of this ecumenical question of *homoousios*, in some inspiring and revitalized form for the Christian world, the Catholic Church as we know it today may not exist by the end of this century.

However, on the positive side of the equation, the question of *homoousios* is essential for understanding the historical foundation of the idea of man as being Godlike; that is, by letting one's mind be informed and dominated by universal principles, and most emphatically through the principle of the *advantage of the other* established as a government principle at the Peace of Westphalia, in 1648. *Homoousios* is the most important and most difficult paradox to solve at this present moment of history, because this is the road that leads you to generate, understand, and apply the fusion energy-flux density idea that Lyn has been developing throughout his entire lifetime.

Therefore, *homoousios* is the paradox whose historical time has come to be examined in a new form, and whose resolution calls for fusing together all of humanity, as a species, for the Defense of Earth, by elevating all of mankind from the lower epistemological manifold of animal opinion-making to the higher epistemological manifold of human creative knowledge. What has to be resolved, therefore, is how to become God-like from the vantage point of epistemology; that is to say, harmonically speaking, by making human *homoousios* with universal principles proportional with the *homoousios* of Christ with the Father. See also my report on the treatment of the triune function of mind with Ramon Lull and Cusa and the ecumenical principle in [CREATION AS THE MEMORY OF MANKIND](#).

Such an epistemological outlook has to be based on the commitment to the principle of classical artistic composition which is the best knowable dynamic expression of the human mind, because that is where you can access poetic consubstantiality as an “ontological transfinite” with the universal principles of the composition of the universe.

There are essentially two forms of such experiences in consubstantiality, one is by religious contemplation as experienced by mystics such as [St. Therese of Lisieux](#), and the other is by epistemological atonement of the mind in consubstantiality with the principles of composition of the universe. Ironically, it is by means of “The Little Way” of St. Therese that both these experiences may be achieved as she demonstrated on her deathbed, by praying God to let her live her eternity on Earth, and not in Heaven, for the purpose of helping mankind.

Our epistemological mission is of the same intentional character. Our prayer is to help human beings in becoming capable of leading themselves beyond the limitation of their state of individual mortality by helping others bring a contribution, no matter how small it may be, to the benefit of future generations. This experienced consubstantiality is the first required step toward changing humanity for the better. Thus, as Therese knew, immortality is better served in the improvement of mankind on Earth. In other words, when the actualized intention of improving mankind becomes the actual agency of change in the future improvement of mankind for all times to come, then, true human consubstantiality with universal principles is consummated in the imitation of Christ.

However, the question is: how does one know when the results of one's actions are good for posterity? The answer is when the performative form of the action becomes necessary for a self-subsisting future; that is to say, when the knowledge of the lawful ordering of the universe coincides with lawful actions of change which increase the energy-flux density of the future. If the actions and the knowledge were not to coincide, then, the intention would prove to be a form of perversion such as French existentialism or British empiricism, because both merely represent cultural forms of degeneration in human civilization. Therefore, as Lyn concluded his performative paper on the subject of the strategic significance of the Vatican's ecumenical negotiations:

“We cite the foregoing not to explain the notion of perfect consubstantiality, but rather to accomplish the result announced at the outset: that, although most persons have no comprehension of consubstantiality as such, the indirect influence of that notion upon the everyday thinking of our civilization has been the foundation upon which European civilization was built. In other words, consubstantiality is not an arbitrary or merely abstract conception; it is an efficient principle, even among those who are not aware of this connection. Conversely, the absence of that principle is also efficient, an absence which would probably mean the end of civilization, or perhaps even the human species, under present trends.

“If the lawful composition of the universe is knowable to mankind, then the ordering of ephemerals, such as planets, star-systems, and mortal lives in that lawful composition's unfolding is governed by an adducible generating principle, an efficient and knowable principle of *continuing creation*. Once that is known, then the existence of the Creator (the Composer) and the generative principle of composition are known in that way. The consubstantiality of the Composer and Principle of Composition (Logos) are proven.

“The question posed by the contemplation of such knowledge is whether the individual person, imprisoned within the ephemerality of mortal existence, can enter into atonement (consubstantiality) with the Composer, through becoming an instrument of the Principle of Composition. Therefore, unless Jesus Christ were so unified with that consubstantiality, the whole human species must be nothing but a herd of irrational, degraded beasts. Without that perspective, the human species does indeed become a herd of irrational beasts, like the rock-drug counterculture of today.” (Lyndon LaRouche, [Op. Cit.](#), p. 28-29)

FIN