



IVAN KONSTANTINOVICH AIVAZOVSKY:

THE UNITY OF EFFECT OF THE WHOLE IN CHANGING ITS PARTS:
How to look into artistic compositions for the underlying principle of axiom busting.

by Pierre Beaudry, April 13, 2014



INTRODUCTION: HOW CAN BEAUTY BE SO TERRIBLE?



Ivan Konstantinovich Aivazovsky (1817-1900), one of the finest marine painters of all times, was an Armenian-Russian born in Crimea in 1817. His paintings reflect that he must have had fully understood the implications of British Empire's Edward VII strategic war plans against his native land.

He created about 6,000 paintings, most of which were axiom busting seascapes reflecting the axiomatic challenges between the human mind and the forces of nature.

This report examines the significance of the Promethean principle of fire in relation to the axiomatic effects of truth on the human mind, by means of classical artistic composition that produces the simultaneity of what has already happened, what is happening, and what is about to happen.

Figure 1 Alexey Tyranov, *Portrait of Ivan Konstantinovich Aivazovsky*, 1841.

1. RESONANCE: HEAT AS A UNIT-MEASURE OF AMATTEROFMIND

“An artistic composition is always a state of mind, and the best of them are always reflections of what takes place on the walls of Plato’s Cave.”

Dehors Debonneheure

For the last fifty years or so, Lyn has been developing a method for the human mind to act on the world by using two different levels of effectively increasing political heat in the world with the truth. The first level of truth is to tell it like it is. The second level of truth is to cause a direct axiomatic change in another person’s mind through the typical method of *Die Hauptsache ist der Effekt*, *tschike, tschike, tschike, tschik*. [The main point is the effect.] This second level of truth is the only truly effective one, because it forces a performative change in the mind of another by using the corrosive impact of the truthful action itself.

What is common to those two methods of telling it like it is and of axiom busting is that their effects have different levels of resonance on the subject matter, and the point this brings up is how to measure change in the minds of different people in order to change them. This method, by the way, does not work with people who are not willing to engage in it.

Since we know that the whole of the universe affects all of its parts in the axiomatic simultaneity of physical eternity, but in different degrees, why not use this Prometheus-LaRouche parameter of fire, as a characteristic rather than a magnitude, to measure how things change in the universe? Is this not the way that the human mind affects all of its ideas? Is this not the way that humanity has progressed and increased its power throughout the centuries by increasing its energy-flux density?

This new characteristic measure of change should also be applied to the electro-magnetic spectrum, as some younger members have recently suggested, but provided that the heat power index be appropriately measured from the wall of Plato’s Cave.

This Promethean characterization of knowledge must therefore become the measure of change by means of which all future science and artistic compositions are evaluated. I don’t know how to answer the question of heat measuring electro-magnetic resonance, as such, but I can show you how to apply the same principle to the domain of classical artistic composition. The process is essentially a matter of heating up the discussion over how ideas affect the world by means of the axiom busting truth of underlying assumptions. Just consider the two following examples.

2. THE POWER OF TELLING IT LIKE IT IS

Telling it like it is represents the best way of preparing society for a change. This first level of truth is generally considered the standard of obvious truth which one uses to target the less stupid section



of the population. Such a truth generally corresponds to a strategic situation that needs to be changed, in which the population usually reaches high levels of heated debate over an obvious crisis whose leaders refuse to do anything to resolve. This portion of a complaining population is ready to be changed, when they are met in the streets by an organizer who has a truthful polemical approach that will keep most other people away, but will only attract the thinking person with a sense of humor. For example, we used to recruit scientifically oriented people at airports with a pro-nuclear sign that said: “JANE FONDA SPREADS FASTER THAN NUCLEAR WASTE.”

Such a polemical approach is very effective, because it tells it like it is. Although this approach does affect people in a way that they will never forget, it doesn't change them axiomatically. It merely confirms what they already know to be the situation, but it prepares them for a general axiomatic change which will or should come later.

Figure 2 *Chaos* by Ivan Aivazovsky (1841). Originally published anonymously, it forecasts chaotic times to come for Crimea and the Armenian people.

3. THE TRUTH OF AN EFFECT OF FOREKNOWLEDGE IN THE MIND OF ANOTHER

Doing it as you tell it at the same time is the most effective way to change people axiomatically. “How did you know this is exactly what I was thinking?” That sort of reply coming from someone you have touched with the truth is the most effective action, because it shows that you have applied the change to yourself, and that you have not died from it. That's a more profound action of truth that Lyn identified as *Die Hauptsache ist der Effekt*, *tschike, tschike, tschike, tschik*. [The main point is the effect] In this case, the standard of truth is based on affecting a change by forecasting it; that is, by looking into the person's mind and putting the person before the fact that this is what he has to do in order to improve his life. And, once the individual is made to look at himself in this way, he is made to see his own

cowardice with respect to his responsibility for mankind , and generally agrees to change completely by concluding: “Where have you been all of my life?”

This method doesn't work too well in the current degenerate levels of society, because the youth of today is either too ignorant, too self-centered, or too proud. Something new and revolutionary must be introduced in the process of organizing which calls for producing an actual axiom busting change. Maybe some courageous youth can come up with a new measure of heating up the minds of the younger generation. The truth of the matter, however, will have to be, effectively, in the proverbial pudding, like the situation of a ship in a stormy sea, hanging precariously in an untenable situation between a rock and a hard place. However, beware. These wave effects are not translucent for the enjoyment of your sense perception. They are not made to impress you, but to change you. What you are looking for in Aivazovsky's works is the state of mind, like the case of the lucid transparency effect of the truth in Aivazovsky's [*Ship on Stormy Seas*](#). (Figure 3)



Figure 3 Detail of [*Ship on Stormy Seas*](#). (Figure 1) Surface rings of seafoam highlight the axiomatic effect dominating the underlying truth of the current beneath the surface. The question is not what it means, but what it does to you.

Aivazovsky's treatment of water in his seascapes is unique in that he treats it as a transforming agent within a time delayed process of change. This works like the catenary characteristic delayed action in the space-time of your mind. The purpose of the unity of effect of most of his paintings is to express the change in the state of anxiety in the minds of the spectators, the change from the state of anxiety that overwhelms you and must be resolved in times of crisis. So, while your physical eyes are looking at a sea storm, your mind's eye is looking at the transforming process of your own mind under the effect of a more profound internal tribulation.



Figure 4 Ivan Konstantinovich Aivazovsky, [*Ship on Stormy Seas*](#), 1858. The dynamics between a mind in peril and a growing translucent wave of hope.

The transforming process of [*Ship on Stormy Seas*](#) captures three differentiable moments of change into a single one. These moments are the future state, the present state, and the past state; all three organized by time reversal from the future. Their contents are represented by three layers, which are expressed in physical terms by the mixture of sunlight and atmosphere, the human element on the surface of the water, and the invisible axiomatic undercurrents below the sea. Aivazovsky's painting represents the proportional relationship of this triply-connected action between the power of nature and human reason. That proportionality forms a unity of effect, which is fraught with a multiplicity of coordinated events taking place in three different levels: the sky, the surface of the sea, the axiomatic undercurrents; all of which are subjected to the same process of change. Thus, the unifying effect of the painting as a whole can simply be identified as the proportionality between the power of change and the change of power in your own mind. This is how an increase in energy-flux density overpowers your mind, by axiomatic inversion. This is where a moral difference must be made between permanent revolution and constant change, one leads to entropy, the other to anti-entropy.

Note first the different states between light and water, then between water and evaporation. There are barely any differences among the three levels, except a difference in heat. The same changes take

place in the clouds above, as on the surface, as they occur in the undercurrents below. Light is present in all three levels as well. Next, look at the time factor. The light piercing through the thunderclouds is the attracting calm of the future, the resolution of the crisis, the possible coming of a silver lining. The residue of interconnected seafoam circles floating on the surface of all of the waves are the traces of previous waves recalling that something has taken place before, is still at work below, and is growing in power as the ship is moving toward you. This reflects the depth of the process of change, not the simple snapshot of a fleeting moment. Look at how Aivazovsky uses the idea of heat as the underlying measuring rod to show the effects of the interrelated waves onto the dimly lit screen of Plato's Cave. Remember that all artistic compositions are truthfully located on the wall of Plato's Cave, not on a canvas. Thus, the degree of heat is the only unit of measure for adducing any changing amount of matterofmind.

Note finally, that the stormy winds and the light after the storm move from the back to the front in a right to left manner and whose inclination is given by the tilted position of the ship; while the undercurrent rolls the waves in the opposite direction, from the front to the back in a left to right manner. This double action causes the undercurrents to form a spiraling action moving from front to back. The effect of change in the mind is, therefore, ascribed to the unity of effect of those two opposite motions combined into one.



Figure 5 Ivan Konstantinovich Aivazovsky, [*The Ninth Wave*](#). (1850)

If the waves of the sea can destroy you, they can also save you. [*The Ninth Wave*](#) (Figure 5) is the best known and most optimistic and hopeful of all of Aivazovsky's paintings. It also captures the axiom busting method that the artist uses in most of his seascapes. It is renowned as the most beautiful painting of all of Russia, because it has the power to change the spectator's axioms from freedom to necessity. In marine language tradition, the ninth wave is the greatest of a growing series of waves that rise above the level of the sea into a higher and higher last wave before breaking into a raging roar. Russian seamen believe that the ninth wave is the most destructive and most powerful of all waves, because it is made up of nine other waves. The ninth wave is a self-generating wave of nine other waves. This wave is not to be confused with a Tsunami or any Cantorian number.

In [*The Ninth Wave*](#), six human survivors of a shipwreck emerge on floating debris hoping against hope that they will not be destroyed by the coming ninth wave up ahead. They are slowly moving what is left of their lives and wreckage toward the highest wave, which is pulling them either to their doom or into the shimmering sunlight of a sublime new future. Is that motion determined by fate, or by the social characteristic of ocean power? That is the question. What is in the nature of the whole whose power it is to change all of its parts?

FIN