



FRIEDRICH SCHILLER'S 'THE MAID OF ORLEANS': A NEW APPROACH TO THE SCIENCE OF EPISTEMOLOGY

(How Schiller provokes you to acquire an efficiently defined foresight into the future.)

by Irene and Pierre Beaudry, March 31, 2013



*« And let us, ciphers to this great accompt,
On you imaginary forces work. »*

William Shakespeare, *Henry V*.

*"But, my good man, if I were concerned with results,
I could have avoided all this work, being content with
the vicarious hypothesis. Be it known, therefore, that
these errors are going to be our path to the truth."*

Johannes Kepler, *New Astronomy*, Chapter 49

*"What's true is mind. But, you have, today, you have
fewer and fewer people who have minds. But they do
have sense perception; they do have a pleasure/pain
sense. And it's the imprisonment with the
pleasure/pain principle, and then adding certain moral
judgments on pleasure/pain, that's where the fraud
comes! And it's because you have a society which is
based on fraud, that you have a sick society."*

Lyndon LaRouche

Figure 1 Jeanne d'Arc, Reims Cathedral, France.

FOREWORD

Just as Jeanne d'Arc is a warrior on the field of battle, so does Schiller put you in armor, and on the battlefield of your imagination. Just as Jeanne is fighting to free France and to unite it into a sovereign nation, in order that the French become free of tyranny, so now does Schiller put you in the fight to free you of sense certainty to become both a patriot of your nation and a world citizen.

Suddenly, you are captured: you are questioning all you see and hear. You no longer bow down and accept what is dished out to you; now, you wonder, you measure, you assess. The report has three parts.

1. THE FORESIGHT OF COURAGE
2. THE TRAP OF PUBLIC OPINION AND SENSE PERCEPTION
3. HOW METAPHOR WEARS THE MASK OF WHAT'S NOT THERE

INTRODUCTION

Given the urgency of the great moral breakdown crisis in human civilization at this time, what we have to access, foremost and urgently, is a new state of existence of the human mind in the immediate future. Precious time has already been lost, especially in the last two centuries, when the human mind has been reduced to downgraded human beings as mathematicians or mere beasts, and even to the Satanic Beastman quality, such as run by the British oligarchy, under the personal slave function of Satanist Queen Elizabeth II, with her policy of world population reduction.

For anyone who considers the primacy of mind in the universe, and who makes it primary as Kepler did in his [*vicarious hypothesis*](#), it is clear that the future scientific way of thinking for the benefit of mankind involves a conscious form of *telepathic mind to mind communication*, based on universal physical principles, and on the explicit rejection of assumptions that prevent people from discovering them. The hypothesis must be made for the advantage of the other and against the social enslavement of public opinion.

The most important means of accomplishing this task, however, is not located in science *per se* but, rather, in the epistemological congruence of a performative unity of effect that brings together scientific knowledge and classical artistic composition under the same umbrella of a higher social state of existence for society. The mental gestalt of unifying sense perception and the imagination becomes the key to developing creativity through artistic forms of ironies for the explicit purpose of causing a discovery of principle in another person's mind. If Johannes Kepler is the scientist who made that possible in the domain of science, then, Frederick Schiller is the most important poet to have dedicated his life's work to that same purpose. In that sense, Schiller represents the pathway to the future, and the mastery of his ideas is urgently required to establish a new form of thinking for humanity that could save the present generation from self-destruction.

Schiller's approach defines an efficiently productive foresight into the future by taking the form of an epistemological function of mind that is task-oriented and political in character; that is, with the

intention of developing statecraft in congruence with the Peace of Westphalia as absolutely necessary for the survival of every citizen of every nation in the world. However, this objective cannot be attained unless the influence of sense perception is eradicated as a fallacy of reality and replaced by a true knowledge of educated emotions coherent with human reason.

The point to be made about sense perception, which Lyn has been emphasizing again and again, is that if you don't change the way you think, for instance, that reality is what you perceive, then our species will be extinct very soon. The point is not really a matter of opinion; it is really a matter of salvation or inclination toward extinction for the human species, because the cult of sense perception, which is the same as the cult of entertainment, will have destroyed the ability for most human beings of the species to access the noetic functions of creativity required to inhabit interplanetary space. This is a real threat, because we will have to get away from planet Earth at some time in the future, not just because we may go extinct from a hit by an asteroid, but the bestialization of mankind is actually a process that is already dangerously advanced in our so-called civilized society, and the task, as Lyn defined it, is a matter of life and death for the whole species:

“Let us, therefore, reconsider the proper choice of definition of “Intelligence Quotient.” Morality and human intelligence are to be “measured” in the relative weight of reliance on the interdependent principle of *vicarious hypothesis* and *metaphor*, in contrast to relative weight of sense-perception. *Vicarious hypothesis* and *metaphor*, as combined in practice, determine relative human sanity and practical levels of intelligence, that of both the individual personality, and of the generality of the ideology of the society.

“To the extent that human society were progressive in its direction of development, *vicarious hypothesis* and *metaphor*, when properly combined, tend to become victorious, If not, mankind were probably on the way to extinction. Any contrary opinion is foolish sham, and leads toward the worst probable outcome, that of the same general bestiality which we in the United States have experienced as a trend since the “cover up” of the assassinations of both President John F. Kennedy and his brother, Robert.

“In the meanwhile, physical science, notably mankind's progress toward higher relative concentrations of the application of *vicarious hypothesis* and *metaphor*, would tend to reduce the percentile of the human population under the corrupting influence of belief in mere sense-certainties which lowers the “I.Q.” of each relevant society which has failed to displace customary belief in sense-perception for the advantage of the principles of *vicarious hypothesis* and *metaphor*.

“Therefore, for example, your attitude towards Max Planck and Albert Einstein, against the depraved Bertrand Russell, may now be measuring your fitness to be regarded as actually a human individual. That is not a matter of mere opinion; it is a matter of those qualities which actually distinguish the intellectual life of the actually human personality, from the pathetic superstitions of worship of the pleasures and pains of vulgar sense-perception.” (Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. [A NEW SYSTEM AMONG NATIONS](#), LaRouchePAC, March 10, 2013)

1. THE FORESIGHT OF COURAGE

The beauty of Schiller's *The Maid of Orleans* resides in the mastery of human emotions during a period of breakdown crisis. His aim was not to replicate the so-called "objective" historical facts of the life and death of Jeanne d'Arc, but to use her character as a model of human resourcefulness and courage in times of national crisis. That's what history is all about, in reality, and from that standpoint, the play is a total historical masterpiece. Look at Jeanne d'Arc as the ruby laser through which you can focus the highest amount of energy.

The first clash of emotions that Schiller forces on the spectator is located in the last section of the prologue where he sets the tone of the entire play on two conflicting and irreconcilable ideas between Jeanne d'Arc and her father, Thibaut d'Arc.

*"Thibaut: God grant the King of France protection!
We are peaceful countryfolk who know not how
To wield the sword, nor how to wheel the steed
Of war. – Let us with patience wait and see
Whom victory will give us for a king. 370
The fate of battles is God's judgment, and
Our lord will be whoever is anointed
And sets the crown upon his head at Rheims.
– Sow to work! " And let us think of present
Things only. Let the ones of lofty birth
And Princes vie and draw lost from the earth.
We can behold destruction calmly still,
For storm-fast stand the acres that we till.
The flame may burn our towns and all we grew.
Their horses' hooves may trample down our grain, - 380
The new spring brings new seed-time in its train
And our slight huts will quickly rise anew.
(All except the Maid withdraw.) "*

To which Jeanne responds at length:

*"Joan: Farewell you mountains, you beloved pastures,
Familiar, quiet valleys, fare you well.
Among you, Joan will no longer wander.
Forever, Joan bids you now farewell.
You meadows that I watered, and you trees
That I planted, thrive in joyous green.
Farewell you grottoes and cool-flowing springs,
And Echo, lovely voice amid this valley 390
Who often answered songs of mine in turn, -
Now Joan goes, and never to return.

O all you scenes of pleasures calm and still,
I leave you now behind for evermore.
Disperse, you lambs, upon the heath and hill,*

*You are a flock without a shepherd, for
To feed another flock is now His will
Upon the field of peril and war.
Such is the Spirit's summons unto me,
I am not moved by earthly vanity.*

400

*For He who unto Moses once descended
Amid the burning bush on Horeb's height
And made him go to Pharaoh, who extended
Unto the shepherd Jesse His great might
And chose him for the cause to be defended;
Why showed all shepherds favor in His sight;
He spoke out of the branches of this tree:
"Go testify upon the earth to Me.*

*In rugged bronze thy body shall be laced,
In steel thou shall enclose thy tender breast,
With man's love thou shalt never be embraced
No passion's sinful flame thy heart invest,
Thy hair shall not by bridal wreath be graced,
No lovely child may nestle at thy breast,
But with war's honors I will make the great
Before all earthly women's fame and fate.*

410

*For when the bravest falter in the fight,
When France is on the verge of last defeat,
Then thou shalt hold My Oriflamme upright,
And like the rapid mower in the wheat
Cut down the haughty conqueror in his might
And give his fortune's wheel reverse complete.
To sons of France thou shalt delivering bring
And set Rheims free and therein crown the King."*

420

*God has vouchsafed to guide me by sign,
He sent the helmet here, it comes from Him,
Its iron touches with strength divine,
I have the courage of the Cherubim;
I feel swept onward to the battle line,
A storm's force drives me onward, life and limb,
I hear the shouting of the battle ground,
The war steed rears, and trumpet fanfares sound."
(Exit.)*

430

(Friedrich von Schiller, *Mary Stuart, The Maid of Orleans*, Two Historical Plays, translated by Charles E. Passage, Associate Professor of World Literature Brooklyn College, Frederick Ungar Publishing Co. New York, 1965)

Schiller's drama is contained in those two statements, which represent the fight that a patriotic individual has to wage in order to become a citizen of his country and of the world. During a national crisis, a decision has to be made to choose between the presence of one's familiar and known universe,

which one is comfortable with, and the unfamiliar and unknown of the future. Schiller sets up this conflicting situation even before the first act begins, in order to set the tone and coloration of every emotion that will unfold on the stage of your imagination after that choice is presented to you. The intention of the play is, therefore, to give the spectator the means of discovering the underlying principle which affects that choice and offer him the opportunity to make that same decision, that Jeanne made.

But then, sense perception enters into play and causes everywhere uncertainty. Is Jeanne d'Arc for real? Everybody has doubts, because everybody, including the Dauphin Charles, is driven by public opinion. Nobody knows for sure, because they all want to know with their senses, they want to see with their own eyes, they want a tangible proof. ***“You see my face for the first time today, from whence have you acquired this knowledge?”*** (1010) asks Charles of Jeanne, after she discovered, without having seen him before, who the real King was, hidden among the courtiers. ***“Joan: Saw you when no one else, save God, saw you.”*** In other words, Jeanne saw the king through the eyes of God; that is, through the lens of universal physical principles.

The spectator's expectation, and what you are about to think next, therefore, is already secured through Schiller's clear understanding of the function of sense perception and its relationship to your creative imagination. But, a number of delicious surprises come unexpectedly. The mission of Jeanne is stated clearly in Act I, in the form of an irony of forecasting the future. Thus, after the blind encounter with Charles, Jeanne has the following dialogue with the English Herald on the knowledge of the future. The intended message is “apparently” aimed at Charles, but it is, in reality, directed at the spectator:

***“Joan (to the Herald):
Who sent you and who speaks here through your mouth?”***

The Herald: The British field commander, Salisbury. **1190**

***Joan: Herald you lie! That Lord does not speak through
You. Only living persons speak, not dead men.***

***The Herald: My general lives in total health and strength,
And lives for the destruction of you all.***

***Joan: When you left he was still alive. A shell
From Orleans this morning laid him low
While he was watching from La Tournelle tower.
– You laugh because I tell you far off things?
Do not believe my words, believe your eyes!
You will encounter the procession with
His corpse when your feet carry you back home.
Now Herald, speak, deliver your commission.*** **1200**

***The Herald: if you are able to reveal things which
Are hidden, you know this before I tell it.***

***Joan: I do not need to know it. Listen now,
However, to what I tell you, and take
These words back to the Prince who sent you here.***

*– King of England, and you, Dukes of Bedford
And Gloster who administer this kingdom,
Give reckoning unto the King of Heaven* 1210
*For all the blood that has been spilled by you.
Surrender up the keys of all the cities
That you against the will of God have conquered.
The Maiden has come from the King of Heaven
To offer you peace or bloody war. Choose now!
For I say unto you that you may know it:
Fair France has not been destined by the Son
Of Mary to be yours, - but Charles,
My Lord and Dauphin to whom God assigned it,
Will make a royal entry in Paris* 1220
Attended by all nobles of his kingdom.
*– Now Herald, get you gone from us in haste;
Before you can reach camp in urgency
With this report, the Maiden will have placed
In Orleans her flag of victory.”* 1225
(She leaves. Everyone is in commotion. The curtain falls.)

The irony, here at the end of Act I, resides in the playful trick of sense perception that Schiller loves to play on the spectator in order to show him the failure of a mind that does not think ahead of time into the future, as does Jeanne. What is the device that Schiller uses to create the sense of a forecasting insight? He plays on the time it takes to get a message across to its destination. Is that destination physical or mental? That's the question.

However, the foresight timing of Jeanne is not based on the clock-time discrepancy of the Herald, but on the creative power of time reversal from the future. The two different times move in opposite directions. The Herald's time is behind him and the time of Jeanne is ahead of her. These are two fundamentally different times of communication, and Schiller plays on the conflict between both, for the benefit of the spectator. Jeanne thinks in a completely different time frame than does the Herald and the spectator. Her time comes from the future which she already knows, with the certainty of universal physical principles that speak through her, because all of her actions and thoughts are filled with the certainty that she has already crowned Charles as the King of France in Reims. Provided that certain characteristics of action are directed against the English enemy, in time, Jeanne will always know in advance what the outcome will be. She uses the same method that Lyn does in forecasting.

Schiller puts the spectator into the future from the start, and in the sublime knowledge of forecasting that Jeanne knows how to wield as a weapon, as if she were a prophet. She knows that nothing else but the knowledge of principles will lead her to certainty, and that the certainty of sense perception is useless. Thus, the Herald leaves the Royal Court with the belief that Jeanne has some sort of divine power, while, in reality, all she has is the vicarious quality of taking the responsibility for France that Charles is afraid to take. You might object that Jeanne knows because she has already gotten the news of Salisbury's death, ahead of time. But that is the wrong way to look at it. She knows the future, because she creates the future. That's the difference that Schiller wants the spectator to discover in this play.

2. THE TRAP OF PUBLIC OPINION AND SENSE PERCEPTION

The domain of metaphor is only effective in its purpose, when the imagination connects with reality. However, one of the shells of reality that classical drama has to break-up, is “groupthink,” the public opinion consensus rule, which you may not agree with, but which you don’t have the courage to go against, because your status with the group will be put in jeopardy if you do. As a result, you keep silent and you don’t rock the boat in order to maintain peace and not get into trouble. You go along to get along. This is the general unwritten law of social behavior under any oligarchical system. “Groupthink” is the most effective means of destroying creativity in a society. The stronger public opinion gets the less creative your society gets, and the less creative your society gets, the more degenerate it becomes and the faster it is driven to extinction.

Whether the social group you belong to is scientific, artistic, religious, political, etc., “groupthink” is the mechanism that perverted psychologists choose to use when they wish to keep all individuals of a society under control, and maintain their obedience to a socially acceptable behavior. Public opinion is your local control policing mechanism. No matter what “groupthink” you belong to, it functions exclusively on your sense perception image of yourself; and you cannot make a move without somebody, judging that image, and deciding whether it is acceptable or not within the group. The control mechanisms are never made conscious; they act as underlying assumptions that individuals take for granted and agree with without being aware that they are trapped within this social enclosure. The survival of the individual is based on how well he is capable of adjusting the image they have of themselves with the image that others have of them. Thus, “groupthink” becomes the judge, jury and executioner of the unwritten law of social acceptability that prevents you from speaking out when you should. The marching order of “groupthink” is: “Don’t make waves or you’ll get into trouble!”

However, if a society must have such a defensive rule of behavioral conduct to maintain control over its individuals, it is also threatened by a paradoxical situation of the most interesting kind. There is no such a thing as a perfect society, because every society is subject to change. What may be considered to be a society’s greatest protection against outside influences actually represents the very principle of its extinction. Indeed, the ultimate outcome of any form of socially controlled opinion is invariably suicidal, because the desire to maintain the integrity of its authority cannot coexist without change, and creativity is essential ingredient to the survival of any society. Therefore, there exists no group that is not threatened by the fixed underlying assumptions that controls it. So, if you wish to join a group or a society and maintain your own creative powers alive, you must become an axiom buster and never play by the rules of that society. The key to a society’s survivability always depends on its internal trouble makers.

Public opinion is the social rule of conduct that Schiller abhors in all of its manifestations. In his lectures on universal history, for instance, he identified the disease in the form of opposition between the “philosophical mind” and the “bread-fed scholar.” As he said: “Through always new and more beautiful forms of thought, the philosophical mind strides forth for higher excellence, while the bread-fed scholar, in eternal stagnation of mind, guards over the barren monotony of his school-conception.” (Friedrich Schiller, *Poet of Freedom, Volume II*, Schiller Institute, Washington DC, 1988, p. 257)

With the character of Jeanne, Schiller did not wish to create an infallible hero, but a real human being with failings. The axiomatic change is best represented in Act IV, Scene II, when Jeanne’s father,

Thibaut, recognizes the shadow of guilt in the face of his daughter, and became merciless about forcing her to go back to her old peasant axioms and renounce her mission:

“Thibaut (to the King):

You think you have been rescued by God’s might?

O Prince betrayed! O blinded Frankish people!

You have been rescued by the Devil’s arts.

(Everyone falls back in horror.)

Dunois: Is this man mad?

Thibaut: Not I, but you are mad,

And all these people here, and this wise Bishop,

Who thinks the Lord of Heaven would reveal

Himself through a mere lowly serving girl.

2980

Now let us see if to her father’s face

She still asserts her brazen, cheating lie

With which she has deceived her King and people.

Now by the Triune God tell me for sure:

Are you among the saintly and the pure?

(General silence. All eyes are fixed upon her. She stands motionless.)

Sorel: She does not speak!

Thibaut: Nor does she dare do so before

The dread name that is feared within

The depths of Hell itself! – What she a Saint

Sent forth by God! – In an accursed place

It was contrived, beneath the magic tree

2990

Where through the ages evil spirits have

Held Sabbath. – There to mankind’s enemy

She bartered her immortal part so he

Would glorify her with brief earthly fame.

Let he roll back her sleeve and you will see

The markings with which Hell has stamped her there!

Burgundy: Monstrous! – But we must believe a father

Who testifies against his very daughter.

Dunois: No, we must not believe a madman who

Brings shame upon himself through his own child!

3000

Sorel (to Joan):

O speak! Break this unhappy silence! We

Believe in you! We trust you utterly.

Just one word from your lips, a single word

Will be enough for us. – But speak! Destroy

This monstrous accusation. – Merely state

That you are innocent, we will believe you.

(Joan stands motionless, Agnes Sorel step back from her in horror.)

But Jeanne remains silent. Has she lost the courage to go against public opinion? Is she in agreement with this outcome? Has she lost her individual creative thinking? Is she so frightened that she can no longer speak out against this cruel lie? Schiller has put the spectator into a real crisis, deliberately, and he will not let him off the hook. He is forcing the spectator to take a bold new step into the real world of the creative process of mind by having the audience internalize the creative process of the poet, himself. The point is that the spectator is now forced to deal with the truth of history, which is not to be found in any of the facts of your history books, but on the stage of your own imagination.

Where is the truth of history? What is the true story of Jeanne? Is she not a heroine? Is Schiller not destroying the heroic image of Jeanne? What is Schiller doing? The point that Schiller is making is that a classical drama is not based on heroes; it is based on the truth of how the human mind works. The mind is the subject of Schiller's play, not the flesh and blood person of Jeanne. The flesh and blood person of Jeanne is nothing. It is merely a physical envelope. What goes on and comes out of her mind is what's real. And, the only way to know this is to make Jeanne a real human being with a mind that deals with passions and emotions, with the sort of feelings of pleasure and pain that torment her mind. It is that torment of the mind which is to be internalized by the spectator and which is the true subject of his investigation.

And, since public opinion cannot see beyond the pleasure and pain of sense perception, it cannot see what comes from above and which has made possible something that only Jeanne could understand, as the poet chooses to intervene by making the invisible suddenly become visible to the spectator. There is something that Jeanne cannot confess publically, because she feels she will betray her mission if she does.

***“La Hire: She is frightened. Horror and amazement
Have closed her mouth. – Why, innocence itself
Must tremble at such ghastly accusation.***

(He goes up to her)

***Rouse from your terror, Joan. Innocence
Has its own language, and a victor's glance
To blast a slander with its mighty lightnings.
Rise up in noble anger, lift your eyes,
Beshame and punish this unworthy doubt,
This outrage to your sacred virtue.***

3010

(Joan stands motionless. La Hire falls back in horror. The Commotion increases.)

Schiller makes it appear that Jeanne has convinced herself that she has betrayed her own cause because, in the thick of the battle, she had a momentary emotion of magnanimity for the English Black Knight, Lionel, whom she let escape at the last moment. This moment of weakness appears to the audience as the reason for her silence before the accusations of public opinion. However, the ambiguity between the accusation of being a witch and the alleged sin that she may have committed causes a state of perplexity that the spectator must resolve in his own mind. Therefore, he is forced to return to the declared weakness that Jeanne had expressed in Act IV, Scene I:

***Joan: “Why did I have to look in his eyes?
Or see the features of his noble face?***

*It was with your glance that your crime began,
You luckless creature! God requires an instrument
Unseeing. With blind eyes you acted well!
But once you saw, God's shield abandoned you
And you were caught in nets of Hell."*

2580

That mere “*glance*” is precisely the clue which permits the spectator to solve the enigma of the play and understand the curse of sense perception that he has also fell under. But, the spectator remains in a quandary, he is not sure; he is fighting to figure out why Schiller abandoned him with this excruciating pain of guilt. It is in that sense that, Act IV, Scene II is the heart of the moral measure of the creative process of the whole play. But, the spectator will need to have a solid moral fiber to discover this. This is where Schiller is toughest on the spectator, because he leaves him to his own devices to discover that Jeanne remained silent before all of these accusations; because she was choosing not to abandon her mission, because she could not have her emotion of love of mankind be soiled by a moment of physical weakness. At the same time, the spectator is being torn apart because he is the only one who can and must figure out why the enemy within is that of popular opinion.

It is the compromise with public opinion which is the worst sin of all, because compromise with the truth that should be said publically is the sin that kills creativity. If you lose your sense of alert over public opinion, you have lost everything. So, Jeanne goes into a melancholic state and even went as far as putting her mission into question – echoing her father’s speech at the beginning of the play [366-382]:

(The flutes resume. She falls into silent melancholy.)

*“Joan: Fates of battles, quarrels of kings,
Are these things of my concern?
Guiltless I had guarded lambs
On the mountain top.
But you wrenched me forth to live
In a Prince’s haughty hall,
My choice it was not to give
Myself to sin and guilty fall.*

2610

Then, in Act V, Scene I, Jeanne finds her strength again when, after three days of marching through a storm and eating only wild roots, she comes back to her senses, with the helping hand of Raimond and enters the Charcoal Burner’s Inn where she is recognized as “*the witch of Orleans,*” and everybody flees.

*“Joan (Calmly and softly):
You see, the curse pursues me, everyone
Takes flight. Look to yourself and leave me too.*

3110

*Raimond: I leave you! Now! And who will be your guide
And go with you?*

*Joan: I do not go alone.
You heard the thunder over me. I am
Led by my destiny. Have no fear, I
Will reach my goal without my seeking it.”*

This is the ransom that one has to pay for breaking with the going along to get along rule of sense perception. Even as Raimond attempted to understand what happened to Jeanne, he didn't because she refused to speak against her father's accusations out of respect, not out of guilt. As a result, Raimond also believed Jeanne guilty of some sin, simply because he did not know there existed a higher principle that Jeanne was responding to and was operating from.

“Raimond: And you kept silence at that horrible Denunciation? – You speak now, and yet before The King, when speech was vital, you kept silence!

Joan: I bowed in silence to the destiny Which God, my master, then enjoined upon me.

Raimond: You could withhold an answer from your father!

Joan: Because it had come from my father, it Had come from God. Correction too will come From Him.

3150

Raimond: But Heaven too vouched for your guilt.

Joan: The Heavens spoke and therefore I was silent.

Raimond: What? With one word you could have a cleared yourself And yet you left the world in dismal error?

Joan: It was an act of Providence, no error.”

The irony, here, is that it was the world that led itself “*in dismal error.*” Jeanne could not speak, because one word from her and her vicarious mission would have been over. Similarly, everybody was led to believe that she kept silent because she was guilty of some sin. That is not true. That may be how it appeared to be, but that was not how it was. Schiller had her remain silent in order to make the axiomatic difference between the pleasure and pain principle of public opinion and the higher principle of mind. Jeanne acted vicariously for the benefit of everybody else, because that was her moment of truth, her Gethsemane, and she was atoning for everybody else's sin. There was no other reason. But, no one understood how this silence was for Jeanne an actual victory. She was victorious because she was blindly vicarious. She won the battle against sense perception because she accepted to be led by her principles. As Schiller put it:

“Joan: Did I deserve to be God's messenger Without acceding blindly to His will? And I am not so wretched as you think I suffer want, but that is not misfortune For one of my rank; I am banished, outlawed, But in the wilderness I found myself. When honor's radiance surrounded me Then there was conflict in my heart. I was The most unhappy of all creatures when

3170

*I seemed most envied in the world. –But now
I have been healed, and this great storm in Nature
That threatened to destroy her, was my friend
And it has purified the world and me.
Now there is peace within me. – Come what may,
I am aware now of no further weakness.*

*Raimond: O come, come, let us hurry to proclaim
Your innocence aloud to all the world!*

3180

*Joan: The One who sent confusion will resolve it
The fruit of Destiny will only fall
When it is ripe. A day will come to clear me,
And those who have cast me out and damned me
Will then become aware of their delusion
And tears will flow then for my destiny.*

Raimond: And I should endure in silence until Chance –

*Joan (taking him by the hand):
You see the natural phase of things alone,
The earthly bond is still upon your sight.
With my eyes I have seen immortal things. –
No hair may fall from any human head
Without the gods. – Do you see yonder where
The sun is setting in the sky? – As surely
As it returns tomorrow in its brightness,
The day of truth inevitably will come.”*

3190

3. HOW METAPHOR WEARS THE MASK OF WHAT'S NOT THERE

How can errors trace a pathway to the truth? For no less than two years, Lyn has been emphasizing that real action in physical phase-space cannot be characterized by the presumption of sense perception, but by an insight into the meaning of metaphor as defined by classical artistic composition, and more specifically, by the classical stage of the Shakespearian drama. As Lyn said:

“As I have included these considerations among my recently published writings, the presumption that “evidence” with the characteristics of mere “sense-perception” corresponds to a real action in physical phase-time as such, is a belief which must be urgently superseded by a notion derived from an appropriately deep insight into the actual meaning of the subject of “Classical Metaphor.” I mean that metaphor is expressed in the “shadow-form” of the Classical stage—but only for what may be identified as the Classical stage—as in the case for the recognition that the action moved by the playwright, director, and actors on stage, embody the reality of the effective action, rather than abstract and fixed measures of lapsed physical time. In other words, the emphasis must be placed on a notion of effective action measured in the

language of a physically actual quality of *true metaphor*, instead of per unit of clock-space “space-time.”

The distinctions which I have just proposed, here, are the reality of the action as, primarily, an experience of the human mind, rather than a sense-perceptual event in what is usually considered as the mere “clock-space-time” of sense-perception as such. So, I have recently presented my view of the realization of “the chorus principle” of metaphor employed by the inherently future-oriented poet William Shakespeare for his **King Henry V**. That view points toward the reality of an experienced future, physical space-time, that as we must proceed in considering action within the lapsed, relative space-time of the near regions, or broader scope of actions within the realm of the Solar system. (Lyndon LaRouche, [A NEW SYSTEM AMONG NATIONS](#), March 10, 2013.)

This is the “hourglass” time of the creative process in the simultaneity of eternity; that is to say, the time of an action that is real only because it has the universal power to change human beings for the better by contrast with sense perception, and that is valid at any moment in history. This is the real time of the real world which changes the minds of human beings on the stage of their own imagination of the creative process. This is the reality that very few people perceive in their entire life-time, because it does not coincide with their self-enclosed clock-time familiar daily sense perceptions. Rather, it coincides with universal events of change which appear to be beyond the reach of their little me. That stage-reality of the creative imagination exists only when human beings are motivated to shed their ego and do the good, because the historical situation they live in gives them no other choice but to decide on the future that is being forced upon them as a captive audience. That is the transcendental nature of irony in classical drama.

The idea of a universal event is very real, and is fundamental, because man is created as a captive being within a set of conditions that have been imposed upon him by the universe as a whole, and which demands that he acts in accordance with his own creative imagination, in order to help his fellow man to survive with his species. This is the state of existence of the prisoners in Plato’s Cave. However, since Plato’s prisoners are confined to the darkness of the cave, and only have access to the reality of light through the shadows projected on the dimly lit stage-wall of that cave, they must discover the way to free themselves by figuring out some device to escape. How can they escape, you ask? How can human beings

free themselves from the prison of their sense perception? The only device is for you to put on the mask of others and relive the agony of their pleasure and pains. **(Figure 2)**



Figure 2. The ironic nature of the Greek masks is not that they represent Comedy and Tragedy. That is a historical misrepresentation. What they represent is the imagined reality of the pleasure-pain principle through the persona of an actor who is not there.

And, this act of metaphor can only happen when prisoners discover that the freedom they get, in exchange for their effort, is not the one they were looking for; because the universal drama of mankind is

to be able to wear the creative function of the mask without noticing that it is there. The irony, however, is that the social freedom the prisoners discover through that masquerade is better than the result they were hoping to get.

Now, this mask poses a very interesting paradox, because what is real is what is not there. The mask of what is not there is precisely the effect that a good classical drama must have on the audience. By raising the spectators above their seats into this experience of creativity, the act of fiction becomes the highest form of reality. That masquerade projects onto the captive minds of the audience the creative process of the author-playwright, whose only wish is to see the audience discover how his creative imagination works. If the director and the players on stage do not replicate that intention, the play is a flop. That's the metaphoric function of reality. If the composer of the play succeeds in integrating the viewer's creative imagination into the state of mind of the composer through the mask of the play, then, only two things can happen. One, the spectator leaves the theater in state of perplexity, or two; he discovers that, beyond his state of perplexity, he has the responsibility to make the appropriate changes in his own personality that is demanded by the author.

The drama, then, actually takes the form of reality at that moment and not before. A classical drama represents how the real world works. This is when the fiction becomes real; that is, when the spectator realizes that the play is entirely and exclusively about him. "*De te fabula narratur!*" That's the power of metaphor, when you discover that the creative imagination is reality. Then, and only then, the audience is caught and cannot escape this task that is asked of every individual in the theater, because only then, does the spectator realize that the only freedom he has, is to help others discover the same escape route. But, the spectator also discovers that it was not freedom that he wanted, it was the principle that gave him freedom. That's the Platonic principle to be discovered through the masquerade of what is not there. It is because authors perverted this principle that Plato considered poets *personae non gratae* in his *Republic*.

The creative imagination can uniquely be spurred by some classical drama through which the spectator must identify with the creative imagination of the author and become an actor-author himself. The only choice in the matter is that man has the power to break his own chains when he chooses to break the chains of others through such a masquerade. Freedom is always the freedom of others; that is, when the self discovers a way of having its ego not being there; that is, when the mask becomes reality.

Although this is just a thought, let me propose an experiment that you may want to consider applying to your own situation. Sometimes important things escape us simply because we don't pay enough attention to them, but, sometimes, it is also because they have to be out of the way of progress. So, I want to make sure you don't miss this one.

A lot of people think that thinking does not exist, because they don't feel it. They think that thinking is just sense perception. That is stupid. They think that thinking is something like the scientific experiment with neutrinos: they are undetectable because you cannot see them, therefore, they don't exist. And, if they are not visible, they think that nobody will pay any attention to them. That's where the mistake comes in. Everybody is able to notice their thinking, because everybody is transparent. What obviously stupid people don't realize, however, is that thinking is undetectable like neutrinos because they try to find it with sense perception. Ideas don't get invisible because they get smaller to sense

perception; they get invisible because they are made of mind-like substance that is visible only to the mind which takes the time and effort to think about it.

However doubtful this may appear to you, believe it or not, thinking has been verified in many different ways through musical and poetical experiments, and it was demonstrated to exist as ironies in a great number of classical artistic compositions, such as paintings. So, don't try to imagine that no one is capable of detecting your own thinking processes, because they can't see them. Anybody can see right through you, because you are quite transparent, as we all are. The only problem is that you might not think that your thinking processes matter, and that they are essential for the survival of the human species of tomorrow.

In the 1930's, a Swiss scientist made the astonishing discovery whereby, according to the laws of aerodynamics, bumblebees could not fly. As the story goes, bumblebees didn't know about the laws of airplane flying, so, naturally, they went on flying just the same. So, you see, the same principle applies to your thinking processes. Most people around you may want you to believe that your thinking doesn't matter. No matter what you do, thinking will keep bothering you, anyway, and independently of sense perception. So, you might as well make the best of it, and eliminate what is detrimental to your creative thinking, before you become permanently unaware of the fact that you don't think.

CONCLUSION

Is Jeanne really inspired by God or is she putting on an act? Is Jeanne inspired by God or by the devil? What is true? What is false? What is simulation? What is real? Who is truthful? What is truth? Why did Jeanne not speak, why did she not tell the truth at the end? Was she like Cordelia: love and be silent? And if she had spoken the truth, would she have been believed? The tipoff is when Dunois says: forget what the others think, just tell me the truth:

***“Dunois: ... You scorn denial of such base suspicion,
– Disdain it, but confide in me; for
I have never doubted your innocence.”***

3038

In fact, Schiller's leitmotiv is doubt vs certainty; falseness vs truthfulness; fact vs fancy. The issue is judging Jeanne. And as you engage in that debate, you learn to assess and judge her father, her sisters, the King. The King! Yes, you, the viewer, now judge a king, you are both entirely drawn in to the play but at the same time you are at a distance, clinically assessing and judging and determining what should be done -- like a General on the field of battle. This is the door to forecasting.

The play is filled with ironies of the sort that really only Beethoven was a true master of. The play is totally musical. It is not so much an opera, even though *Fidelio* comes immediately to mind as you catch and sort out the ironies that come at you, as you then learn to seek out the ironies more and more as you derive great enjoyment in finding them, exercising your mind on them. Your mind is fully alive. As Jeanne is fully inspired by the mission God assigned to her, so you are fully alive by the mission Schiller

has assigned to you: to explore and develop your imagination, your creativity. As Schiller brought Jeanne to life so too did he revive life in you, taking you out of whatever stupor you may have been in, putting in front of you the unexpected, awakening your curiosity.

You are full of questions: who really is Jeanne? Is she truly hearing voices or imagining them? Is she truly acting for the freeing of France or just to free herself from the sheep? Who has power really? Not the king. He is outcast, penniless, defeated. Jeanne has power: from whence? What is real power? What about her father? Should she not heed him?

The play is written like a piece of music, a symphony, but a Beethoven symphony, not just any kind of music. The *motivführung* is expressed by the last verse: “**Brief is the pain, and joy is everlasting.**” [3544] This ending is the leitmotiv throughout the play, the subject matter which moves the ironies which accumulate and crescendo. You are fully in the play, breathless, as though on the field of battle with Jeanne. You are Jeanne. But when Jeanne is in her crisis you too abandon her, you too are irritated by her silence, and you too misjudge both Jeanne and the mission of her life. By the end of the play you are filled with doubts but of a different sort, a wiser form of doubt from a higher plane.

You wonder: could you have done what she did? You become self-conscious of your quick judgments made earlier, your readiness to find fault. You come out of the theater as Schiller wished you to come out: a better person than when you went in, but not in some Kantian way. You come out in a very complex way, you come out more intelligent than when you went in. You come out as a better citizen of a nation, with ammunition to better act as a patriot in that nation. And, you find yourself doing things you never dreamt you could, or would do, before.

The purpose and intention of classical artistic composition is the discovery of its principle of composition. That is why any kind of classical art is so pleasing, even when it is tragic – it evokes the joy of discovery of how the mind works in the viewer and amuses the mind in new and inventive ways to provoke new and higher discoveries. But the purpose is always moral: the essence of man is discovery of principle and that capability must be provoked, educated, and developed. So, classical artistic composition is the education of the art of discovery of principles.

FIN