

AXIOM BUSTER

THE TRUTH ABOUT THOMAS AQUINAS

On the axiomatic failure of Aristotelian deductive logic

by Pierre Beaudry, 9/7/2021

FOREWORD

Why has Lyndon LaRouche not yet been recognized as the most important creative intellect of the twentieth century? Why are Liberal Democrats so pessimistic, outraged, and fearful, about their failure in Afghanistan? What is the common underlying murderous axiomatic fallacy behind Liberal Democrats and cybernetics?

The reason for the refusal of LaRouche's exoneration can be found in the hidden Dominican cloisters of the Ultramontane Roman Church of the Middle Ages, where the brainwashing method of Aristotelian deductive theology became the founding birthplace of today's Norbert Weiner's cybernetics concoction; that is, Aristotelian Intelligence (AI).

As a result, today, as it was during the 1200's Albigensian Crusade, the Liberal Democratic leaders of the Western world are going to their demise by jockeying for the best front row seats of the public opinion arena in anticipation of the greatest genocide in human history. Are you going to sit back and watch this happen like some new Roman circus?

PLATO'S HIGHER HYPOTHESIS FOR UNDERSTANDING IMMORTALITY

In his *Phaedrus* dialogue, Plato considered self-movement as the most crucial condition for determining the immortality of the human soul and the most necessary principle for the progress of human life. After Plato, Lyndon LaRouche considered self-development as a necessary principle for the self-government of the human species. Here is how Plato addressed that question:

“All [each] soul is immortal, for that which is ever in motion is immortal. But that which while imparting motion is itself moved by something else can cease to be in motion, and therefore can cease to live; it is only that which moves itself that never intermits its motion, inasmuch as it cannot abandon its own nature; moreover this self-mover is the source and first principle of motion for all other things that are moved.

[...] “The self-mover, then, is the first principle of motion, and it is as impossible that it should be destroyed as that it should come into being; were it otherwise, the whole universe, the whole of that which comes to be, would collapse into immobility, and never find another source of motion to bring it back into being.

“And now that we have seen that that which is moved by itself is immortal, we shall feel no scruple in affirming that precisely that is the essence and definition of soul, to wit, self motion. Anybody that has an external source of motion is soulless, but a body deriving its motion from a source within itself is animated or *besouled*, which implies that the nature of soul is what has been said.

“And if this last assertion is correct, namely that ‘*that which moves itself*’ [Emphasis added] is precisely identifiable with soul, it must follow that soul is not born and does not die.”¹

‘*That which moves itself*’ is the necessary pathway to becoming human, which humanity is currently being challenged to become; that is, by being challenged into going through the singularity of an axiomatic transformation, the most significant change in the way man has been thinking since the Italian Renaissance.

IT WAS IN THE NAME OF GOD THAT POPE INNOCENT III INITIATED THE GENOCIDAL ALBIGENSIAN CRUSADE

Are we going back into a dark age today? What caused the Middle Ages to collapse into a dark age was not the Black Plague; it was the Aristotelian Delphic ideology regurgitated by Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274 AD) and his epigones of the Dominican Order, who spread the disease of axiomatic deductive thinking to justify the superiority of belief over reason throughout Europe and South West Asia via the medieval Ultramontane² Church of Rome. An artistic illustration of that disease can be discovered through the depiction of the conspiratorial agreement between Thomas Aquinas and Pope Innocent III, as pointed out by the brush of Raphael in *The Dispute of the Holy Sacrament*.³

¹ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 245c7-246a2. Translated by R. Hackforth (Cambridge and New York, 1952).

² Ultramontanism has had many meanings throughout history. Here, Ultramontanism means the imperialist tendency in the Catholic Church to bring matters of civil and secular government under control of the religious sphere.

³ As I have stated in the conclusion of my report: [RAPHAEL'S 'DISPUTE OF THE HOLY SACRAMENT' AND THE ANOMALY OF POPE INNOCENT III](#), the Catholic Church committed a genocidal crime against the Cathars of Southern France. “According to the Cathar website, http://www.cathar.info/cathar_news.htm of October 16, 2016, the French Bishop of Pamiers, Monseigneur Jean-Marc Eychenne, made a public apology for the persecution of the Cathars of Languedoc.” However, the Vatican is still holding prayers over the issue.

The cause of the collapse of European society during the Middle Ages was the abusive use of the Aristotelian-Euclidean type of logical-deductive state of axiomatic belief that was



imposed on the educated elite of Europe throughout all of the European universities during the thirteenth and the fourteenth centuries, a mental proclivity which was used to uphold and defend the corruption of the Ultramontane Church of Rome, and which was used to promote the Inquisition against the believers of other faiths for several centuries. Why do people go to war against other people who don't think like they do? The clearest case of such mass brainwashing in European history was demonstrated by the genocidal crusade of Pope Innocent III against the Albigensian Cathars, a Christian sect of Southern France during the thirteenth century.

Raphael showing Thomas Aquinas and Pope Innocent III conspiring in *The Dispute of the Holy Sacrament*.

In the year 1215, the Bishops of the Fourth Council of Lateran, led by Dominic de Guzman (founder of the Dominican Order) and Pope Innocent III, declared the Cathars to be heretics because they interpreted the Catholic Doctrine of the Resurrection as being in accordance with the Platonic idea of "reincarnation."

When Innocent III (1198-1216) became Pope, the Catholic Church had become a Roman Imperial Theocracy with the Pope acting as the Roman Emperor of Europe and the Roman Curia as his government and banking arms. Innocent III had become Constantine reincarnate. At his coronation, the Cardinal Archdeacon crowning Innocent III declared solemnly: "Take this tiara and know that thou art Father of princes and kings, Ruler of the World, the Vicar on earth of our Savior Jesus Christ, whose honor and glory shall endure through all eternity."⁴

⁴ Peter de Rosa, *Vicars of Christ, the Dark Side of the Papacy*, Crown Publications Inc., New York, 1988, p. 67. For a more complete picture of Innocent III and the Ultramontane Papacy, see my reports on the Ultramontane Papacy, in <http://www.amatterofmind.us/strategic-studies-ii/>. Barbara W. Tuchman reported in her 1878 book, *A Distant Mirror, The Calamitous XIV Century*, that Thomas Aquinas also supported Pope Innocent III on the Jewish question: "The doctrine that Jews were doomed to perpetual servitude as Christ-killers was announced by Pope Innocent III in 1205 and led Thomas Aquinas to conclude with relentless logic that 'since Jews are the slaves of the

How could the human mind accept genocide in the name of Faith? It could only be done by reducing human beings to the level of animals and by reducing human reason to the level of deductive logic and putting it entirely at the mercy of blind faith. This is what the Ultramontane Church did and this is the Delphic operation that Thomas Aquinas undertook a few years after the genocide of the Cathars. Aquinas served the former Pope by arguing that theological truths must exceed human reason because "the truth of the universe," as he called it, can only be grasped by faith and not by human reason. Aquinas wrote: "That is why it was necessary that the unshakeable certitude and pure truth concerning divine things should be presented to men by way of faith (Contra Gentiles 1.4)."⁵



Pope Innocent III excommunicating the Cathars (left). Massacre of the Cathars (right)/ [Wikiwand](#), Creative Commons

Under legitimate circumstances for the Catholic Church faith and reason are both consulted to justify religious belief, however, in the case of a crusading Papacy, reason was completely dominated by faith, because religious faith had to have priority over all matters governing the earthly domain. Using the obvious logic that the heavenly domain is superior to the earthly domain, Thomas Aquinas arrogated to himself the right to project the idea of the superiority of the power of faith over reason, and consequently, theology gained domination over philosophy. Thus, from such an assumption, the Ultramontane Papacy gave itself the right to rule over the world.

Church, she can dispose of their possessions.' Legally, politically, and physically, they were totally vulnerable." Barbara W. Tuchman, *A Distant Mirror, The Calamitous XIV Century*, Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York, 1978, p. 115.

⁵Rudi A. Te Velde, [Natural Reason in the Summa contra Gentiles](#), p. 59.

The Cathars were a Christian sect who believed in the immortality of the human spirit as the creative principle of human identity, and believed that such a spirit had been trapped in a polluted world dominated by money and by a corrupt papacy. They refused to go along with the corruption of the Church and were willing to die for their faith in order to become immortals. According to an insightful report published by Matthew A. McIntosh in <https://brewminate.com/the-medieval-cathari-religious-sect-wiped-out-in-the-albigensian-crusade/>, it was the immortal purpose of the Cathars which represented the greatest danger to the Ultramontane medieval Church. As McIntosh states:

“The goal of Cathar eschatology was liberation from the realm of limitation and corruption identified with material existence. The path to liberation first required an awakening to the intrinsic corruption of the medieval “consensus reality,” including its ecclesiastical, dogmatic, and social structures. Once cognizant of the grim existential reality of human existence (the “prison” of matter), the path to spiritual liberation became obvious: matter’s enslaving bonds must be broken. This was a step by step process, accomplished in different measures by each individual. The Cathars clearly accepted the idea of reincarnation.



“Those who were unable to achieve liberation during their current mortal journey would be reborn again on Earth to continue the struggle for perfection. For the Cathars (like the Hindus and Buddhists), it should be understood that reincarnation was neither a necessary nor a desirable event, but a result of the fact that not all humans could break the enthralling chains of matter within a single lifetime.”⁶

Arnaud Amaury and Dominique de Guzman (St. Dominic) crushing the immortality of reason in the name of God. (Photo by API/Gamma-Rapho via Getty Images)

The immortalizing process of catharsis that the Church prevented its own flock from attaining says a lot about what it means to go through the difficult singularity of an axiomatic break from limiting and debilitating axioms of this dogmatic Ultramontane Church, especially when it was incapable of recognizing the aspirations of its own people. Nothing was able to hold

⁶ [*The Medieval Cathari: Religious Sect Wiped Out in the Albigensian Crusade*](#), Curated/Reviewed by Matthew A. McIntosh, January 26, 2020.

back the fanaticism of the Dominican-run Inquisition based on the rule of blind belief, especially after it had been given the green light by the Ultramontane Church of Rome to kill all of the Cathars of Southern France. The brutal success of the Inquisition, that is, of the trickery of having faith dominate reason, gave the Ultramontane Church a powerful authority that lasted for centuries and still exists in the Roman Curia today.

From May 1243 until March 1244, the Cathar stronghold of Montsegur near Carcassonne in the Languedoc was taken over by the troops of the Bishop of Narbonne, and, on March 16, 1244, 225 Cathar "*parfaits*" were burnt alive at the foot of their castle while others were forced to recant and wear yellow crosses on their clothes as they watched their leaders burn. When asked how he could recognize a heretic from a Catholic, the military commander, Arnaud-Amaury, the Cistercian Abbot of Cîteaux, stated: "*Caedite eos. Novit enim Dominus qui sunt eius*"—"Kill them all, the Lord will recognize His own." Although the Albigensian Crusade lasted 20 years (1209-1229) the murdering of Cathars went well into the mid 1240's. Matthew McIntosh described the result of such an action in the town of Béziers, on July 22, 1209:

"The doors of the church of St Mary Magdalene were broken down and the refugees dragged out and slaughtered. Reportedly, 7,000 people died there, including many women and children. Elsewhere in the town, many more thousands were mutilated and killed. Prisoners were blinded, dragged behind horses, and used for target practice. What remained of the city was razed by fire. Arnaud [Amaury] wrote to Pope Innocent III, 'Today your Holiness, twenty thousand heretics were put to the sword, regardless of rank, age, or sex.'"⁷

CATHOLIC BISHOPS ASK FORGIVENESS FOR THE CATHAR GENOCIDE

Some Catholic bishops have asked for forgiveness for the Cathar genocide, but the Vatican has not.⁸ It should be noted that a plea of forgiveness for the genocide of the Cathars had been asked of Pope John Paul II, in 1998, by the mayor of Toulouse and several other officials. According to [*Nationalia World news*](#), September 22, 2016, the plea was initiated as follows:

"It was a three-page letter sent to Pope John Paul II at the initiative of mayor of Toulouse, Dominique Baudis, president of Occitan Convergence Joan Francés Laffont, Abbot Jòrdi Passerat, Bertran de La Farge, Patrick Lasseube and some 20 occitanists who asked the Catholic Church to recognize its sins. Pope John Paul II asked forgiveness in a

⁷ Ibidem.

⁸ See my reports: [THE ULTRAMONTANE PAPACY PART I](#) and [RAPHAEL'S 'DISPUTE OF THE HOLY SACRAMENT' AND THE ANOMALY OF POPE INNOCENT III](#)

[year] 2000 document entitled "Memory and Reconciliation", but it was too generic and made no reference to the Cathars."⁹

According to the Cathar website, [*Cathars and Cathar Beliefs in the Languedoc Cathar News*](#) of October 16, 2016, the French Bishop of Pamiers, Monseigneur Jean-Marc Eychenne, made a public apology for the persecution of the Cathars of Languedoc. The Cathar website reported:

“On October 16, 2016, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Pamiers apologized for acts contrary to Gospel. Though not explicit, these acts are widely taken to include the Crusade against the Cathars, the activities of the Inquisition in the Languedoc, and in particular, the burning of some 225 baptized Cathars at Montsegur in 1244. Speaking in French, the bishop said: ‘We ask the Lord for forgiveness for some of our members and some of our institutions participating in acts contrary to the Gospel, in which the Lord Jesus gave us the commandment to love our neighbor and not to respond to violence with violence’

“The Bishop's apology was made specifically on behalf of his diocese. The apology was made at a crowded hour-long service (a "celebration" not a mass) at the village Church of Montsegur - with a thousand or so listening outside. The Cathars' distinctive form of the Lord's Prayer was sung in the church. Cathars never built or used church buildings, so this might have been the first time the Cathar form of the Lord's Prayer has ever been used in a church.”¹⁰

On March 13, 2000, Pope John Paul II asked forgiveness for the errors of the Church over the past 2000 years, but the [*Memory and Reconciliation: the Church and the faults of the past*](#) issued by the International Theological Commission of the Vatican Curia omitted the names of the victims as well as the names of the sins the Church had committed during those centuries.

It was only the axiom busting power of artistic composition of the Italian Renaissance which succeeded in outflanking the Delphic Aristotelian mind control operation of the Middle Ages, which is still a menace today under the form of cybernetics and systems analysis. Here is how artistic composition was able to deal with the matter under the brush of Andrea di Bonaiuto.

⁹ See [*Bishop of Pàmias to ask forgiveness for Cathar Crusade*](#). 22.09.2016. See the letter to John Paul II: [**MANIFESTE POUR LA RECONCILIATION.**](#)

¹⁰ [*Apology by the Bishop of Pamiers.*](#)

ANDREA DI BONAIUTO AND 'THE TRIUMPH OF ST. THOMAS AQUINAS': PITTING FAITH AGAINST REASON

One has to admire the courage of Andrea Di Bonaiuto for his historical treatment of the “triumphal” Thomas Aquinas during the early Italian Renaissance by portraying him sitting on a throne like a god and presiding over his well ordered and disciplined Aristotelian categories in his famous *Triumph of St. Thomas Aquinas*.¹¹ Behind nearly every stroke of Bonaiuto’s brush, there is an irony hidden in plain sight.



Andrea di Bonaiuto, *The Triumph of St. Thomas Aquinas*, 1365-1368, Spanish Chapel, Santa Maria Novella, Florence.

For example, one cannot miss noticing that Thomas Aquinas is sitting slightly higher than the ten prophets of the Old and New Testaments as he is being blessed from above by seven angels representing the Seven Graces. That is quite an elevation for a humble monk. Sitting in such a triumphal station, Aquinas is shown presiding over the Christianized Aristotelian

¹¹ Andrea di Bonaiuto was one of the advisors for the construction of the Duomo of the Cathedral of Florence. See my report: [ANDREA DI BONAIUTO, THOMAS AQUINAS, AND THE UNITY OF OPPOSITES](#).

categories of knowledge, each of which is sitting in a small alcove separated from all of the others, as if human knowledge was the sum of separated and independent sciences, each forming a piece of the perfect human mind's puzzle. The details on the bottom right side show mini-thrones with female figures representing the liberal arts with their corresponding Greek male figures at their feet. The left side represents seven female virtues with seven corresponding religious male figures all perfectly compartmentalized. Is the mind of the Dominican monk so perfectly ordered that each of his thoughts is separate from all others? If the human soul were to be so logically ordered, wouldn't it be a perfect entropic automaton?

Of course, nothing can be so perfect in this world, and there is inside of that fresco a small axiomatic singularity which disturbs such a triumph of self-perfection. See if you can locate it. Look at the foot of Aquinas' throne. Note the presence of a distorted blemish right under his feet: what is that? Is this the metaphor of the Thomist founding principle of logical perfection or is it something that Aquinas is trampling on and that he is attempting to erase from his perfect order? It is difficult to tell. Sitting on the ground, there are three well known "heretics:" Nestor, Averroes, and Arius. Two are almost erased and the third and only recognizable figure is Averroes, facing the spectator. Next, look at the theological statement that Aquinas wrote on the subject of heresy in his *Summa Theologia* to justify the genocidal actions of Pope Innocent III:

"(1) There is the sin, whereby they [the heretics] deserve not only to be separated from the Church by excommunication, but also to be shut off from the world by death. For it is a much more serious matter to corrupt faith, through which comes the soul's life, than to forge money, through which temporal life is supported. Hence if forgers of money or other malefactors are straightaway justly put to death by secular princes, with much more justice can heretics, immediately upon conviction, be not only excommunicated but also put to death."¹²

Now, ask yourself some crucial questions: *who is the real forgerer, here, and from what superior authority does Aquinas's theological statement come from? How can anyone justify such a right to kill people?* Did the people of his time really believe that this was written in the name of God? Isn't such a command merely promoting mass murder of selected people or is it also killing immortality in the souls of all other Christians? How many leaders went along with Aquinas's *Summa Theologia* command during the Middle Ages and later? What happened to those who refused to go along with such a declaration of war against so-called "heretics"? How many died because of it, either by rejecting or by adopting such a policy? Why has the Catholic

¹² Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologia*, ii, Q. xi. Article III. Whether heretics should be tolerated, in Documents of the Christian Church, selected by Henry Bettenson, Second edition, Oxford University Press, London, 1963, p. 186-187.

Church not denounced publically such a horrible sin and why was the *Summa Theologia* not been censored for such fabricated logic? How could such an arrogant expression of arbitrary power be permitted to continue in the name of Truth?

Truth is not obviously easy to find and even harder to tell, because, often, you have to look for what is not there, and that is not self-evident. You have to look for the precise logical mental trick that Thomas Aquinas used in order to prevent people from speaking out against his authority. In other words, once you find the axiomatic defect, you have to challenge the authority and you have to have the courage to tell the truth. Then, most importantly, you have to discover the truth about the wrong axiomatic underlying assumption behind the statement or the action, and make that public for everyone to see. So, what is the “axiomatic flaw” of Aquinas? What is the nature of the distorted blemish under Aquinas’s feet featuring Averroes in Bonaiuto’s painting?



Nestor, Averroes, and Arius, detail from the Bonaiuto Spanish Chapel, Florence

Aquinas studied Averroes’s translations of Aristotle at the University of Paris from 1246 to 1248, and became professor of theology in 1265 at the same university. He used Averroes’s argument of applying Aristotle to Islam and applied Aristotle’s philosophy to Christianity. Aquinas’s most significant works were *Disputed Questions on Truth*, *Summa Contra Gentiles*, and his unfinished *Summa Theologia*. When the Vatican launched new territorial conquests by

using religious crusades against Islam as a pretext, European university theologians began to be targeted and accused of the averroist heresy.

An attempt was then made to resolve the underlying axiomatic problem of Aristotle by the Platonic-Augustinian-Franciscans who openly disputed the Dominicans on this matter, but no one succeeded in revealing the truth about the axiomatic flaw of Aristotelianism and identify the theological flaw behind the *Summa Theologia*. In spite of the admirable efforts of the Franciscans, the rigorous logic displayed by Pope Innocent III against the Albigensians became the new rule of conquest for the Ultramontane Roman Church, which culminated with the Inquisition embracing Thomas Aquinas as the greatest theologian of the Catholic Church. From that moment on, the education of the Catholic Church seminaries around the world became based on Thomas Aquinas's Aristotelian doctrine.

THE ULTRAMONTANE FORM OF GEOPOLITICS

Aquinas's systematic use of the Aristotelian doctrine of deductive logic was a means of imposing a hierarchical control of Christian theology over philosophy; thus, was born the theological form of geopolitics as the basis for religious wars. *"He who controls theology controls philosophy, and he who controls philosophy, controls the world."*

To win the war against the heretics, the Ultramontane Vatican needed complete theological control over philosophical thinking throughout Europe and South West Asia; and he who mastered the logical argumentations of the Church became the champion who controlled the means of justifying war and peace throughout the world. Aquinas argued the fine point that theology was superior to philosophy because there are truths which can only be based on faith and which reason cannot understand. In other words, he who succeeds in imposing blind belief over creative reason has the means of controlling the world of consensus seekers. That control of reason by faith became the singularity with which Aquinas was able to sign the death warrant against true human immortality.

In 1272, Aquinas became the regent master of the University of Paris for a second time. The reason for this elevation to such a high ranking position was because he publically denounced Averroes who, by that time, had become considered a "heretic" and a "radical Aristotelian." In order to demonstrate his good faith, Aquinas wrote a pamphlet against him, titled *On the Unity of Intellect, against the Averroists*, in which he officially condemned the Islamic philosopher as an anti-Christian heretic.

On December 6, 1273, Aquinas is said to have had a shocking experience during the celebration of a mass which left him in a complete state of confusion. When his Dominican companion, Reginald Pipemo, asked him what was wrong, Aquinas told him that God had spoken to him to the effect that he may have been wrong. Aquinas wrote: "Such things have been

revealed to me that what I have written seems like straw (*mihi videtur palea*).”¹³ Was his conscience catching up with him?

Aquinas never wrote again and his *Summa Theologia* remained unfinished. It is reported that he never recovered from that last dramatic event and died three months later. Three years after his death, in 1277, the Bishop of Paris, Etienne Tempier, Chancellor of the Sorbonne, issued a condemnation of 219 theses against Aristotle and the Averroists. The condemnation, which was meant to clarify how God's power could not be reduced to any principle of deductive logic that Aristotle or Averroes may have concocted, included twenty theses against Thomas Aquinas.¹⁴

AQUINAS CRITICISM OF AUGUSTINE'S DOCTRINE OF FAITH

The epistemological relationship of *Faith, Reason, and Will*, is central to Christianity as is the dynamic relationship of the three persons of the Holy Trinity; however, the question is as axiomatically different between St. Augustine and Thomas Aquinas, as the power of ideas was different between Plato and Aristotle. Now, let's examine this question in light of a few “straws” that Aquinas pulled over your eyes in order to crush St. Augustine's doctrine of faith. Aquinas's critique can be found in [*DE VERITATE*](#), Question. XIV, Article. 1, where he separated faith from reason in order to justify the power of one over the other.

This epistemological question has great implications not only for the future of the Catholic Church, but also for the future of mankind, because in all cases, *Faith, Reason, and Will* cannot be separated entities. The issue is that all three functions of the mind must be integrated as a dynamic process of creation that it is and each must be dependent on one another not only for the well being of the soul, but also for the progress of the human species as a whole.

Aquinas focused on making the difference between reason and belief because he wanted to justify the power of the Ultramontane Church of Rome over the laic powers of the world. At the beginning of the thirteenth century, when Pope Innocent III imposed his religious authority over the civil governments of Europe, the process of capturing reason became the equivalent of today's British-American geopolitical idea of policing the world with the Rules-based International Order under the guise of Tony Blair's 1999 doctrine of “Responsibility to Protect” (R2P).

¹³ Thomas Aquinas, Wikipedia.

¹⁴ See Edward Grant, *The Foundations of Modern Science in the Middle Ages: Their Religious, Institutional, and Intellectual Contexts*. Cambridge University Press. 1996, pp. 81–82.

Pope Innocent III imposed an imperial regime over the Catholic Church and the Kingdoms of Europe had to obey the spiritual authority of the Church, after which, the new Dominican Aristotelian-scholastic approach took over the education system of Europe. The Aristotelian system became the means to control minds with scholastic reasoning whereby truth was replaced by logic. The method could be applied to any topic and to any field of knowledge whatsoever, providing that the arguments followed a rigorous dialectical method that Thomas Aquinas had perfected in his *Summa Theologia*; that was his lesson learned from Averroes. A topic was chosen, favorable propositions were given; then counterproposals were brought in opposition and the opposition was rebutted. This is how Thomist (Aristotelian) Theology became the hegemonic science of all sciences.

Aquinas insisted that the domain of reason had to be entirely separated from the domain of faith because faith did not “logically” require any reasoning justification for adhering to its object. On the other hand, reason had to be cleansed from any non-logical characteristics. The irony, however, was that Aquinas used only deductive logic to justify faith. Moreover, the isolation of faith from reason was grounded on the “promise” of a reward after death, rather than on the improvement of the human condition. As a result, from the fourteenth century on, most of the Catholic priests on all five continents were subjected to a rigorous course of Thomist Studies in their Seminaries before they became ordained. They became perfect geopolitical Christians, using the perfect divide and conquer deductive weapon.

Here is an example of Aquinas’s Aristotelian geopolitical dialectics, which he applied to St. Augustine against the unity of *Faith, Reason, and Will*. Geopolitics is the science of maintaining the opposites in conflicted states; the aim is not the truth or the resolution of conflicts; the aim is to keep everything separate under the tyranny of logic. The choice of argumentation can be found in Aquinas’s *DE VERITATE*, Question. XIV, Article. 1, where he uses St. Paul’s *Corinthians* to counter Augustine’s statement. Aquinas argues his opposition as follows:

“**Difficulties:** Augustine says, and the Gloss on the second Epistle to the Corinthians (3:5),¹⁵ ‘Not that we are sufficient to think’ repeats: ‘*to believe is to think with assent.*’ [Emphasis added] But this description does not seem to fit in with our other knowledge, for 1) the knower is distinguished from the believer, as is clear from Augustine. But the knower, precisely as knowing, thinks something over and gives assent to it. Therefore, it is incorrect to say that ‘*belief is thought with assent.*’ [Emphasis added] 2) Such thought (*cogitation*) implies some inquiry, for to think (*cogitare*) is, as it were, to shake together

¹⁵ 2 Corinthians 3:5, **KJV**: "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God;" Aquinas’ original Latin text locates Augustine’s statement: ‘*belief is thought with assent*’ as being taken from St. Augustine, *A TREATISE ON THE PREDESTINATION OF THE SAINTS*, The First Book, Chap. 5.-TO BELIEVE IS TO THINK WITH ASSENT.

(*coagitare*), that is, to separate and compare one thing with another. But inquiry is not part of the concept of faith, for Damascene says: “Faith is consent without inquiry.” Therefore, it is wrong to say that “*belief is thought with assent.*” [Emphasis added]¹⁶

Here is where Aquinas’ opposition to Augustine is firmly established: believing and thinking are two completely distinct operations which must be conceived of separately because thinking uses critical judgments and faith does not. In other words, believing and thinking must not have anything in common. On the other hand, Augustine had written:

“And, therefore, commending that grace which is not given according to any merits, but is the cause of all good merits, he says, ‘Not that we are sufficient to think anything as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God.’ Let them give attention to the [sic], and well weigh these words, who think that the beginning of faith is of ourselves and the supplement of faith is of God. For who cannot see that thinking is prior to believing? For no one believes anything unless he has first thought that it is to be believed. For however suddenly, however rapidly, some thoughts fly before the will to believe, and this presently follows in such wise as to attend them, as it were, in closest conjunction, it is yet necessary that everything which is believed should be believed after thought has preceded; although even *belief itself is nothing else [than] to think with assent.* [Emphasis added] For it is not every one who thinks that believes, since many think in order that they may not believe; but everybody who believes, thinks,—both thinks in believing and believes in thinking. Therefore in what pertains to religion and piety (of which the apostle was speaking), if we are not capable of thinking anything as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God, we are certainly not capable of believing anything as of ourselves, since we cannot do this without thinking; but our sufficiency, by which we begin to believe, is of God. Wherefore, as no one is sufficient for himself, for the beginning or the completion of any good work whatever,—and this those brethren of yours, as what you have written intimates, already agree to be true, whence, as well in the beginning as in the

¹⁶ Thomas Aquinas, *DE VERITATE*, Question. XIV, Article. 1. The Latin original reads as follows: “*Dicitur autem ab Augustino in libro de praedestinatione sanctorum, et habetur in Glossa II Corinth. cap. III, 5, super illud: non quod sufficientes simus etc., quod credere est cum assensione cogitare. Videtur autem quod inconvenienter. Sciens enim a credente distinguitur, ut patet per Augustinum in Lib. de videndo Deum. Sed sciens in quantum scit, cogitat aliquid et assentit. Ergo inconvenienter describitur credere, cum dicitur quod credere est cum assensione cogitare. Praeterea, cogitatio inquisitionem quamdam importat: dicitur enim cogitare quasi coagitare, id est discutere, et conferre unum cum altero. Sed inquisitio removetur a fidei ratione; quia dicit Damascenus quod fides est non inquisitus consensus. Ergo male dicitur, quod credere sit cum assensione cogitare.*”

carrying out of every good work, our sufficiency is of God,—so no one is sufficient for himself, either to begin or to perfect faith; but our sufficiency is of God. Because if faith is not a matter of thought, it is of no account; and we are not sufficient to think anything as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God.”¹⁷

As for the “assent” of the will, Aquinas argued that it was based on “inclination” rather than on “principle,” as if will power were to be spurred by what you feel like, or what you are inclined to consider to be good in order to decide one side of an opposition rather than the other. Aquinas quotes Augustine as saying that “*belief is thought with assent*” and refutes it saying that both thought and faith could not elevate each other to a higher level for resolving opposites – and that thought together with a willful act of agreement had to remain external to belief. For Aquinas, the believer must exclude both thinking and willfulness and must depend on the will of God alone. Clearly, Aquinas had no understanding of how to work out the dynamics within the Trinity.

For Augustine, on the other hand, faith and reason are not only compatible, but they are inseparable helpers of each other for a higher creative purpose. Augustine considered that faith must precede reason because: “Unless you believe, you will not understand.” (Confessions).¹⁸ Contrary to Aquinas, Augustine considered belief as part of a trinitarian function whereby faith unites and illuminates both thinking, and willfulness.

Aquinas states: “Thus, too, we are moved to believe what God says because we are promised eternal life as a reward if we believe. And this reward moves the will to assent to what is said, although the intellect is not moved by anything which it understands.”¹⁹ Aquinas challenges reason to submit to the power of belief in a “*promised eternal life;*” that is, when philosophy bows down to theology, and civilian government bows down to the Ultramontane Church of Rome. Thus, outside of that Ultramontane Church, you cannot be saved. Here, the ultimate false underlying assumption is that reason is incapable of accessing the superior object of faith, therefore, all critical thinking must be left out and will not be permitted to judge religious matters (which is completely contrary to Augustinian thinking). Then, Aquinas concludes with the logic that reason must become a captive of faith:

“Because of this the understanding of the believer is said to be ‘*held captive,*’ [Emphasis added] since, in place of its own proper determinations, those of something

¹⁷ St. Augustine, [*A TREATISE ON THE PREDESTINATION OF THE SAINTS*](#), The First Book, Chap. 5., p. 3.

¹⁸ Robert E. Cushman, [*Faith and Reason in the Thought of St. Augustine*](#), Cambridge University Press, CHURCH HISTORY, Vol. 19, No. 4, December., 1950, pp. 271-294 (24 pages). “The principle is the foundation stone of Augustinian theology. It is responsible for the first full-fledged Christian Philosophy. Although it has periodically been influential, it has also frequently been lost to the sights of Christian philosophers; and, beginning with the ascendancy of Aristotelianism in the XIIIth century, was largely obscured.” (p. 273)

¹⁹ Thomas Aquinas, [*DE VERITATE*](#), Question. XIV, Article. 1.

else are imposed on it: 'bringing into captivity every understanding... (2 Corinthian. 10:5). Due to this, also, a movement directly opposite to what the believer holds most firmly can arise in him, although this cannot happen to one who understands or has scientific knowledge.'"²⁰

ST. AUGUSTINE ON FAITH, REASON, AND WILL

The issue of faith and reason in St. Augustine becomes clear when one understands that it is the free will which is the primary force behind all knowledge and that it is faith which makes knowledge possible by giving it its object of love. Viewed from that vantage point, Aquinas's mind is pessimistic and passive while Augustine's mind is optimistic and active because he is trustful that both his faith and reason can change the universe. This is the crucial axiomatic moment of change to be considered.

A similar point can be made here in understanding the difference between faith and reason. Lyndon LaRouche made the point on Shakespeare's famous soliloquy in *Hamlet* by showing how the question "To be or not to be" is not spoken in the indicative mood, but in the subjunctive mood, where Hamlet is confronted with an axiomatic change which he failed to bring to fruition. LaRouche gave the following reason for that failure:

"'To be' in what? There are two states. One, is the state of knowing the tradition which is going to guide you in your action. The other, is a new way of thinking, or a different way of thinking, which violates your tradition, by which you might survive. You are certain that if you follow tradition, you are doomed: "To be or not to be." What's the issue?

"The issue is, this is like death. Death is an experience from which no one has returned; and to change my ideas, to change my axioms of belief, is, to me, like death. It's uncertainty. It's the unexplored, the unexpected. I would rather bear the ills I have and die, than go into this strange area of new things, contrary to tradition, and live.

"And so he walked to the end of the drama, into an orgy of death which he knew he was walking into, like an existentialist. Because he refused to admit that what he assumed to be beforehand, the right way of thinking, was the only way of thinking which he could accept. And he would rather die than change that."²¹

²⁰ Thomas Aquinas, [*DE VERITATE*](#), Question. XIV, Article. 1. «The Latin original is as follows: "Et inde est quod intellectus credentis dicitur esse captivatus, quia tenetur terminis alienis, et non propriis. II Corinth. X, 5: in captivitate redigentes omnem intellectum et cetera. Inde est etiam quod in credente potest insurgere motus de contrario eius quod firmissime tenet, quamvis non in intelligente vel sciente. »

²¹ Lyndon LaRouche, [*Morning Briefing, Sunday, September 5, 2021*](#), Page 3 of 27.

It is the love of mankind as God demonstrated through His Word becoming flesh that the human mind trusts in faith, and it is the humbleness of God's will which makes human knowledge capable of becoming in His image. Therefore, it is primarily through the *will to love mankind* as God does which makes knowledge powerful and creative for mankind and gives mankind the ability to change the universe as a whole, because what is known cannot be divorced from what is loved.

However, nothing can be fully known unless the consent of the will becomes the dominant power of the mind and the mind humbles itself for the sake of the loved one. This may sound like *agape*, and it is, because it is solely for the *benefit of the other*. In other words, you don't know enough, if you don't love enough. This is what the Augustinian nature of *agape* must lead every human being to discover during his lifetime as a *universal principle*. This is how LaRouche stated this "*willful action of significance*" as a matter of strategy to command the universe:

"Well, typical of those kinds of acts that we make— which we can prove the universe will *obey*, otherwise the universe won't obey them—are actions which conform to the discovery of a universal physical principle. If you can discover a validated, universal physical principle, and you can give that, as an order to the universe, the universe will obey. Man is the only creature that can do that! That can formulate an order, called a universal physical principle, validate that discovery, and issue that discovery as *an order, a command*, to the universe, and the universe is compelled to obey.

"That is the means. The accumulation of these principles, which are part of our technological culture, is the means by which mankind has been able to increase the life-expectancy, to improve the demographic characteristics of populations, and, in general, to increase man's power, *measurable power, in and over the universe, per capita and per square kilometer*. That's the great, scientific experiment.

"We are able to *do* this, not only through physical experiments, through physical discovery: We're able to do this, by discovering higher levels of methods of social cooperation, through which, we're able to cooperate in fostering these kinds of discoveries, and applying them.

"So, those things, those are the kinds of actions, which the universe acknowledges to be *man's willful actions of significance*. Everything else that man does is on the level that any lower form of animal life can accomplish. So, therefore, the kinds of action which distinguish a human being from lower forms of animal life, is that, and only that.

"Now, look at this question of strategy, which I've introduced here, from that standpoint. Strategy should mean—once we've understood these lessons, which, presumably, we had learned from study of European history, since the time of Solon and Plato, [and] say, what's important, what is strategy—the purpose of strategy is to defend the human species, to improve its condition,

to improve its well-being, to improve its power in and over the universe at large. That's the purpose of strategy."²²

Thus, it is necessary to recognize the *universal significance* of the matter of strategy so as to not repeat the previous mistakes of history. The only way to make sure that we don't repeat the mistakes of the past is to love mankind by reconnecting with St. Augustine's epistemology and restore his dynamic conception of *Faith, Reason, and Will*.

Recall to mind, here, the trinity function that Aquinas rejected in the form of the Augustinian self-transforming process of "*faith is thought with assent*," and look at this concept as a mixture of *Faith, Reason, and Will*. The process of Augustine's knowledge works as follows: reason is entirely dependent on both will and faith such that when reason fails, it is faith which must push reason to improve its knowledge; and when faith fails, it is the will which must give reason the impetus to move upward and uplift faith back to its chosen object of love. All three, *Faith, Reason, and Will* have a lot of work to do within this triply-connected loving action, because without faith, reason won't know where to go and will won't be focused to get reason there.

THE TRIPLE POWER OF THE TRINITY: FAITH, REASON, AND WILL

In his *City of God*, Augustine refers back to Plato's conception of God by stating that "in Him are to be found the cause of existence, the ultimate reason for the understanding, and the end in reference to which the whole life is to be regulated."²³ This is the triply-connected Platonic view which corresponds to the Trinity of the creative human mind in the Augustinian epistemology, and which Plato projected unto the power of "God as being the creator of nature, the provider of intelligence, and the kindler of love."²⁴ Such is the triple power of man distinct from the animal.

THE POWER OF FAITH

Augustine starts with the Christian idea that the mind is incapable of discovering the truth on his own and that, therefore, "faith is the starting point of knowledge." (*De Trinitate*, IX, No.

²² Lyndon LaRouche, [*Storm Over Asia, Take Two: I Told You So, and Now It Is Happening*](#), EIR, Vol. 48, No. 35, September 3, 2021, p. 31.

²³ St. Augustine, [*De Civitate Dei*](#), VIII, No. 4; cf. VIII, 1 and 9.

²⁴ St. Augustine, [*De Civitate Dei*](#), XI, No. 25. All of the Augustine quotes are taken from: Robert E. Cushman's [*Faith and Reason in the Thought of St. Augustine*](#). As he said: "Augustine regarded this as defining essentially the several works of the persons of the Trinity." (Op. Cit., p. 275.)

1, 1.) In other words, if you believe, you are able to understand, and if you don't believe, there is no way you can understand anything; you are at the mercy of everything that is thrown at your sense perception. The ordering principle is therefore very clear: *credo ut intelligam*. (I believe in order to understand.) This is the Augustine epistemological condition for all possible knowledge because, if the example of Christ is missing in the willfulness of determining the conduct of mankind as the prime mover of change in the universe, then, there exists no adequate principle to explain the reason for the defense of mankind. So, how does faith move knowledge to know?

THE POWER OF REASON

Plato's view is that the human mind is able to access those fundamental ideas from a higher domain. In other words, the real form of things is not what is perceived by the senses, but by the intelligence, when it apprehends the pre-existence of things in their form of pre-established harmony, as in the case, for instance, of the Lydian orderings in classical musical composition, because it is this *divine epistemological geometry* which makes all knowledge possible. How do I know this knowledge to be true? See what Augustine wrote about the Platonic approach to the Holy Trinity and note the mind's ability to reach beyond a limit:

“It is part of the higher reason to judge of these corporal things according to incorporeal and eternal reasons; which unless they were above the human mind, would certainly not be unchangeable; and yet, unless something of our own were subjoined to them, we should not be able to employ them as our measure by which to judge corporeal things. But we judge of corporeal things from the rule of dimensions and figures, which the mind knows to remain unchangeably.” (*De Trinitate*, XII, No. 2, 2.)

Here, Augustine hints at music, geometry, and arithmetic as shadows of the unchangeable domain. In other words, the human mind does not discover the nature of things from their external forms, but from their intelligible characteristics. The mind knows this to be true because it is able to construct its unchangeability. As LaRouche once said: “*Believe nothing that for which you cannot give, yourself, a constructive proof.*”

THE POWER OF WILL

If “faith is the starting point of knowledge,” then, the will must be the key to getting things moving in life. The Augustinian solution to the forward motion of the trinity function of *Faith, Reason, and Will* is the incarnation of the Word made flesh. However, if the will is humbled before his Creator, and moves reason and faith beyond the sensual grasping of objects upward to the principle of light, then an axiomatic transformation should take place within such knowledge whereby the mind goes from a lower manifold to a higher manifold. Augustine concluded:

“Then set I myself a means of gaining so much strength as should be sufficient to enjoy Thee; *but I could not find it, until I embraced that Mediator betwixt God and man*, the man Jesus Christ; who is over all, God blessed for ever more, then calling onto me and saying: I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life; who mingled the food which I was unable to take (his own flesh) unto our flesh. For the Word was made flesh, that by thy wisdom, by which thou createdst all things, he might suckle our infancy.” (*De Trinitate*, IV, 18, 24.)

Thus, as God through His Incarnation humbled Himself in physical space-time, He became through Christ, the mediating principle of historical knowledge for man, but only if man receives that gift by becoming, himself, the humble servant of mankind.

THE PARADOXICAL NATURE OF THE IMMORTAL AXIOMATIC SINGULARITY

Once people begin to see the possibility of change beyond a fixed world order filled with disease and death, then, as at the end of the Black Plague in Europe during the second half of the fourteenth century, people will begin to look into the future. This is what is currently happening in the world, today, in reactions to the fallacious regime of Liberal Democracy. As the British *Sunday Times* of August 22, 2021 reported one British Minister to say in the wake of the American Armed forces, leaving Afghanistan:

“America has just signaled to the world that they are not that keen on playing a global role, [...] The implications of that are absolutely huge. We need to get the integrated review out and reread it. We are going to have to do a hard-nosed revisit on all our assumptions and policies, [...] The US had to be dragged kicking and screaming into the First World War. They turned up late for the Second World War and now they are cutting and running in Afghanistan.”²⁵

One more time, mankind may be beginning to turn back to immortality. But, this time, man must look into something never before looked into: not one's personal immortality, but the immortality of all of mankind. In this regard, ask yourself: How can someone go into two opposite directions at the same time? That is what happens to you when you go through an axiomatic change. You go into an inversion like through a caustic of negative curvature. So, unless you discover the pathway to a higher dimensionality where paradoxes can be resolved, you will not be able to solve the problem of the current worldwide axiomatic transformation.

The paradox to be resolved is that of putting a right handed glove on your left hand. That is impossible because the two hands, right and left, are opposite to one another. It cannot be done. If you try to solve this paradox at the level of exclusive logical oppositions, you will fail.

²⁵ Reported by Carl Osgood in his *War Report* for 8/22/21.

However, it is possible to solve the problem when you go to a higher domain where the two opposites coincide and become interchangeable.

The nature of such an axiomatic singularity is such that it cannot be understood by common sense, logically, mathematically, or digitally. It can only be dealt with poetically or ironically, because it can only be understood through metaphors of classical artistic compositions such as in Bonaiuto's *The Triumph of St. Thomas Aquinas*. Such is the case of immortality as mankind's axiomatic singularity, because this is how human self-development works. As Lyndon LaRouche stated the matter:

“Only mankind has that specific quality of being able to self-develop in such a way that mankind is potentially an immortal species. And our job, in leadership, is to provide that factor of immortality of the human species, which lies in human creativity. And what's happened, essentially, is the effort of a ruling force in society which wants to control mankind—the so-called oligarchical principle—to limit mankind's numbers, to prevent mankind from knowing too much science, too much progress, and always to keep mankind down, underneath the control of an oligarchy. And that's the oligarchical principle.”²⁶

Man is capable of elevating himself, willfully, to higher degrees of knowledge, which means that he is able to understand how and why Aristotelian deductive logic is a fallacy of composition which only satisfies sense perception dominated people.

CONCLUSION

If you wish to discover the singularity of such an immortal axiomatic transformation, all you have to do is to go against the manipulating rulers of this world and identify the axiomatic flaw of their principle of other-directedness. If you go along with them just to get along, you will be brainwashing yourself because brainwashing is nothing but *other-directedness*. On the contrary, *inner-directedness* is the inversion that God went into when the Word became flesh; He humbled Himself by becoming human. In other words, by becoming human, He turned Himself inside out as if one turns a right hand glove inside out onto a left hand glove.

²⁶ Lyndon LaRouche, [*LaRouche on 'The Pact of the Human Soul'*](#), EIR, Vol. 38, No. 31, August 12, 2011, p. 12.



Michelangelo Buonarroti, *The Creation of Adam*, Sistine Chapel, c.1512.

In doing so, God transferred his creative powers by inversion into mankind and gave humanity the freedom to become immortal, if he wishes to be. Thus, man becomes creative by inverting himself into other human beings to come in the future. Consider this paradoxical matter in light of what Cusa stated it in his *The Vision of God*:

“Trusting in Your help, O Lord, I turn once again in order to find You beyond the wall of the coincidence of enfolding and unfolding. And when at one and the same time I go in and out through the door of Your Word and Concept, I find most sweet nourishment. When I find You to be a power that enfolds all things, I go in. When I find You to be a power that unfolds, I go out. When I find You to be a power that both enfolds and unfolds, I both go in and go out. From creatures I go in unto You, who are Creator—go in from the effects unto the Cause. I go out from You, who are Creator—go out from the Cause unto the effects. I both go in and go out when I see that going out is going in and that, likewise, going in is going out.”²⁷

Look at the two opposite worlds, the physical and the spiritual, as if they were bound together through faith and reason, one enfolded into the other, such that the higher domain generates the lower domain as the sphere generates the Five Platonic Solids. Use such a process as a metaphor for the ordering principle of the Universe, but be careful not to be seduced by the simplistic nature of the lower domain. Don't just build Platonic solids; build also the Spherics

²⁷ Nicholas of Cusa, *De Visione Dei*, translated by Jasper Hopkins, The Arthur J. Banning Press, Minneapolis, p. 701.

which generates them and compare the two axiomatically different domains in order to better understand the axiomatic process of transformation. Lyndon LaRouche made the crucial point about this question of immortality as follows:

“Because we’re all mortal. And to arouse in us the passions, while we’re alive, which will impel us to do good, we have to have a sense that our life, and the consuming of our life—the spending of our talent, is going to mean something for coming generations. The best people look for things—like Moses—that are going to happen, when he will no longer be around to enjoy them. It’s this sense of immortality. It’s why parents, in the best degree, sacrifice for their children. It’s why communities sacrifice for education, for their children, for opportunities for their children. You go through the pangs of suffering and shortage, but you have the sense that you’re going someplace, that your life is going to mean something. That you can die with a smile on your face: You’ve conquered death. You’ve spent your talent wisely, [that is] why life will mean something better for generations to come.”²⁸

FIN

²⁸ Lyndon LaRouche, *LaRouche in Talladega: The Immortal Talent Of Martin Luther King*, EIR, Vol. 31, No. 4, January 30, 2004, p. 31.