
PLATO'S 'DELERIOUS ART' OF FORECASTING THE GOOD

Pierre Beaudry, 11/15/2020

FOREWORD

Throughout history, divination has mostly been recorded as a form of manipulation of people with oracles about their uncertainties and hopes for their future. Such a form of forecasting has tended to be used to entice people into believing that something good would come if they didn't make waves and if they accepted to go along to get along with the powers and principalities that be. Politics is nothing but a hypocritical form of that ancient practice of divination, whereby oracles are replaced by governing promises of delivering future goods. The question is: can human beings develop a higher natural state of mind, a higher knowledge, which supersedes political forms of divination, which opens the mind to direct divine inspiration, and which ultimately secures the peace of the world for mankind? Socrates and Plato thought it could be done. Do you?

INTRODUCTION

For Plato, the practice of divination is totally different from the type of political manipulation the world has been witnessing since ancient Greece. As Socrates demonstrated with his dialectical method, divination (*manteia*)¹ is the highest form of knowledge that humans can use when they choose to go beyond the shadowy nature of the physical world, because such a knowledge, although not religious as such, is aimed at discovering the power of the human mind as created

¹ I exclude here all magical forms of divination which are practiced by charlatans in most primitive societies around the world.

in the image of God. This power of forecasting the Good as Lyndon LaRouche demonstrated, is based on the principle of the flank:

“The ancient Roman army was destroyed by Hannibal through his double-flanking operation. A greatly superior force of the Austrians was defeated in their well-designed copy of Hannibal’s defeat of the Roman military, a copy of which was successfully accomplished by defeat of the superior mass of Austrian forces by a lesser force directed by Frederick the Great, at Leuthen. The principle in both exemplary cases was secured not through military forces as such, but by the principle of strategies which inheres in the human mind, not the nominal strength of the troops as such. The issue, in such cases, is not forces as such, but the superior principle which the mind of the commander and his forces have brought to bear. War is best won by other means.”²

For Plato, that principle of the flank was based on the art of divining what is beneficial for mankind as a whole; that is, the art of forecasting the transfinite domain of the Good. As Plato’s Stranger acknowledged in the *Statesman* dialogue:

“When there arises in the soul of men a right opinion concerning what is the Good, the Just, and the Beneficial, and what is the opposite of these – an opinion based on absolute truth and settled as an unshakable conviction – I declare that such a conviction is a manifestation of the divine occurring in a person who is truly of *supernatural lineage* [emphasis added].” (*Statesman*, 309c.)

Near the end of the *Philebus*, Socrates considered that the challenge was “to try to learn from this knowledge what the Good is, in man and in the universe, and what form he should forecast the Good to possess.” (*Philebus*, 64b) It is that form of inspired knowledge that we must now investigate for the purpose of achieving lasting peace in the world. The “*supernatural lineage*” that Socrates refers to in the above statement is, in point of fact, a true reference to the transfinite domain that LaRouche has introduced us to.

² Lyndon LaRouche, [The Principle of the Flank: Victory or Hell](#), EIR, June 24, 2011, p. 37.

PLATO'S 'DELERIOUS ART' OF FORECASTING THE GOOD

In ancient Greece, the art of divination was called *mantikos* (μαντικός), or the art of forecasting future events; that is, a valid knowledge of the future improvement or demise of mankind. Throughout his dialogues, Plato speaks of *mantikos* in very different ways, but most profoundly, as a sort of true and naturally inspired knowledge of the Good, as opposed to the abuse that oligarchies make of their predictions by manipulating sophistry through language ambiguities as the cult of Apollo at Delphi did, or through different forms of artificial divination such as necromancy and the like.

In the *Timaeus*, Plato attributed such a power to individuals who are ignorant of what they are saying because they are merely the interpreters of such truths proffered by the heavens through an illumination of the rational soul. Plato presented this first form of divination as follows:

“There is but a single proof which suffices to demonstrate that it is to the foolishness of man and not to his wisdom that God has given the art of divination (μαντική). Indeed, no ordinary man, when in his right mind, can attain true and inspired divination (μαντική); it happens only when he is inspired, when he is overtaken by sleep, by some distemper, or by some excess of enthusiasm (ένθουσιασμον). On the contrary, it is the man who has all of his wits about him, who is able to reflect, after remembering those words proffered in a dream-like state or in an awoken state, under the power of divination or of enthusiasm (ένθουσιασμον), and gives meaning to the visions which were then perceived, and is able to explain and evaluate them through reasoning, and determine whether they make sense or not, and to whom they may bring some good or evil, for the past, the present, or the future. As for the person who is in a trance and stays in it, it is not his function to interpret what he has seen or what he uttered; as the ancient saying goes: ‘only the man who has his wits about him can act or judge himself and his own affairs.’ And for that reason, it is a customary law to appoint only interpreters to be the judges of a true inspiration. Some people call them prophets or soothsayers; but this is a misunderstanding, because

those individuals are only interpreters of the words and of the mysterious signs, and are not soothsayers themselves. That is why their real name should not be prophets, but only interpreters of prophecy.” (*Timaeus*, 71e-72ab)

Here, Plato is inspired by the same enthusiasm that Pasteur had when he noted that the etymology of the Greek term *entheos* meant “inner God.” As Pasteur said during his acceptance speech at the French Academy:

“The Greeks understood the mysterious power of this underside of things. They are the ones who left us one of the most beautiful words in our language, the word enthusiasm – *Ev Θεος* – an inner God. The greatness of human actions is measured by the inspiration that gives birth to them. Happy is the one who carries within himself a god, an ideal of beauty and who obeys him: ideal of art, ideal of science, ideal of the country, ideal of the virtues of the Gospel! These are the living sources of great thoughts and great deeds. All of them light up with reflections of the infinite.”³

For Plato, divination (*mantike*) is a reminiscence of the Good passed on as a forecast or anticipation of the future to someone in his sleep, which he barely remembers the language of when he wakes up. This natural inspiration and enthusiasm also has a profound epistemological significance which Plato develops extensively in *Republic VI and VII*, before and after his allegory of the Cave, and which is necessary for the guardians of the city to internalize. And, in the *Phaedrus*, Plato insists on adding the characteristic of delirium (*manike*) that he attached to divination (*mantike*), but which he identifies, in reality, as the true art of forecasting:

³ Louis Pasteur, [*Discours de réception de Louis Pasteur*](#), Académie Française, April 27, 1882. « Les Grecs avaient compris la mystérieuse puissance de ce dessous de choses. Ce sont eux qui nous ont légué un des plus beaux mots de notre langue, le mot enthousiasme. —*Ev Θεος*. — Un Dieu intérieur. La grandeur des actions humaines se mesure à l’inspiration qui les fait naître. Heureux celui qui porte en soi un dieu, un idéal de la beauté et qui lui obéit : idéal de l’art, idéal de la science, idéal de la patrie, idéal des vertus de l’Évangile ! Ce sont là les sources vives des grandes pensées et des grandes actions. Toutes s’éclairent des reflets de l’infini.”

“Here is a testimony worth paying attention to, which is that the ancient creators of words in antiquity, who gave things their names, and gave to the meaning of the term delirium, *mania*, no shame nor disgrace; otherwise, they would not have connected the greatest of all arts, that is, the art of forecasting the future, with this very word *manike*, the delirious art! However, it was because they held delirium to be a beautiful thing, whenever it came from a divine inspiration, that they gave it this denomination. But, the younger generation which has no sense of beauty, have added a *t* and called it *mantike* (*μαντική*), the art of divining. The point is that this is also the art of those prophets who guess the future by studying the flight of birds and the like; an art which, in reality, with the help of reflection, produces opinions (*oiesis*), rational thought (*nous*), and history (*historia*). That is the reason why *oio-no-histike* was called by these ancients the art of telling the future. Today, our contemporaries call it *oionistike*, making use of a long *o* (ω) to make the word sound impressive. Thus are superior in perfection and in dignity the prophecy of inspiration over that of reading an omen, both in name and in function is the former superior to the other, because of the superiority of heaven-sent delirium over man-made sanity.” (*Phaedrus*, 244cd)

The play on the word ‘*manic*’ and ‘*mantic*’ gives a clue to the difference that Plato made between ‘*mantic art*’ and ‘*oionistic art*.’ The distinction should become obvious to the reader for the following reason: divination through the observation of signs (*oionistic*) such as birds belongs to an artificial or staged form of divination, which requires a sense-perceived object to support the prophetic knowledge. Since a visible sign conveyed through a physical object is always more effective in convincing a weak mind than would a conceptual inference through words, Plato chose to make this epistemological distinction between those two types of divinations, the natural divination (*mantic*) and the artificial divination (*oionistic*). This difference will become important when Glaucon discovers the way to access the Good as an axiomatic new way to understand the future in *Republic VI*, 511d-6.

PLATO'S INSPIRED KNOWLEDGE OF THE GOOD

In the *Republic*, Plato chooses the inspired knowledge of the Good over belief and over sense perceptions, because the mind requires a projection which carries the contradiction of opposites beyond a mere visual projection, as in the allegory of the Cave. A few pages later, Socrates attempts to bring the attention of Glaucon to the higher principle of inspired truth with knowledge of the Good, which lies beyond the source of light projecting the shadows on the dimly lit wall of his mind. Socrates brings him, and the reader, into a crucial “thought experiment” where he explains the epistemological conditions of what he is attempting to forecast in his own mind; that is, how to reach the domain of the transfinite science of the Good. Socrates first attempts to get the point across with numbers; then, he asks Glaucon to make a transfinite leap into the domain of the intellect⁴ in his own mind, but filtered through Socrates’ mind:

“Are you able to capture the idea of this science the same way as I have? I said.

“What idea? Glaucon replied.

“It could be one of those sciences that we are looking for and which naturally leads to the awakening of our pure intellect, but no one knows how to use it properly, though that science is capable of lifting our mind to the level of universal being.

“What do you mean? he asked.

“I will try, I said, to clarify my thinking process for you. Do you keep watch and observe the things I distinguish in my mind as being or not being conducive to our purpose and do you agree or disagree so that, here too, we may see more clearly whether my divination (*manteuomai-μαντεύομαι*) is right?”

⁴ For Nicholas of Cusa, the domain of the intellect (*intellectus*) is also superior to the domain of deductive reasoning to which the Aristotelians restrict themselves. For Cusa, the domain of the *intellectus* is the transfinite domain of the unity of opposites. For Aristotelians like Thomas Aquinas, however, the intellect is reduced to a perception of things. As Aquinas said about the notion of the truth: “*Veritas est adequatio intellectus et rei.*” (Truth is the conformity between the intellect and the thing)

“Expose those ideas, he said.

“Observe, I said, if you can discern that among the objects of our perceptions some of them are able to provoke the intellect to reflect on itself, because some perceptions seems adequate to judge them, while others always require the intellect to examine them, because perceptions yield nothing that can be trusted.

“You obviously mean objects viewed at a distance, he said, and perspective drawings.

You have completely missed my meaning, said I.

“Then, what is it that you mean? he asked.

“The experiences that are not thought-provoking are those that do not produce any contradictory perceptions. Those that do have that effect, I set aside as provoking reflections; and that is the case when the perception of something close or far manifests something that could be its contrary.”
(*Republic VII*, 523a-c)

This is the point of difficulty which Glaucon had to resolve. Is he able to “intellect” the same idea that Socrates is accessing? Is he able to set his mind ahead into the future and forecast (*manteuomai*)? In other words, is his mind capable of reaching beyond the domain of the becoming, which is the domain of sense perception and change, and attain the transfinite domain of being and of essence, which is the domain of the creative intellect? That is the prophetic insight of Socrates, which Plato is attempting to get across to Glaucon, and to the reader, provided that the verbal action of forecasting (*manteuomai*) is not wrongly translated by “surmising”, “guessing”, or “imagining”, etc., which are sophistries, as are those proffered by politicians who are looking for your vote. Forecasting is the act of making the future alive and present.

The reason why Socrates has such difficulty in getting his point across to Glaucon is because Glaucon suffers from the influence of the oligarchical system in which children are educated by sophists; because, once they find the truth about

the reality of oligarchism, they realize how they are taught to disguise the truth and take the habit of lying in order to gain approval. “Don’t make waves” children are told when they are urged to disregard the morality of their ancestors and when they are being made ready to accept the immorality of the current system of education. They are confronted with the confusing opposition: “Truth doesn’t exist”, “snow is black,” etc. This is the reason why Socrates always insists on exercising the mind by resolving the contradictions of opposites beyond the domain of sense perception. For instance, once you have convinced people that truth is not always good to tell, then, you are an inch away from also making believe that truth no longer exists; then, truth becomes merely a matter of social convenience. One can always recognize this sort of sophistry, because it always compromises the truth.

Near the end of *Republic VII*, Socrates chose a very powerful argument in which he made a last attempt to have Glaucon discover the truth about sophistry versus morality. Socrates arrives at this crucial point of his forecasting experiment where he said:

“Therefore, said I, let someone come and ask such a man what honesty is all about; when he answers what he has learned from the legislator, that he is confused by a hundred and one refutations, he becomes reduced to think that honesty is no more honest than its opposite, and he will fall into the same uncertainty on the subject of justice, or on the good, and about the principles that he reveres the most. What will happen then, tell me, with the respect and obedience that he had for his traditional morality?”

“Inevitably, he said, his honor and his obedience will no longer be the same.

“And then, I said, when he stops honoring and obeying these principles and he considers that they are no longer binding on him, and he realizes that he can no longer discover the truth of these principles, is he not likely to turn only toward those flatterers who propitiate his proclivities?”

“Absolutely, he said.

“From then on, therefore, I think we’ll see him become a rebel against the law and no longer the law abiding citizen that he was.

“Necessarily.

“Therefore, nothing else can be expected from those who take up dialectics in this manner and, like I said a moment ago, we must be lenient with those who fall into this trap.” (*Republic, Book VII, 538de-539a*)

It is clear in this last section of *Republic VII*, that Socrates is using systematically his “delirious” knowledge of forecasting in order to attack the sophistry of politicians. Why else would he repeat the term divination or forecasting (*manteuomai*), no less than 4 times in the short section of *Republic VII* 538a4, 538a7, 538a9, and 538b9? Most translators will mislead the reader by translating the term *manteuomai* by “guessing,” “imagining,” or “surmising.” Socrates’ purpose was to emphasize what sort of education parents must choose for their children, if they wish them to be guided by the Good as opposed to the sophistry of public opinion manipulated by an oligarchical regime.

When Socrates forecasts, he uses his God-given inspired knowledge of the Good to guide the “guardians” of the City who have the responsibility to know how legislation must relate to the Good. As he said earlier: “In any case, said I, it doesn’t matter to me whether justice and honesty find a guardian of the city, if that guardian ignores the relationship these virtues have with the Good; and I forecast (*μαντεύομαι*) that no one will be a good guardian until he knows these things sufficiently.” (*Republic VI, 506a*) In other words, Socrates does not advise people to go to the Oracle at Delphi in order to guess about the future; he recommends that they go to their own minds and to the Good. But, how do you know if you are on the right path? Just make the following distinction clear in your mind.

Political leaders of ancient Greek City-states used the religious sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi to obtain predictions and advice on their future. Such “Delphic operations,” as Lyn used to call them, were nothing but ways to turn truth into sophistry, or to transform a well meaning intention into the opposite of what it was meant to say. For example, the trick of the talented politician is to turn the truth of

reality into a good imitation of the truth with the opposite result. An example of such a “Delphic operation” was the use of the inscription of the famous motto “know thyself” (*gnothi seauton*) written on the forefront of the temple of Apollo at Delphi. It doesn't mean what you think it means.

The meaning of the original Delphic message was best expressed by Aeschylus in *Prometheus Bound*, when he revealed that it was a warning that the Olympus god Oceanus gave to Prometheus against his tendency of speaking ill of the gods. “Know yourself,” was meant to say: “Know your place, and know your limitations. Don't exceed your authority.” It was Socrates who gave the true meaning of that inscription, when he made Critias discover, in Plato's *Charmides*, (164de), that to “know thyself” means to learn how to become temperate and to act with moderation (*sophrosyne*).⁵

PLATO'S GEOMETRY OF THE GOOD

“So, in short order, this is what I also recognized concerning the poets, that they did not compose through their own knowledge, but with a certain natural disposition and enthusiasm (*ἐνθουσιαζοντες*), just like the diviners and the givers of oracles: For these also say many fine things, but they do not know the science of what they are talking about.” Plato, *Apology*, 22b-c.

Plato's principle of forecasting (*manteuomai*) is very similar to Lyn's principle of the flank in warfare, in both its disposition and enthusiasm, because the form of the Good which produces its success extends itself like a proportional line between the visible and the intelligible domains. As LaRouche demonstrated on the subject of forecasting:

“It would have been widely accepted, among reasonably competent statesmen of former times, that the course of economic developments, of a nation or world economy, is shaped by choices, especially choices of policies made during the critical phases of an unfolding process. However,

⁵ See my report: [Sophrosyne, not sophistry](#).

most among today's generation of statesmen are too often lured into the often fatal folly, of relying upon so-called objective, or statistical forecasting. We must never forget the determining factor: it is the human will, in choosing, or failing to choose, appropriate kinds of voluntary, critical changes in policy, which shapes the future of nations, and of mankind as a whole. These are the decisions which have relatively decisive impact on the course of events, especially under crisis-wracked conditions similar to those prevailing, world-wide, today.”⁶

What LaRouche is advocating here, is the study of how to prepare yourself for the axiomatic change which is just around the corner and how to decide what must be done in response to the shock-wave crisis which is about to hit you. This is why a clear understanding of Plato becomes most necessary at this time.

Let me back track to the end of *Republic VI*, for this last part of my report and show you how Plato treated the transfinite measure between the visible and the intelligible domains with a proportionality taken from a mixture of those two incommensurable domains. First, Socrates proposed a heuristic device to bring Glaucon to the higher level of understanding the domain of the intellect by means of ideas alone, by first investigating an idea without any visual illustration. Socrates had Glaucon go through the following steps as if he were going through the well-tempered Lydian divisions of the musical octave by a series of minor thirds:

“Suppose then a line cut into two unequal segments, and cut again those two parts into two smaller parts in the same ratio – one half is for the visible domain, and the other half is for the intelligible domain – and then as an expression of the ratio of their relative clearness and obscurity, consider that all you have on the first segment of the visible world are images. By images, I mean first of all shadows, then reflections in water and on the surfaces of opaque bodies with smooth and shiny texture, and on everything of that sort. Do you understand?”

⁶ Lyndon LaRouche, [On the Subject of Strategic Method](#), The Schiller Institute, reprinted from Summer-Fall 2000 issue of *Fidelio Magazine*.

“I do understand.

“On the second segment, represent an intellectual image of the first one, which must include all living beings, including ourselves, and with us all of the plants and all of man-made objects of the world.

“I can represent that, he said.

“Can you also consider, said I, that the visible segment also includes true and false aspects of things and that the image is to the model as the object of an opinion is to an object of knowledge?

“Yes, he said, certainly.” (*Republic VI*, 509de-510ab)

Here, I interrupt the Socratic dialogue, briefly, in order to make an important pedagogical point. The last question asked by Socrates is the key to the axiomatic discovery of Glaucon:

“Can you also consider, said I, that the visible segment also includes true and false aspects of things and that the image is to the model as the object of an opinion is to an object of knowledge?”

The way you should be thinking is in the form of *this is to this as that is to that*. You should have by now a mental-geometrical image of this *proportionally divided line* between the visible and the intelligible. In fact, this is the form of a “geometrical image” that Socrates is looking at in his mind and that most academic scholars don’t understand, because they don’t understand the significance of the inscription at the door of Plato’s Academy: “*Let no one ignorant of geometry enter.*” The reason for that question to Glaucon can be found here, in *Republic VI*, where Glaucon discovers how the Good could be extended from the mental to the physical, like a geometrical line into four transfinite steps, or musical register shifts, first starting, like Socrates said, from the lower manifolds of perceptions and going to the higher manifolds of mental conceptions that Socrates had devised into four unequal but proportional segments as follows:

[conjecture-opinion] : [belief] :: [understanding] : [reason-intellect]

(The geometrical proportion reads chronologically from the past to the future and from a lower to a higher manifold: Conjecture or opinion is to belief as understanding is to reason or the intellect)

However, the fact that the Good may have such a metaphorical pathway of change in the Simultaneity of Eternity with the Physical Universe (SEPU) does not mean that you can make a visible construction of such a sequence with physical lines or shapes except in a classical artistic composition; because if you proceed in this fashion, by deductive reasoning, the more clarity you think you are going to get will turn to fallacies of composition. It is like the academic scholars who translate *mantike* by the word “guessing” from the past instead of “forecasting” from the future. The idea that Glaucon was looking for was finally found in the nature of the geometrical composition of the principle of proportionality itself: *this is to this as that is to that in the same proportion as this is to that*. Socrates further pursued his idea in the following manner:

“On the other hand, consider next how the intelligible segment must be divided.

“How?

“In the first part of this second segment, the soul, making use of images of the objects which in the previous section were originals, is forced to instigate searches by using assumptions from which it proceeds not up to a principle but down to a conclusion. In the second part of the same second segment, the soul proceeds from the hypothesis to the absolute principle without using images, as in the previous case, and relies on ideas only by progressing systematically through the intellect alone.

“I don't really understand what you mean by what you have just said, he added.

“Well, let me try again, said I. You may understand better after I have said the following: You don't fail to know, I think, that those who deal with geometry, arithmetic, and other similar sciences, presuppose the even and the odd, the figures, three species of angles, and many other similar things

which are pertinent to their domains of research: that they treat them as known objects and that, after they have submitted their hypotheses, they consider they no longer have to justify to themselves or to others the fact that they are self-evident to all minds, and that, starting from these hypotheses, they go through all of those steps and end up by way of deductive results to the demonstration of what they had initially intended to find in the first place.

“Yes, he said, I realize that.

“Consequently, you also know that they make use of visible figures and that they reason on these figures, even though they may not be the ones they are thinking about, but other ones to which those are similar. For example, it is of the square in itself or of the diagonal in itself, and not of this square or that diagonal that they trace, and the same goes for all other figures. All of those figures which they imitate or they draw, which carry shadows and which reflect images in the water, they use them also as if they were images, in order to be able to see these superior objects that can only be captured by the intellect.

“It is true, he said.” (*Republic*, 509d-511a)

Socrates continues to develop the argument until, suddenly, Glaucon interrupts him in his process of thinking and says that he “understands, but not sufficiently.” (511c3) Glaucon then states that he understands that the dialectic science of Socrates is of a higher degree of knowledge than other sciences, and then, he makes the crucial discovery of the transfinite nature of the proportion, when he says:

“And I think you call understanding and not intellect, the knowledge of geometers and their like, because understanding is the intermediary faculty between opinion and reason.

“You have understood me very well, said I. And now apply the four sections to the four operations of the mind: the most elevated one is reason or intellect, the second is understanding, the third is belief, and the fourth

and last is conjecture or opinion. Arrange them in a proportion such that they participate in clarity in the same degree as their objects partake of the truth.”
(*Republic*, 511de)

Note that Socrates has ordered the sequence of his quadratic Lydian line as the inverse proportionality to what he formerly described above, because the faculty of deriving to a conclusion by understanding and deductive reasoning is axiomatically the inverse of accessing a new principle by way of the higher hypothesis of reason; that is, the difference between thinking from the bottom up or from the top down. Understanding merely concludes something from the past, which is, with something that is already known, while the intellect, on the other hand, starts from a future principle that never existed before. Thus, Glaucon discovered how the *simultaneity of eternity* works by time reversal from the top down, and how the proportionality is everywhere incommensurable such that each of the four segments related to each other via an ordering of completely different transfinite manifolds. The whole process is inspired from the future in the quadratic epistemological condition which I have identified as Simultaneity of Eternity with the Physical Universe (SEPU).

[reason-intellect] : [understanding] :: [belief] : [conjecture-opinion]

(The geometrical proportion reads by time reversal from the future to the past and from a higher to a lower manifold: Reason or intellect is to understanding as belief is to conjecture or opinion.)

This inversion is crucial because it allows the mind to go back and forth in time in order to make changes as if from within a universal sphere of three dimensional directions of motion. In that sense, forecasting or divining is not a remedy for the failures of the soul; divination is what makes humans really humans by fulfilling the purpose of final causality. By being a final cause, divining becomes the ultimate food of our intellectual appetites and the ultimate bridge of our psycho-physical connection to God. Divining is the function that makes ideas more real than physical realities. The key to understand the dynamic of this process lies in the Socratic demonstration of the immortality of the soul in the *Phaedrus*.

It is the nature of the created soul of man to be able to think by way of historical time reversal as well as by chronological time; that is, from the future to the past as well as from the past to the future, because these are the two forms of mental action which demonstrate the true nature of the immortality of the soul; that of its inner-directedness. In other words, if the soul were not capable of going forward and backward in time in order to affect change in all directions, it could not be self-moving and self-reliant; and if the soul cannot be self-moving and self-reliant, it cannot be immortal. Plato stated:

“Here is how this demonstration works: all souls are immortal, because *what is capable of moving itself is immortal* [emphasis added] as opposed to what is being moved by something else. In fact, if that which imparts motion is itself moved by something else, when that something else ceases the motion, the soul will also cease to exist. Therefore, only that which can move itself is capable of always being in motion, because it never lets go of itself and is never determined by another mover; moreover, this self-mover is also the source of the first principle (*ἀρχή*) of motion for everything else that requires to be moved.” (*Phaedrus*, 245c)

So, let's get it done. The point, here, is not to fall into the trap of a deductive argument over this issue and debate how a first principle (*arche*) can or cannot come into existence; the issue is to understand and master the emotional maturity that the question requires for application in the political domain and in the immediate future ahead.

CONCLUSION

In the mind of God, there is an infinite coincidence between the opposite physical and mental domains; however, such domains cannot coincide by any form of human curve fitting identity. All physical evidence must be filtered through a divinely inspired epistemological sieve which only the mind of man in the image of God is capable of approximating.

Therefore, understanding the Platonic epistemological significance of the Good means two things: one it means that the Good implies tolerance and

flexibility in the handling of principles, and secondly, it also means that the virtue of *sophrosyne* must be the bounding linkage of the principle of harmony and proportionality. These are the two conditions under which the Good can be exercised with justice and benevolence without compromising the Platonic principle.

Lastly, take the same Socratic divided-line and bring it a step further into the future by applying it to Leibniz's principle of proportionality that he established as the policy principle for his Academies of Arts and Science to be instituted around the world. Leibniz replicated the same Socratic proportionality function of the Good and applied it to the Beauty of the Universal Republic of Mankind. This is what we have the ability to construct for the whole of mankind today by becoming guardians of nations. The world citizen statement was spelled out in Leibniz's letter to Tsar Peter the Great on January 16, 1712:

“Although I have very frequently been employed in public affairs and also in the judiciary system and am consulted on such matters by great princes on an ongoing basis, I nevertheless regard the arts and the sciences as a higher calling, since through them the glory of God and the best interests of the whole human race are continuously promoted. For in the sciences and the knowledge of nature and art, the wonders of God, his power, wisdom, and goodness are especially manifest; and the arts and sciences are also the true treasury of the human race, through which art masters nature and civilized peoples are distinguished from barbarian ones. For these reasons I have loved and pursued science since my youth. . . . The one thing I have been lacking is a leading prince who adequately embraced this cause. . . . I am not a man devoted solely to his native country, or to one particular nation: On the contrary, I pursue the interests of the whole human race because I regard heaven as my fatherland and all well-meaning people as its fellow citizens. . . . To this aim, for a long time I have been conducting a voluminous correspondence in Europe, and even as far as China; and for many years I have not only been a fellow of the French and English Royal

Societies but also direct, as president, the Royal Prussian Society of Sciences.”⁷

Leibniz expressed beauty as the harmony of proportion in the following manner:

“All beauty consists in a harmony and proportion; the beauty of minds, or of creatures who possess reason, is a proportion between reason and power, which in this life is also the foundation of the justice, the order, and the merits and even the form of the Republic, that each may understand of what he is capable, and be capable of as much as he understands. If power is greater than reason, then the one who has that is either a simple sheep (in the case where he does not know how to use his power), or a wolf and a tyrant (in the case where he does not know how to use it well). If reason is greater than power, then he who has that is to be regarded as oppressed. Both are useless, indeed even harmful.”⁸

Plato’s and Leibniz’s principle of action in forecasting the Good is similar to Lyndon LaRouche’s principle of the flank, which, when used properly, if even by only a handful of determined individuals, the future peace of mankind can be secured. What is that LaRouche principle of action, you ask? LaRouche answered:

“So, what is action? What is relevant action? What kind of actions can we take, which the universe acknowledges to be a command?

“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

⁷ Quoted by Maria Rosa Antognazza, [*Leibniz: An Intellectual Biography*](#), Cambridge University Press, New York, 2009, pp.470-471.

⁸ Gottfried Leibniz, [*On the Establishment of a Society in Germany for the Promotion of the Arts and Sciences \(1671\)*](#), The Schiller Institute.

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.”⁹

These are the conditions under which the universe can be made to obey. Do you think you are appropriately prepared to willfully accomplish such actions of significance in the world today?

FIN

⁹ Lyndon LaRouche, [*Storm over Asia Take Two: I Told You So, and Now It Is Happening*](#),” EIR, Vo., 37, No. 36, September 15, 2000, p. 35.