

THE CREATIVE PRINCIPLE IN PAINTING

SEEN THROUGH THE EYES OF LEONARDO DA VINCE

BY Ruth Bierre.

THE CREATIVE PRINCIPLE IN PAINTING - Seen through the eyes of
Leonardo Da Vinci

by Cristina Juarez

Plato, in his Republic, chose music, that music associated today with the tradition of Mozart and Beethoven, as one of the two pillars of the education of the guardians of the State, those men and women who will be raised to be the wisest, the most beautiful and courageous, and who will be called upon to rule the State according to natural law. The reason for this is located in the tremendous power of good music to reach the innermost soul and to prove to that soul empirically the existence of Universal beauty, perfect harmony and rhythm, the perfect models by which the soul is to rule itself if it is to participate in universal perfection. Music, say Plato, has the power to teach children Reason, to give them an internalized reference point to distinguish between those qualities that belong to the realm of Reason, and which define them as human beings, and those which degrade them the level of a mere beasts, before they are actually old enough to grasp consciously what Reason actually is.

Similar for painting, and perhaps more so if one agrees with Leonardo Da Vinci that painting is the most excellent of the arts. While music uses the sense of the ear to move the soul through perfect harmony and rhythm, painting uses the eye, the most excellent of the senses according to Plato and Leonardo, to move the soul with the visual forms of universal beauty. Painting in the neo-platonic tradition, that of Van Eyck, Da Vinci or Rembrandt the Ideal Forms of Beauty, so that contem-

plating them with its mind's eye, man might have the perfect model by which to make of its imperfect soul, a beautiful soul. Indeed, as one can say for music, what child brought up to contemplate Ideal Beauty as is depicted in the works of Leonardo and the others, and what child taught to create himself such - models could forget them and run astray in to the universe of the ugly, of chaos and disorder as defined by bestial passion? (illustration of Da Vinci's angel in the Verrochio painting).

It is not accidental that Plato gives music, and art in general, a central, crucial role in the education of the most excellent of the State. As we will see in this article the question of art is not at all a question of mere taste, or that of affording a "well rounded" education. Art as understood by the neo-platonic tradition which we represent poses the most crucial questions for the survival and progress of mankind, and properly defined represents the highest form of knowledge.

Nothing more difficult to conceive nowadays than this, - when art rather than being the means by which to mediate Beauty and Reason has become the means by which to effect precisely the opposite: to degrade the human individual to the worst possible forms of bestiality and irrationality. Did you meet Beauty and Reason the last time you walked around in a modern art museum? Horrors, no! You were plunged in an infernal pit of deep folly: rage, pornography, murder, fear, anguish, sexual perversion and the worst possible forms of human perversion have become the subjects celebrated and glorified by the so-called modern art.

But the problem is much older than modern art. Bestialist -

painting was not born with Picasso and Salvador Dali, even though they may certainly be credited with having produced the most hideous form of art the human species has been able to muster; - pornographic little pigs like Rubens and his follower Jordaens in the 17th century, or the likes of David, Gericault and Delacroix later on, were part of the same bestialist faction in art whose father was none other than Aristotle. In fact, contrary to what most art historians today gullibly believe, there are not ten thousand and one different artistic movements in human history. Art history can be reduced to the struggle between two diametrically opposed, antagonistic conceptions of art. One is the bestialist Aristotelian conception whose subject of inquiry is all that which pertains to the realm of the UGLY, ugly defined as that which lacks Reason, lawfulness and which is generated by bestial passion. The other, is the Platonic conception of art whose aim is to attain the highest Good available to mankind and which we will define as the Science of Beauty.

It is Aristotle who is responsible for nominalism and bestialism in philosophy and politics, who also, for the first time, systematized in his Politics, the conception which would give birth to all which is hideous in art. Aristotle, who hated the creative powers of the mind, and who saw the struggle of the species to use those powers to master the universe for man through science and technology as being the source of "pain and suffering", defined the role of Art in his Politics as being the - "remedy" to that "hard reality", that form of expression which allows man to escape the pain and suffering of using his mind in productive activity and provide him with "agreeable" sensations.

For the Aristotelians who reduce man to a mere creature of the senses in no way fundamentally different than the beast, and with no other aim in existence than the frenetic research of sensual pleasure, the very powerful artistic medium has - always been the means par excellence to degrade and maintain man at that level by evoking bestial emotions in the viewer or listener. That this is unfortunately the underlying conception of all art today needs hardly to be stated but let us just for a reminder quote the definition of Surrealism given by the - authors of that movement themselves in the Surrealist Manifesto in order to emphasize our point: "Surrealism, noun, masc., pure psychich automatism by which it is intended to express, either verbally or in writing, the true function of thought. Thought dictated in the absence of all control exerted by reason, and outside all aesthetic or moral preoccupations". -- (illustrations bestialist paintings).

If Leonardo could have heard such people he would undoubtedly have said of them as he said of others: I don't think that small minded, borish men of lowly morals deserve an organism as beautiful, and with such a variety of functions as that of great men of science. The first are nothing but a bag where food enters and comes out. One should rather identify them to a food canal, because nothing proves to me that they participate in any way to the human species except their voice and figure... otherwise they ressemble enough the beasts... One should call - them dung makers, and toilet fillers, since it is their only role in life. They practice no virtue, and the only thing they leave behind are the toilets full"!

We propose therefore with Leonardo that our beautiful museums stop being used as toilets and that the entire collection of - bestialist works, whether classic or modern, be moved to the place where it belongs!

Nothing could be more opposite to the neo-platonic conception of art, which quite the contrary, views art as the PRIVILEGED MEANS by which to uplift man of that hellish pit, out of what Leonardo calls the corporeal prison of bestial existence and into the realm of Reason and universal beauty. The platonics start from the conception that man is potentially two - beings: the little beastly described above, or a God-like individual. To the extent that man locates his sense or identity - in his corporeal nature, as the Aristotelians do, there exist no fundamental difference between man and beast. Both man and beast perceive the world through their senses, both have sensual appetites and pleasures, and both are finites, will die - one day. To the extent that man locates his sense of identity in his creative powers, as those powers enable him to increase his mastery over nature and to improve the existence of his society, man becomes truly human, that is, man becomes God-like, or Divine. What we mean by God-like is the following. In the Platonic tradition, God is the name given to the creative principle governing the development of our univers, a principle which is coherent with the creative motion of the human mind. The - univers is not seen, as in the Aristotelian tradition, as one having been created once and for all, and determined for all - times, but as an intelligent and self-perfecting univers governed by a law of self- development. It is this creative princi-

ple which has led the univers to move in a perfectly lawfull process of self-perfection from a lower order of organization, that defined by the inorganic univers, to higher orders of organization, the organic univers and Reason. Creative Reason is the highest achievement of that process of self-perfection since it enables man to reproduce the workings of that fundamental law of the univers in his own mind. Creative mentation is the ability of man to generate self-perfecting hypothesis about the laws governing the univers, which, put into application in the form of scientific and technological advances allow man to become - God himself, that is to harness nature and perfect it deliberately becoming thus himself the creative guiding force of the -- univers. Or, put in the language of neo-platonic christianity, just as God created a self-perfecting univers, man, its highest achievement, has the power to become "God is little helper in the eternal task of creation" by creating endlessly new ideas which realized allow him to pursue the process of self-perfection of the univers. It is this creative principle which Plato defines as the highest cause of the univers, the Good and the Beautiful in themselves. The Good because it represents the most perfect possible lawfull ordering of the univers, and the Beautiful, because Beauty is the interior sense of harmony which pertains to all that which is ordered according to the most perfect cause of the univers.

It is only upon this world conception that we can properly define the role of art. Art is that form of knowledge privileged to have as its unique task to make human beings divine, to uplift their souls through Beauty, to the realm of the Good and

the Beautiful in themselves. From that standpoint we declare war on the surrealists and other food bags, and we define the role of art as PRIMARILY MORAL. By moral we do not mean that art should depict moralizing scenes, but that Art must be that form of knowledge which improves human beings, which gives them a concrete experience of Divinity, so that they might become better and abandon a bestial existence. This was Leonardo's conception of Art: "Art", he says, "represents nothing else - than true pleasure and moral improvement: it heals from the original bestiality. Have this for absolute truth: men are - born beasts and how many of them die without having been anything other than bags where food goes through".

Art heals from the original bestiality by making of the creative process its only subject of inquiry. It is from this standpoint that we say that art is the HIGHEST FORM OF KNOWLEDGE. Scientists and others might shriek upon hearing this. Let them shriek. We invite them to read through this article and hope they will be able then to join us in the realm of the truly divine things. Art is the highest form of knowledge because contrary to other sciences whose subject of inquiry limits itself to specific or particular areas of inquiry, art and art alone inquires into the very essence of those creative processes which make creative discoveries in any particular field of inquiry possible. Let physicists discover the true functioning of the physical laws of the univers, let anatomists discover the true functioning of the laws governing the human body, let geometres discover the laws governing physical space, but let ART TEACH THEM FIRST THE SECRETS GOVERNING CREATIVE MENTATION

so that they might have the mental tools by which to innovate in all their fields!

But art does not only move the intellectual faculties of the mind; the power of Art lies in the fact that it moves the soul through Beauty. Art eliminates all dichotomy between formal, unemotional thought on the one hand, and bestial emotion on the other, and unites thought and emotion according to the highest cause of the univers, the Good and the Beautiful in themselves. Art achieves, this, as will become clearer later on, by using the objects of sense perception, of ear and sight, to mediate a perfectly scientifically, lawfully ordered, creative conception, making of a work of art something that could be defined like a beautiful conception, or what is the same, as a reasoned emotional quality. For these reasons we say that Art is the Science of Beauty.

And art does not just talk about the creative process, it does not content itself with describing the creative process as one could read it out of a book, but leads the viewer or listener scientifically through the ACTUAL PROCESS of creating a new conception. By evoking creativity concretely in the viewer, Art teaches the soul what is the method by which he can generate creative ideas, a method which has nothing to do with mystics or irrationality but is entirely lawfull and knowable.

It is this taste of actually creating a new conception which is then associated with the titillating excitement, or being uplifted while contemplating or listening to the great works or art. It is in this short, exciting moment of the creative experience that Art uplifted man to the realm of divinity. It

brings man into coherence with the fundamental law of the univers, or the neo-platonic God. It is thus the artist who is the closest to divinity and he who has the task of uplifting others to that realm. And if you don't believe me, hear what the greatest scientist and artist of the italian renaissance, Leonardo had to say about this: "See who are the true richmen! Are they not the artists who give to the common man the treasures of their visions, and who manifest the perfection of things, and prove the all powerfull hand the Great Artist of which they are the chef-d'oeuvre since they have the divine faculty to - create"!

Herein lies the tremendous power of Art, and the reason why Plato and ourselves give to art, an essential, crucial, role in the education of our guardians and of society as a whole. As Leonardo expressed it so clearly in the last lesson he delivered to his Milan Academy, a society with no painting, and we can add, with no art, is a blind society, not because it cannot see anything, but because it cannot see the ESSENTIAL, the creative principle governing the univers and our minds, which is the primary cause, causing all other things that come into being.

For these reasons as well, Art has been one of the main political weapons wielded in the life of death struggle the has opposed throughout history the neo-platonic humanist elite, - that political faction to which we owe all scientific and technological progress of the specie to our days, to the bestialist oligarchy, the controllers of Aristotle, who have used every - available means throughout history to maintain the human species at a bestial level. The power of art as a political weapon lies

not in the fact that the themes depicted would be themselves political. This would be to reduce the term "political" to its most banal and superficial sense. The political struggle between the neo-platonics and the bestialists can only be defined ultimately as a battle for the control of the minds of people, the neo-platonics aiming at educating the population to the level of Reason; the bestialists doing precisely the opposite. The outcome of the struggle between both factions will be ultimately determined by whoever wins this epistemological war.

The importance of art in this epistemological war, as the most powerful language by which one can either educate larger layers of the population to Reason thus strengthening the humanist faction overall, or, as the case of Rock music so hideously proves, destroy larger layers of the population, -- turning them into furious Dionysians manipulable by the oligarchy, was fully understood by both factions. The warning made by Plato to his guardians in the Republic against allowing bestialist music or poetry to be introduced in the perfect State shows that Plato was fully aware of this double edge sword - character of art. The slightest change in music in that direction warns Plato in a warning that should have been listened to by our Heads of State in the 50's and the 60's when the oligarchy laughed at the onslaught on civilization known as Rock music, - might lead to the destruction of the State. Just as the contemplation of the Beautiful in Art has the power to move people to that realm, so contemplation of the Ugly, of folly and insanity, has a similar power to evoke folly and insanity in the viewer. What will our children be like if they are brought up to contemplate everywhere the models of corruption, of sexual brutality,

of rape and murder, which are the models glorified by modern painting? The answer is self-evident. If then the society celebrates that insanity, as is the case today where Rock music - and modern painting have become the Arts of the States, then the viewer or listener begin to associate folly with that which is expected and celebrated by society, and not as deformities which must be overcome. At that point, the society, as is the case unfortunately now, is nearly dead.

Thus contrary to all attempts of art historian to make us believe that great artists, or bestialists were not involved in politics, or if they were, it was a matter of pure coincidence, neo-platonic and bestialist artistes, were both at the very - core of the humanist or bestialist political factions and -- struggles of their day, wielding Art as the means by which - either improve or destroy the species.

On the side of the humanist painters, the top political role played by Leonardo in the Florentine Republic is generally well known, but most of the other great painters of the time were - also top political humanist figures: Van Eyck, for example, was a diplomat in the court of the only Burgundian humanist Duc, - Philip the Good; Brueghel, was most probably assassinated by the bloody Duc of Albe for being a close collaborator of the humanist networks of the great William the Silent in the Low Countries, along with other figures such as the great mathematician Simon Stevin, and the geographer Mercator. Although - hardly no biographical references remain today of the great - painter Hyeronimus Bosch, one can conclude from the violent - and sophisticated attacks made by Bosch in his works against -

the Whore of Babylon, the Isis Cult, and the dominican monks who practiced those cults -- all forms of black magic cults associated with the oligarchy -- that Bosch was not only a great humanist painter, but most probably a top intelligence agent for the humanist faction of his time.

These great artists used painting as a means to educate the masses to reason. Brueghel for instance, made excellent polemical engravings on the themes of the capital sins which were then printed into mass leaflets by his friend Plantin, the great humanist printer of Antwerpen, and distributed to the population. Duhrer was known to do the same thing. Great works of Art were very often in churches where the majority of the population had the access to contemplate them. Today one can still get a taste of how that experience was like when one visits the Ghent Cethedral. In one of the beautiful chapels of the Cathedral, hanging on the same wall where it hung nearly 5 centuries ago, one finds the greatest work of Van Eyck, The Mystical Lamb. As turists and others crowd in the small chapel, a priest proudly opens the triptic and watches his audience be moved deeply through the intense beauty of this work which celebrates the coming and dying of Christ which opened the realm of Reason to mankind. Millions of people during the course of the last 5 centuries have been moved by this work and will continue to be so in the course of the next centuries!

In a similar way we can trace the top artists of the bestialist oligarchy from the pornographic Rubens, up to the Picassos and Dalis of today. The case of Rubens is exemplary: a diplomat for the hideous Spanish Habsbourg court, Rubens had been educated

and primed for his job by the networks of assassins and spies of the oligarchy otherwise known as the Society of Jesus. Dali is also exemplary: an a fascist and monarchist serving the interests of the present day bestialist oligarchy centered around the European crowns, Dali is also associated with H. G. Wells and the french Louis Pauwels, both close associates of the British monarchy working for the explicit aim of establishing a new dark ages today. Dali, an open supporter of drug consumption, stated the aims of his art quite explicitly in a recent interview to french television: my art, he stated, is like a drug, emotions in people which they know are reality -- and once they have begun to look at it, it is addictive like a drug, they cannot stop...

The oligarchy has led a massive and successfull drive, during the last 2 centuries to destroy neo-platonic art, and there can be no doubt that this destruction of the arts has been a main contributing factor to the present degeneration and decay of the society as a whole. Society has been blinded by the oligarchy. The last of the truly great painters was the great Goya; ever since, the most excellent of arts of Da Vinci, has fallen system matically into ever deeper pits of insanity. The last of the great poets were Schiller and Edgar Allan Poe; since then, poetry followed the same road of painting. The situation is essentially the same for music, or for theatre.

At it's historic conference held in Detroit in December 1979, the International Caucus of Labor Committees, the most advanced neo-platonic organization in the history of humanity to date, determined that the only way to stop the present crisis of hu-

manity from leading to the end of civilization in the next period ahead, was to generate a new great golden renaissance, - comparable in grandeur to the great renaissance of the 15th and 16th centuries. The policies of the bestialist oligarchy squatting today in England, the Carter administration, Israel and - China have led humanity to one of those points, where either the humanists brutally and rapidly take over and begin to set humanity back on its road to progress, or we will be facing the extinction of the entire civilization, much, in the same way as the great and advanced culture of Atlantis died. Because of the oligarchy we are now facing for the first time in history the possibility that the whole human species could be annihilated in a thermonuclear confrontation. Even if humanity were to - avoid a nuclear catastrophe, hegemony of the oligarchy over - the economic policies of the world, have led to the present - collapse of the economy which threatens equally to destroy the civilization. And when we look at that element of society which could save us and bring society out of this mess, the youth, we find that the very same oligarchy has destroyed whole sections of that youth through Rock music, counterculture and drugs.

Only through a new golden renaissance, a new outburst of human creativity of the quality of the golden renaissance, can we stop the present destruction of our civilization and this huge task cannot be accomplished unless it is led by a renaissance of great art, and of painting in particular, since Art is the very Science of Creativity.

Art will be the means by which to open the eyes of mankind to the method by which one creates deliberately new ideas, and

art will be the means by which to restore to the human species what it lacks the most at this point: Beauty. We can condemn the present state of affairs in the world for all kinds of Reasons, but let us here condemn it because it makes the univers ugly, chaotic and disordered, and precisely the very opposite of what is harmonious. Let us therefore use Art to make the univers and our society, good, beautiful and harmonious, or - what is the same, let us set the world in its road to scientific and technological progress, so that it functions beautifully in coherence with the fundamental law of the univers.

To realize this task, the scientific redefinition of neo-platonic art is necessary. This article on the creative principle of painting is a contribution to that task.

THE GOOD AND THE BEAUTIFUL IN THEMSELVES

Art is the Science of Beauty, but since our world quite obviously seems to mistake the beautiful for the ugly, we must first redefine Beauty, or Plato's Good and Beautiful in themselves scientifically if we are to generate a new renaissance of the Arts. Then we will proceed to define what is the method by which painting reaches the Good and the Beautiful in Themselves.

We will redefine painting as a science of Beauty on the basis of the conception of neo-platonic art developed by the most advanced neo-platonic humanist in history to date, Lyndon H. - LaRouche. After nearly two centuries of destruction of the arts, Lyndon LaRouche and his wife Helga Zepp LaRouche, are the two

people who have been able to fully reestablish the neo-platonic roots of Art, and the crucial importance of Art for the human society. We refer the reader to the numerous documents published by both on the question.

For the rest, the main conceptions which went into the elaboration of this article, are those of Plato, of Leonardo da Vinci, and of Edgar Allan Poe, who together represent the very pillars on which the science of art must stand today.

The best vantage point from which to understand what we mean by Beauty is Plato's famous image of the man chained inside the cave, possibly Plato's most powerful image to point at the three different levels of existence available to man. As we have outlined elsewhere the three platonic levels correspond to the three phases of development of man as he moves from the infantile lower level, through adolescence, onto the highest level, that of adulthood. In Plato's language these are successively, the bronze, silver and golden souls. Beauty-in-itself can only be understood from the standpoint of the level of the golden soul. We will help ourselves with some of the works of the great painters to illustrate each of these levels. Then we will go into the language of painting properly speaking.

Imagine says Plato, a man who was born inside a dark cave, was chained at birth to the floor of the cave and made to look, all his life, towards the cave's darkest wall. Behind him, and invisible to him, is a ramp and behind the ramp a big fire, the only light inside the cave. On the ramp, marionettes are moving around. All the chained man sees throughout his life are the

shadows of the manionettes on the wall. He does not know real marionettes only their shadows.

This poor wretch is man existing in the lowers, bronze soul level of mind. Not only does he not see the true causes of things, he does not even know the objects, the ephemeral themselves, only their shadows. These are Leonardo's food canals, those men for whom reality is only what they can perceive -- through their senses. Goya and Brueghel depict such individuals with abnormally developed mouths to taste, huge noses to smell, strong bodily features big ears to hear... and hardly no brains.

Indeed, man at this level doesn't think, he only "feels", and since he only "feels" his only aim in life is to satisfy his sensual appetites and to look for sensual pleasure. He does not think in the sense that he doesn't recognize the existence of universal law and causality, a law which must be abided under peril of being destroyed, and refuses to govern his own behavior according to it. Thinking for the bronze soul is reduced to that activity which allows him to define the means by which to obtain ever higher and more amusing forms of sensual pleasure.

Morally, this man exhibits the morality of a little pig, and by saying this probably we are insulting the pig who after all is nothing but a little beast in the first place. Freedom for the bronze soul is the liberty to do as he pleases, as he feels regardless of consequences this might bring to the society, and to himself ultimately, Freedom for the greenies, creatures of feeling who fear progress, is to halt scientific and tech-

nological development regardless of the fact that this will bring death to millions of people. Freedom for the wretched counterculture freak is to be able to shoot himself up with ever more powerful drugs in a frenetic search for bigger pleasures, regardless of the fact that at one point he will be dead, and will have led other to death. Freedom for the terrorists is to kill humanists, those "fascists" who attempt to impose the "dictatorship of Reason" upon the irrationality of feeling.

The emotional realm of existence of such creatures is best defined by the christians capital sins: rage, luxury, cupidity, arrogance, are the emotional colourings which govern their existence.

Running eternally after the objects of sense perception and sensual pleasure, the men in the cave, and these poor wretches, are unable to grasp reality which lies not with the objects - that come and go, the ephemerals, and much less in their shadows, but in the hideous causes which are responsible for the existence of such ephemerals.

When one unchains the man in the cave, continues Plato, and bring him out into the sun light, he will, in the first moments be blinded and unable to see anything around him; he would turn immediately back to his shadows thinking that they represent the only true reality and not the objects themselves. But as he - grows used to the light, he is able to see the true objects - which exist and to begin to inquire about them, to locate them in the univers, to group them according to their nature into - different categories, to create sciences for the different objects of inquiry, arithmetic, medicine, etc. all while still -

not daring to look directly into the sun, the highest cause of the existence of all things.-

This defines the second level of consciousness, or that of the adolescent, or what we can affectionately call the level of the civilized empiricist. Man at this level begins to use his mind, and to abandon the simple reality of the objects of perception. He recognizes the existence of universal law and causality and accepts to rule his behavior accordingly but... negatively. Universal law and the laws -- of the society are seen as the lesser necessary evil compared to the total chaos which would result for all in society were it to be governed according to the first level. The infantile commitment to - sensual gratification, as in the infantile level, is not negated completely though, it is only negated insofar as this commitment might bring nefast consequences to the society and therefore ultimately to himself.

Many evils result from this. The commitment to two fundamentally different world outlooks -- Reason and bestial sensual gratification -- leads to a dichotomy in the sense of - identity of the individual between public and private life. In public, the silver soul feels obliged to act according to law, lest worst evils befall on him, while in his innermost private self, and in his private life, the silver soul still believes, much like the bronze soul, that true pleasure, or - the true sense of existence, is to be able to achieve the same forms of bestial sensual gratification. This is the case of most people in the society, for whom their public life has no value in itself, or for the contribution it makes to the exis-

tence of humanity as a whole; public life is only the necessary evil, necessary to obtain the desired gratification, either in the form of social acceptance or status, or actual objects of gratification.

Morality for the silver soul is negative, Kantian morality. It is the morality of the old testament: "you shall not do... or else you will be punished". In public, therefore, his sense of identity is governed by the notion of hard, difficult, painful, boring, tiring, but... necessary DUTY. In his innermost soul, and in his private life, the silver soul still firmly believes, that true FREEDOM, is to do what one "feels" like doing, or ANARCHY, as in the first level.

The dichotomy in the sense of identity of the individual - leads also to a dichotomy between thought and emotion. Thought becomes formal and unemotional since the silver soul does not accept the full implications of truth, knowledge about the univers, for his whole self, his innermost sense of identity still being governed by irrational compulsion towards the objects of gratification. Although more acceptable-to-society, the emotional realm and colorations of the silver soul remain fundamentally the same as for the bronze soul: pornography, cupidity, jealousy, ire, etc., remain as the essential emotional material of our silver souls, in their private life.

In the Labor Committees we know these people very well. - These are the good, productive people of the society, who always respond to us: "I know that the economic crisis might lead to a catastrophe, I know there is a danger of war... but I cannot join your struggle... I have my career... my studies... my -

house... my leasures... me... me... me..." These are also our good scientists, those productive people who appear to be ambulant rationalities. Do a test: pick the first scientist, - engineer or other you might find, and talk to him about universal Beauty, about Reasoned Beauty, and if you're a beautiful - women of Reason, like Leonardo's Mona Lisa, be prepared to run and hide as he becomes red in the face thinking about Brigitte Bardot!

Not having fundamentally negated the primary reality of the object, knowledge becomes also an object of gratification, or a means by which to obtain gratification, and therefore the - thinking ability of the silver soul is reduced to the ability of ordering and categorizing existing objects, or objects of knowledge. The man in this second level is unable to inquire therefore, into actual TRUTH, which lies not with the objects that come into being and disappear, nor with particular bits of knowledge, but with the PROCESSES by which all and knowledge about all comes into being.

It is these first two levels of mind, and the underlying unconciouss level of the mind which are the subject of Jerome Bosch's masterpiece, the Garden of Delights. Let us just note here that Bosch possible the most controverted painter in human history, DID NOT defend bestialism nor irrationalism, nor did he take drugs or support drug intaking as a means to achieve creativity, as slanders circulated in recent times in particular by one Wilhelm Fraenger would have it. No painter has led a most vicious polemic against the bestial irrational outlook, and against the oligarchy which is inducing the population to

those outlooks, that Hieronymus Bosch. It is precisely the intensity of the attacks of Bosch on bestialism which has provoked an eerie feeling in the viewers for centuries. What provokes that eerie feeling in the viewers of Bosch is the very in-depth psychological understanding of all levels of the mind, and his capacity to use a very powerful metaphorical pictorial language, to make those levels unmistakably clear and conscious to the viewer.

For instance, rather than depicting bestiality by enlarging and rendering very crude certain physical attributes as you can see in Bruegel's and some times Goya's peasants, Bosch will - often give animal traits to his human figures. And not just any animal, but those to whom the human mind associates the worst possible forms of degradation: birds, horses, unicorns, typical universal symbols of sexual bestiality, or insects, - animals which to this date provoke in people the irrational fear of a universe which is actually unmasterable. These images tend to populate the deep unconscious.

Now look closely to the Garden of Delights. In the best of cases critics have said that the painting represents the "Creation of Man", with the actual moment of creation portrayed on the left hand panel, the consequences of the downfall of - Adam and Eve and the downfall of humanity with them depicted in the middle panel, and the final day, the day of punishment, - hell, depicted in the righthand panel. The "Creation of Man" is actually the title painted on the closed flaps of the - painting by Bosch. But this is only partially true, rather the Creation is the known theme that Bosch chose in order to

build the metaphorical pictorial content which is the true - subject of the painting. We begin with the left hand panel which indeed represents the creation of man as per the Genesis: we find there the birds, reptiles and other creatures of creation; the fountain of life in the middle with its four rivers, and God the Father having just created Adam and Eve - according to his own image. But is this the creation as was understood by neo-platonic christianity? Is this the paradise of Reason of Dante; is this the day of creation of a most perfect, most beautiful univers, and of Promethean, God-like man? Although all objects are there to depict such a notion of paradise, althought at first sight one is struck by a certain order and beauty in the panel, the first impression rapidly gives way to a more and more eary feeling that far from representing the "ideal paradise", this paradise hides something - rotten. Many elements are creating this impression which do not meet the eye at first sight. The landscape for instance and the mounts one sees in the bakcground, are not only depicting the sort of barren univers of the beginning of all - ages; there are organic forms to these mounts, reminding one of fish and insect forms. The same organic, insect-like character is to be found in the fountain of life to such an extent that the more one looks into these forms the more it appears as they could come alive and start walking. The owl, bird of bad omen, placed in the middle of the fountain of life, as well as the pond of stagnating, rotten waters just at the feet of Adam, Eve and God the Father, contribute to create the overall feeling of eariness associated eith such a paradise. Also if

you look at the figure of Eve, and then you look directly vertically upwards from her figure you will find the giraffe, symbol of female pride, strangely standing in the same position and resembling Eve! Note the use by Bosch of non-literal imagery, images that cannot exist in reality but are metaphorical. Bosch is bringing together beauty of color and order, and these eerie elements which combined creates the idea that although it does look like paradise... there is something nonetheless rotten - about this paradise.

We go now to the middle panel, and one has to be a fool not to see that here Bosch is depicting a Dionysian paradise, if one can call that a paradise. Here we find our man of the first level, in fact hundreds of them, letting loose of all rational restraints and indulging in the gratification of all possible sensual appetites, lust in particular. Raspberries, cherries, strawberries and grapes, as well as animals are used as symbols of sexual lust which men are running after, or devouring in a great orgy. Those who have some insight into the processes of the mind will not have any difficulty to recognize that this panel in itself could be used as the most basic and useful fundamental psychology handbook to gain insight into the bestial mind. Take a look for instance at the middle plane of the center panel, at the pond in which the young maiden - bathe. Only women are bathing in this pond and all wear symbols of sexual bestiality on their heads, either the fruit of evil or a bird. Around the pond a cavalcade of men, mounting obscene beasts depicted so as to signify the fury of bestial passions, turn in what seems to be an endless circle, around -

the pond. What keeps the circle going is that all the men are chasing after the fruits of wvil which are, like the proverbial's horse's carrot, eternally out of their reach since the circle is always moving. But this is precisely one of the characteristics of the bestial individual, that is that it is not the object in itself which is so desired, rather the whole fantasy associated to the desire to reach the object. Once the object consumed, depression sets in, and off he goes again in the search of a new more gratifying object... And the circle will turn and turn and turn...

Let's go back now to our left hand panel and discover what is so easy about it. If you look at both panels together you will discover that the geographical setting for both is essentially the same. The same mounts of the left hand panel are taken up again in a slightly different form in the middle panel. The fountain of life in the left hand panel has become the fountain of Adultery in the middle one. One finds also in the middle panel the same geographical line which in the left hand panel separates the fountain of life from the scene including God the Father, Adam and Eve.

The essential difference however, is that there where beasts acting like beasts, are surrounding the ponds and populating the left hand panel, men acting like beasts are populating the middle one! The point which Bosch is trying to make should by now be an obvious one: although all the forms and predicates are present in the left hand panel to represent an orderly and rational paradise, a paradise as would be understood from the stand point of the second level of knowledge, there is another

principle governing the world outlook in this panel which has nothing to do with order and rationality, but which is in fact the Dyonisian outlook depicted in the middle panel.

For reasons of space we have chosen to point to these limited aspects in the work. Much more could be said about the Garden of Delights which is a true treasure, not only of psychology, but of political intelligence and warfare as well.

CREATIVE REASON

Out of the cave, out of the darkness of bestial existence where man is chained by his senses, he comes out to the light, and begins to discover his mental faculties. He discovers he has the ability to think about the univers, about the true objects that exist there and their relationships, and yet, though at a more advanced level than our bronze souls, primary reality he still locates in knowledge about the things that come and go. As man turns his eyes into the sun, the source of light itself, he sees no longer the objects nor their arrangements, but the very essence of that Highest Cause, as it causes all that exists in the Univers. He begins to realize that the objects that come and go are nothing but the visible predicates, the visible moments of something which is of an ETERNAL nature and which is to be located in that Highest Cause. We develop the argument as has been developed by the neo-platonics, and then we take it up from our modern stand point. This Highest Cause, Plato's Good and Beautiful in Themselves, or Universal Law, defines the Univers as a Whole, the Whole having a higher reality than the multiplicity of predicates that belong to -

that whole. This Whole though, is not a simple, fixed whole, one determined for all times, but is governed by the law of self-perfection, of progress. Far from being a clock which will wind out one day, as our present day malthusians believe, the univers exhibits precisely the opposite characteristic, - the ability of moving from lower to higher more complex modes of organization in a process of self-perfection.

It is this process which represents Eternity, as opposed to the ephemeral quality of the objects that come and go; -- those objects however cannot be negated because it is through the generation of the multiple, and through the activity of the multiple vis á vis the whole -- as in Leibniz's monads -- that the process of self-perfection of the Univers accomplishes itself. This is the platonic solution to the millenary paradox of the One and the Multiple. What is primary? Is it the Whole, the Universal, and if this is the case are the parts entirely determined by the whole, in which case freedom would not exist? Or are the parts primary? The solution is that neither the whole as a simple fixed totality, nor the parts in themselves are primary, but primary reality must be located in the continuous process of self-perfection of the totality, one which is accomplished through the intelligent and willfull activity and mediation of its parts.

What we mean by "creative" univers, is precisely this process by which the univers moves "intelligently" and "rationally" from lower forms of organization to higher ones. This process is neither irrational, nor arbitrary; it is an entirely lawfull process by which the univers seems to gathers its forces from

within and generates through the activity of predicates qualitatively new, successively more developed, modes of organization, of which man is the highest form of perfection. Being a lawful process it is also knowable. One can know the activity of certain predicates, singularities, leads lawfully - to qualitative changes in the existence of the Whole.

As man is contemplating that ETERNAL cause, the sun in Plato's image, he realizes that his own mind participates in that very Eternal essence, since he is able to grasp with his own mind, the process of eternal generation and self-perfection - of the Univers. And it is this ability, that defines man as the Highest point of achievement of the process of self-development of the Univers. Of all created creatures, man and man alones participates in both the essence of Eternity and of multiplicity. From the standpoint of his body man is just as - ephemeral as any beast or thing, and if he choses to locate his sense of identity on that ephemeral aspect of his being, he will be like beasts or things, just one more of those objects that come and go, and leave no traces upon the univers except the toilets full; from the standpoint of his mind, he reaches Eternity: he is able to grasp that Eternal cause by which all came into being including his own mind, and use that knowledge to become himself God, to become the creative guiding force - leading the univers further in its process of self-perfection.

That this creative principle does represent the fundamental law of the univers has been proven by the actual process of - self-development of the univers up through the development of mankind. As Lyndon H. LaRouche has pointed out in many arti-

cles, from the present state of physical science we know that the Univers has developed from the mode of existence defined by inorganic matter, to a higher mode of existance defined by organic matter, and to the third higher mode, as defined by Reason. We can use the denomination N , $N + 1$, $N + 2$ to define the three successively higher modes. Each of these modes is qualitatively and fundamentally different from the others; - they are governed by sets of laws which are particular to each mode. However, $N + 1$ emerged out of N , and $N + 2$ emerged of $N + 1$ in an entirely lawfull manner. Therefore we can define these three modes as subuniversalities, governed by particular sets of laws, but belonging all three to a higher process or reality, which is that defined by the process of self-perfection, or by that law of self-perfection which guides the univers in its passing from N , to $N + 1$, to $N + 2$.

Reason is defined as the highest point of achievement of that process since Man, through Creative Reason is able to grasp consciously the process of self-perfection of the univers, and to make of that invariant of progress, consciously, the law governing not only the development of human society, but all the other lower order modes of organization of the univers, those defined previously as N and $N + 1$.

That the development of mankind corresponds and is entirely coherent with that process has been demonstrated by the several thousand years history of humanity. As with the univers, humanity is of all created creatures the only one whose very mode of existance, whose very essence, exhibits the characteristic of a self-perfecting whole. In a manner and logous to

the development of the Univers from the N through the $N + 2$ modes, humanity has moved from a population potential of a mere handfull in primitive times, up to the present 5 billion, through the development of successively higher and more sophisticated modes of organization -- each mode being defined by - the degrees of scientific and technological advancement of the society as a whole.

What made the passing from one mode of organization to a - higher one possible is the creative ability of man to understand the underlying laws of the universe, and to create the scientific and technological tools by which he is able to harness the univers to humanity's benefit. Therefore creativity, as that creativity is realized in scientific and technological innovations, represents also the invariant of the development of the human species.

FREEDOM AND NECESSITY

We have stated before that the creative principle governing the development of the univers is of an entirely LAWFULL and knowable sort. And this poses one of the most important epistemological problems is world history, a problem that Kant was unable to solve, which is the apparent paradox between Freedom and Necessity. It appears at first sight that if the Univers is governed by laws, that freedom cannot exist other than in the form of irrationality. Or as poor Kant forumulated the problem in his antinomies: "In proximity with such a lawless faculty of freedom, a system of nature is hardly cogitable; for the laws of the latter would be continually subject to the

intrusive influences of the former, and the course of phenomena, which would otherwise proceed regularly and uniformly, would - become thereby confused and disconnected".

Same thing for society. The problem of our silver soul is precisely this one: if the society is governed by laws by which we must abide, the freedom can only exist in the form of the anarchistic "do as I feel like" in my private life.

This paradox arises only when one starts from the standpoint that the laws governing the univers are of a deterministic - and mecanistic sort. Indeed if the univers were governed by mecanistic law, then Freedom would only exist as Freedom to - irrationnally break that law. But the history of our univers as we have defined it before proves that it is not mecanistic las which governs the univers; rather the univers has gone - through successive and total revolutions of its modes of organization, defining when looked upon from the most general - standpoint, a process of self-perfection.

Does this mean that there is no causality, and that arbitrary governs? No, that only means that there is a higher sort of causality governing the univers, the causality of a self-perfecting process. This causality, or Law of the Univers, while imposing laws of necessity includes also Freedom within its parameters. But by freedom we no longer mean here irrationality, but the freedom to use its creative capacities to generate new ideas, or modes of organization which solve the problems posed to the univers or mankind by the laws of necessity, and which revolutionize the specific sets of laws governing the univers at any specific mode of organization.

This higher sort of causality is the law of the necessity of progress. Since progress or process of self-perfection are the essential attribute of the existence of the univers, the univers and man, who is its consciousness, must abide to it, must guarantee eternally progress, under danger of perishing. But at the same time, the univers and man possess the divine tools by which to abide to this law, and that is Freedom and Creativity: the freedom to create the new conceptions which upon realization will result in the continued progress of the species and the univers.

The history of the development of the univers through mankind also proves that this process has been realized through the - continuous successful resolution of that Freedom/Necessity paradox. Every revolution in the mode of organization of the univers came about at period of crisis, crisis brought about by the fact that a certain mode of organization was no longer appropriate to allow the continued progress of that univers. The qualitative revolutions of those modes realized by the - passing from the N to the N + 2 modes were the creative solutions found by the univers for the purpose of ensuring its continued existence and development.

Similar for the development of man. Each new technological mode designed by man at any given point in time will necessarily outlive its own usefulness and demand to pass to a higher more complex mode. The reason for this is that is through - technologic that man discovers the resources which are necessary for his own existence and development. These resources being always finite, the continued existence of society in one techno-

logical mode will necessarily pose the question of survival to humanity at a certain point. As the particular mode of organization begins to outlive its usefulness -- as resources for humanity in that particular mode deplete -- man confronts the problem that either he creates a new mode, of a higher more efficient nature, or the species will be confronted with death. To the extent that man has developed those new solutions, to that extent the development of humanity has taken place to our days, and will continue.

Therefore, we are bounded by the law of the necessity of progress, to continue the progress of mankind and the univers, but we are FREE, to use our creative faculties to design those new modes of organization by which the species will continue an eternal process of perfection.

An this law, natural law for the humanists, represents Plato's Good and Beautiful in Themselves. Good because it is the most perfect, rational ordering possible for the univers; - Beautiful because of the inherent harmony -- a harmony which moves the senses -- of all that which is governed by Reason.

THE GOLDEN SOUL

Only when man has contemplated the Good and the Beautiful in Themselves, says Plato, can he begin to rule his own behavior in public and in private according to that natural law. Those men who have tested Eternity, are the Golden Souls, those who have abandoned all pornographic fixation with the objects of sense perception and gratification, who realize that those object have no value in themselves, but only in so far as they

are necessary to mediate Eternal progress, and who rule their entire beings, in private and in public according to natural law. There is nothing wrong with the objects of perception, nor is there anything wrong with the fact that we perceive the world through our senses; what is wrong is to attribute reality to these mere predicates. Objects are necessary to the development of the univers, just as the senses are necessary to man's existence; but they must be governed and ordered by Reason.

THE GOLDEN SOULS

Only when man has contemplated the Good and the Beautiful in Themselves, says Plato in the Republic, can he begin to rule his own behavior in public and in private according to natural law. Those men who have tasted Eternity, are Plato's Golden Soul, men living according to Reason.

Knowing how the Univers truly functions, as a self-perfecting whole, means that man is able to abandon a pornographic fixation with the objects, and to understand that objects are nothing but the NECESSARY MEDIATORS of progress from one moment to the next, and not things to be researched in and for themselves. There is nothing wrong or evil in the objects themselves, but what is wrong or evil is to locate in them a reality which they don't have, reality existing only at the level of self-perfecting processes.

He realizes that he must locate his sense of identity in those qualities which are essential to man, as that essence of man has been defined by natural law. Natural law defines man

as the highest point of perfection of an eternal process of self-development of the univers. As such, man is the only creature of creation which is both Eternity and Multiplicity and - therefore, he is the only "predicate", who consciously, through the development of science and technologies, can lead the progress of his species and of the univers as a whole. Since the process of self-development of the univers is entirely lawfull, the future existence of that univers is DEPENDENT upon the fact that man actually fulfills the task he was given in creation so to speak. So man is bounded by natural law to further that - process, under peril of perishing if he doesn't. But at the - same time, man's essence has the attributes which will allow - him to realize this great task, and that is his creative mind.

Natural Law defines therefore a new positive notion of morality as opposed to the negative Kantian morality of the second level. It is the morality of Reason, Beauty, Love and Joy of the new Testament, as opposed to the morality of fear and punishment of the Old Testament. Negative morality presupposes irrationality, in the form of a research the objects of sense perception. Therefore negative morality, and evil, or irrationality, are somehow both partsof the same being.

Once the problem of the object solved there is no need for the negative morality of "do not... or else (any more). To be good, or to be moral, is to fully realize one's own role in - creation. To be moral or good for man is thus to locale his entire sense of identity, thought and emotion, in public and in private, in the creative contributions he must make to the progress of the species. To be moral is to take full respon-

sibility for the species as a whole so that mankind is able to realize its task. Man has not the freedom to act like a beast; man has the enormous responsibility to ensure that the work of the univers so far had a sense and that it will be furthered. And this is not just a constraint, although there is a NECESSARY, CONSTRAINING, aspect to natural law. There is a higher - level: de by natural law as a creative being, man possesses the essential attributes to be able to meet to this task. And what could be more beautiful than to fully realize oneself to make our species and our Univers Good and Beautiful, one which sel-perfects eternally. Think . Is it not eternity and immortality that man craves for the most throughout existence? then could be more beautiful than to know that through ones own creative contributions one will have overcome our ephemeral natures and contributed to a process which is eternal? - Is one not immortal when a thousand years from now mankind - will continue to exist only be cause of those creative contributions?

By locating his identity in that which makes him truly human, the Golden Soul, eliminates all dichotomy between thought and emotion. Thought is no longer a thing researched for itself as a means to obtain any form of intantile gratification which then leads to the formalization of thought. Thought becomes that divine tool which allows us to solve the problems posed by mankind's need for progress. And emotion, no longer attached to the things that come and go, ceases to be source of rage, jealousy, luxury, cupidity and all other forms of bestial passion, to become the true ally of Reason.

As with the objects, there is nothing wrong with emotion, or desire, in itself. Emotions, or the desire for something, only become bad emotions, when the object desired are of an ephemeral nature. But when the "object" desired is that to realize oneself according to natural law; or what is the same, when emotion is oriented towards what is real as defined by Reason, then emotion joins Reason, the heart joins the mind, to become the DRIVING FORCE FOR PROGRESS. Thus pornography and all other emotions give way to Love, the true driving force for progress of mankind.

Same for P There is nothing wrong with pleasure in itself: pleasure, Beauty, joy, happiness, etc. are all pleasures derived from knowledge that one has fulfills - one's own role in creation.

As our Golden Soul contemplates the Eternal essence, he begins to realize that true knowledge, has nothing to do with knowledge about things, since these things exist today tomorrow are gone. It is not even the ability to make groundbreaking discoveries or to develop whole new sciences, since these also will outlive their usefulness at some point. True knowledge therefore is only the knowledge about the lawfull method by which one creates new knowledge which is adequats to the continuous process of perfection of the species. This is Plato's Hypothesis of the Higher Hypothesis; knowledge is not in objects, nor is it in the single Hypothesis about the laws of the univers, even though that Hypothesis might be a higher - hypothesis, one that represents a qualitative revolution in existing knowledge. True knowledge is knowledge about the pro-

cess by which one lawfully generates successive Higher Hypothesis, or the Hypothesis of the Higher Hypothesis.

LEONARDO'S MONA LISA: A GOLDEN SOUL (illust. Mona Lisa)

Possibly the best pictorial representation to date of the Golden Soul, is Leonardo's Mona Lisa. No wonder the Mona Lisa has been so slandered: a lesbian, a homosexual, a sadistic woman, what has not been said of the Mona Lisa up through the unfortunately infamous portrait of the Mona Lisa with a mustache popularized recently by the British!.

Nothing could be farthest from reality! The Mona Lisa is the Ideal Form of Reasoned Beauty, a Beautiful Soul.

What is it that drives vulgar souls mad about the Mona Lisa? It is the ambiguity of expression, an ambiguity which has only one cause: the complexity of the mental processes of an individual who has fought and overcome infantilism and evil and has raised herself to the level of Reason. It is only in bo-
rish men of lowly morals that you find no ambiguity, their potential qualities of soul being reduced to a very limited, -
crude variety, defined by the emotional field of the christian's capital sins, qualities of soul which can be recognized immediately with no problem. The complexity of mind of the Golden Soul, one who daily takes responsibility for the species, and whose thinking processes are therefore of the quality of Plato's Higher Hypothesis, creates necessarily the ambiguities - which are the subject of Leonardo's Mona Lisa, or of any of Rembrandts self-portraits as well.

But what drives the vulgar soul even more out of their minds

when facing the Mona Lisa is the combination in one single image -- and that of a woman to boot, women who are generally associated with the worst forms of pornography -- of Reason, Beauty and grace, the qualities of the golden soul. The Mona Lisa is not only a woman of reason as you can see from her eyes and her general expression, but she is a beautiful woman of Reason!

The Mona Lisa was Leonardo's Beatrice. And if you don't believe me hear what Leonardo himself said in his Last Lesson to the Milan Academy about the way women had to be depicted by the painter: "Une femme nue correspond plutot a la luxure qu'a l'amour, et la paysanne n'eveille que l'instinct, tandis que les Beatrice agitant l'ame par un sourire. Groyezvous que le plus beau corps de l'italie eut laissé dans l'esprit du Dante le reflet fécond et immortal de celle qui lui apparut resplendissante, pleine de noblesse et de douceur et qui, avec une ineffable courtoisie, le salua par un certain melange de dignité et de bonté, lequel produisit sur lui tant d'effet qu'il crut, en ce moment, avoir atteint le plus haut degré de la beatitude. Selon la Vita Nuova donnez a vos figure cette ineffable courtoisie, ce mélange de dignité et de bonté qui produira encore un grand effet. Peignez les femmes en Beatrice. Je vous ai dit que les dames vertueuses avaient plus vif rayonnement que les impures..."

No wonder when contemplating the Mona Lisa one seems to grasp infinity. Particular thoughts and emotions, or soul qualities that one might discover in the Mona Lisa seem to slip away as soon as we have discovered them and to give way to other soul qualities, and on to infinity, because the rea-

lity of the Mona Lisa is not in any of these particular soul - qualities or thought/emotions but in the fact that she is eternally creating, and thinking.

THE CREATIVE PRINCIPLE IN PAINTING

Once the realm of the Beautiful-in-itself defined, we may go back to see how Art and painting attain that level.

Our of the cave of sensual percpetion, out of the more advanced second level where still the primacy of objects subsists, Art is the PRIVILEGED MEANS, we have said, to uplift man to the level of Creative Reason. And this is why Art is the highest form of knowledge.

Let us just restate the main argument from this more advanced standpoint and then we proceed to show how this principle operates in painting.

Art moves the soul to the highest realm because Art is - reasoned Beauty. When confronted to a great work of art, the viewer or listener feels deeply emotionally moved, or up lifted as said Edgar Allan Poe; but at the same time, it is the mind which is awakened. What is it then? Is is emotion? Is it thought? It is both at the same time. Art move the soul by using the elements of sense percpetion, of visual percpetion in the case of painting, but it does not merely present those simple elements of perception -- nature as we perceive it; it orders them according to Reason, according to the fundaments law of the univers. And it orders them beautifully according to the laws of harmony a proportion. Thus Art operates its magical charm of bringing the mind and the heart together and

uniting them according to the Good and the Beautiful in Themselves.

Art's secret lies in the fact that it doesn't inquire into predicates of any sort, but only into that moment which is fundamental to the essence of the human being and of the Univers, the creative moment. And Art, as we have stated, does not just study, nor describe that moment, but it has the power of evoking creativity CONCRETELY in the viewer, and of teaching him therefore, what is the method by which he can lawfully create new conceptions. In the moment of creation, Art leads the individual concretely to Eternity since he discovers his own ability to generate an infinity of higher hypotheses, and begins to discover governing the generation of higher hypothesis, Plato's Hypothesis of the Higher Hypothesis. Art thus is the means PAR EXCELLENCE to make geniuses out of our children, to teach them how to create at will.

And Art is the source of highest pleasure for the human being, because in that short moment of the creative experience, the soul is able to reach that for which he craves the most throughout existence, Universal Beauty and coherence with Universal Law.

This and no other is the true aim of art. Some thing today that the true objective of Art is to inquire into scientific matters: "perspective, the fourth dimension, optics and yet others sciences" they believe to be the true objective of painting for instance.

We believe, along with Da Vinci and Edgar Allan Poe, that although scientific matters have been and will be excellent

predicates of discussion in the composition of a work of art, and although mastery of the physical laws of the Univers is inseparable from a truly great work of art, the task of great Art is not primarily to inquire into these domains. The difference between Art and Science is the following: while the scientist examines the workings of the "Great Creator" as they appear in the created thing, nature, or at best, use those created things as instruments to look behind to the processes by which they came into being, artist inquire ONLY into that which is Eternal, the ESSENCE OF CREATION ITSELF. And furthermore, Art is beautiful, which science is not. Take geometry for instance; geometry is the most perfect, the mother of sciences, that which alone is able to explain the true laws of the univers, and that without which in fact the art of painting could not exist. Buy yet... geometry is not beautiful; it does not move the mind and the heart together through perfect harmony. It awakens the mind to that which is fundamental and then the mind can imagine the Beautiful, but it is not itself beautiful.

We do not mean to say by that, that Art is not scientific -- Ohh sacrilege!!! -- quite the opposite. "Sciences", says Leonardo, the greatest artist... and scientist of his time -- "are the soldiers of Art; they allow Art to express rigorously the most imperceptible and unsaisissable traits of the human mind". It is creativity, the motions of the mind, -- which are thus primary in Art! What Leonardo means when he says that sciences are the soldier of art, is that Art uses the laws of the physical univers -- the laws of Rhythm and -

Harmony as they pertain to sound for music or poetry, or the laws of the physical univers as we perceive them through our mind's eye as is the case for painting -- as means, as TOOLS, prove the higher efficiency of the domain of Reason in the creative process within the same work of art.

Art is in that respect, the constant proof, in a concentrated matter, of the successful resolution of the Freedom/Necessity principle by man. The Artist uses the laws of the physical univers, not to represent nature per se, but to prove within the work of art that he is able to master those laws, and to change them and perfect them by using them to a new conception, one which cannot exist in nature since it is the working of the mind and one which is more beautiful since Reason is the principle governing the univers.

Thus creativity is set in its lawful context. There is nothing irrational nor mysterious about the creative process; it is entirely scientific we mean that it is governed by exact and rigorous laws. The laws of the physical univers which are the artist tools impose necessity on the artist. He must firstly know those laws and be able to represent them -- the $N + 1$ domain; but he is free to master and to change those laws in order to create the higher sort of lawfulness which is that of the reign of Reason -- the $N + 2$ domain.

And because all of these characteristics are to be found also in painting, we situate the Art of painting among the most excellent of arts, if not the most excellent.

Painting, like the other great arts, music and poetry, will lead the viewer through the process of creating an entirely

new conception, by addressing those areas of the mind where all concept formation is taking place, the preconscious. Like - for the other great arts therefore, painting can only be understood through the establishment of a platonic dialogue between the viewer and the painter himself. We will outline later on how this process is exactly taking place; we want to give here just a general overview of how painting functions.

In painting, this new creative conception is in the form of an entirely new visual one which never existed before and which is much more beautiful than anything one can see in nature for the simple reason that Reason has created it. - This new image will be generated in an entirely lawful way through the use of all the elements by which we conceptualize space visually: the laws governing space in general, the laws of perspective without which no notion of space could be possibly rendered; light and dark, and the subsumed laws of color; the laws of movement and rest of bodies; and the laws governing the body in general. The painter must first be able to master those laws and to reproduce them in the vegetable material of paint because they represent his basic material to create, his puddy so to speak. And this is because painting operates its charms on the human soul by creating the illusion of physical space as we see it, not with the aim of copying nature, but to use those elements of visual perception which the viewer knows from his daily existence in order to lead the viewer from there to the realm of Creative Reason. Once he masters those laws, the painter may enter into the realm of the Divine and begin to mold those laws like puddy, to use them, to break them, to

model them, LAWFULLY, so that they become the tools by which he composes his own creative image.

Here we enter into the creation of that higher sort of lawfulness which governs creative Reason and which in painting - will be realized in the LAWFULL PROCESS OF COMPOSITION of the new creative image. It is this beautiful new image which has the power of moving the soul of the viewer to the highest realm. And the reason why this is so is that the problems posed by the necessity to create an entirely new image lead us right back to the fundamental of the univers, to the problems of the One and the Multiple, and of a self-perfecting process. And it is in this respect that we say the art of painting could not exist without the science of geometry. The visual image obeys to the same laws of the univers: it is a whole, the whole having a higher degree of reality than the elements that compose it. Yet, the image has been generated lawfully through a lawfull internal generation principle of its elements, just like one generates a geometrical figure.

One more thing needs to be clarified. Vision as a whole always obeys to this dialectical principle. As Gestalt psychology has amply proven, one always visualized first the totality, the whole, and only later does one understand the elements that compose that totality. When we say that painting - must create an entirely new image, we do not mean by that - those simple images, governed by linear laws of development, which one generates in daily life and without which the world would be totally incomprehensible. The difference we want to make is the same one as exists between the simple ideas which

every human being, even the bronze soul is able to conceptualize, and the creative idea, one which implies a revolution in previous conceptions. And indeed, the closest parallel in art to the way in which the human mind generates a creative idea is to be found in the process by which painting generates itself a creative image.

We are talking therefore about a "creative" image, or of a visual creative idea, one which leads to an actual revolution in conception. This is an image which is governed internally by the principle of a self-perfecting whole -- of non-linearity -- all while being ONE single image. It is perhaps easier for the reader to grasp a self-development process in music, or in poetry, because there the process takes place in time. One can hear for instance, how Beethoven develops in One musical piece successive variations of the same theme, each variation revolutionizing the internal laws governing the preceding one, while the whole piece is a lawful process of self-development from one moment to the next. In painting -- the time element doesn't exist but the process is the same; the image must therefore be generated in such a way as to lead the viewer in a process of more and more complex hypothesis -- formation about the work -- comparable to that of grasping a musical piece -- while the work remains ONE AND SIMULTANEOUS. Ahhh!!! But here lies the power of painting. Leonardo argues in his Treatise of Painting that painting is by far the most excellent of the art because while with poetry or music there is a development in time, in painting that same process is -- grasped as one and simultaneous. This oneness on the other

hand, should not be mistaken for a simple unity -- like a patch of white paint for instance -- but one which has internal life so to speak, one whose internal law of organization is of a non-linear quality and which leads the viewer in a process of higher order hypothesis about the work, each hypothesis mediated through specific elements or singularities within the work... all while remaining one and simultaneous!

When Rembrandt defines himself as a "mathematician, one whose work is proof in the vegetable material of paint that his postulates could be proven, he does not mean that his work is about mathematics -- horrors, no! -- nor that in his work he solves mathematical problems, although indeed he may do so; the image of the scientist is not used as it pertains to the lower ordered physical domain, but as it pertains to the science of Reason. What he means is that the artist sets out to work a creative idea in mind a hypothesis, or a postulate -- and that this creative idea must be proven with the rigor which one demands for a scientific problem. The creative idea is "proven" through its rigorous realization in the **LAWFULL PROCESS OF COMPOSITION OF THE CREATIVE IMAGE.**

Thus the painter sets out to create a new image because it is this image which will generate a flurry of thoughts, of ideas in the viewer, and uplift him in that moment to the realm of Beauty and Reason. For the composition of the image he will chose certain thematical motives which will determine the areas around which a flurry of ideas can be generated and these are all the themes which are appropriate to lead people to the contemplation of the Beautiful and the Reasoned: take

Leonardo's Mona Lisa, what more appropriate than a woman to lead people to contemplate Beauty and Reason, a woman who by nature is the very image of beauty and grace, but one who has raised herself to the highest point of rigor in scientific - thinking; or what more appropriate than the themes of the life the Christ, he who mediated divinity between God and the human species; or yet, what more appropriate than the death skull and the intense light of Rembrandt's St. Jerome etching no..., to make people reflect on their immortal power of Reason over that which dies, which goes.

But the content is predicate. The main achievement of Art is not to lead people to think about specific domains, but to lead people to create, to formulate higher hypothesis, and to grasp Plato's Hypothesis of the Higher Hypothesis, the process by which one lawfully generates successive, more complex hypothesis. It is therefore the process of realization of the composition in the material of paint, of which content is one side, that is primary in the work.

The other side is the pictorial means of realization of the image and here the artist must define things like appropriate choices of setting for his work: is it a landscape in Leonardo's St. Anne (Paris, Louvre), is it a church as in Van Eyck's madonna..., or other settings. He must choose an appropriate - perspective: deep, shallow, from above, from below, or what - have you; or, he might choose, to use two different points of perspective in the same work. He must choose the harmonies of colors; will richness of color be one of the main pictorial - means of realization as with the works of Van Eyck, or, will

it be a sharp light and dark contrast, a chiaroscuro as with Rembrandt? What figure? young, female, male, both, one or many? These are some of the pictorial means available to the artist.

But pictorial means, like content, are also predicates, this is the formal side of work. Reality of the work as we said is in the process of composition, a process which is realized - through the interplay of these elements, of content thematical elements on the most appropriaty pictorial means to bring forth the essential conception. And this is not just some hazardous interplay; the process of composition is defines by the internal law of generation of the image, through the lawfull ordering and interplay of those predicates. It is that lawfull process of generation of the image which will lead people in the process of hypothesis formulation, and that process must correspond as we said previly to that of a self-developing image.

How the language of painting operates will appear more clearly to the reader as we proceed with the development of the argument. We will start by showing how painting lets the viewer to actually recreate the creative conception by addressing - that preconscious area of the mind where all conceptions are - being formed. Then we will show how the viewer must engage in a platonic dialogue with the painter in order to be able to recreate for himself, the creative process of the painter. We will demonstrate then how ambiguities and tensions created - lawfully by the painter within the one creative image are the key element in the composition of the work to intrigue the - mind and to lead it to generate aflurry, an infinity, of hy-

pothesis about the work. And we will show lastly how a creative image is generated through a lawfull generation principle, and how man is led by that image to wonder about the most fascinating, intriguing, and exciting issued of the existance of - manking and the univers.

HOW TO LOOK AT PAINTING

Even though the oligarchy has destroyed the Art of painting, painting continues to exert a mysterious power over the minds of people. Millions continue to flock into the musseums where the great works of art are kept, and to be enchanted by the - miracle of the creative image, but very few would be able to say what it is exactly that enchants the about one work or the other.

The main problem lies in the way people use their sight. The Eye it is said, is the most developed of the senses, but very few people actually utilize their eyes correctly. The - problem is pretty much the same as that outlinedby Plato in his cave image. The problem of the man in the cave is not - that he doesn't have sight, he does, its just that he orients it in the wrong direction, towards the ephemerals and not towards the eternal.

So with the person who tries to understand a great work of art. What happens when such a person is confronted to a painting? In the case of bestialist painting this poses no problem since the aim of such painting is precisely to excite the senses and to block the mind. No problem whatsoever to understand the pornographic pink fleshed round ladies of Rubens, nor the obs-

cene satyrs of Jordaens; the senses recognize immediately the nature of those images. (illist. St. Anne...)

But let's move to neo-platonic painting and the problems begin. Let's take the St. Anne, Virgin and child of Da Vinci, located at the Paris, Louvre. The viewer will attempt to regal his senses with a nice picture. Very soon he will realize though that there is nothing there which appeals to pornography or any of the other emotions which are associated to that state of consciousness. There is something more in this work that calls on the faculties of the mind. So, our viewer begins as per the second level of consciousness and tries to identify the elements of the work, or the theme according to his own experience and knowledge. He identifies St. Anne, the Virgin and the Child, and the lamb all set in what appears to be at first sight a deserts barren univers. He knows to what biblical theme this refers: St. Anne was the aged mother of Mary, who conceived St. John immaculately, several months before Mary conceived the Christ.

But as he looks more closely he realized that the painting of Leonardo is not really depicting the literal biblical story of St. Anne and Mary; there is something else behind because otherwise why does Leonardo chose this setting? He locates a very alive group of people in the midst of a totally barren - univers. Why? And why has Leonardo put Mary sitting so awkwardly on St. Anne giving the overall impression that Mary - will fall off her lap at any moment. Mary is barely on equilibrium over St. Anne and probably would fall in reality, but in the composition of the work she defies that law and doesn't

appear to fall because her motion and look leads your attention away from her and towards the Christ and the Lamb. And why does Leonardo set his four figures sitting on the very edge of a precipice where the slightest false move and they would also fall? Look at the Christ with his hand on the edge of the precipice, also barely maintaining the equilibrium, and once again the reason why he doesn't appear in danger to fall is because the motion of his body and his attention lead us - right back, in flowing motion, to Mary who pulls him towards her, and to St. Anne. Furthermore, why is the image of St. Anne so unreal appearing as if she were a timeless entity - which exists eternally, an effect achieved by the fact that her shading is very even and appears almost like a veil over her, that her coloring is very similar to that of the background and that even the shape of her head fits in as one of the mountains in the background. And why is Mary, on the contrary, a very alive image of motion and of love towards the Christ; and if they are opposite timelessness and eternity on the one hand, and motion and love on the other, why then does Leonardo make them sit together and resemble each other as if they were in fact the same person? One more question, among the infinity of questions one can ask about this work, why is it that while most painters orient the eye of the viewer to a very definite point, or points of attention in the work, where there seems to be somehow a beginning and an end, in this work there doesn't seem to be a beginning nor an end. Because, look closely, you start with St. Anne who appears at first sight to be the pillar upon which the work is constructed, but her motion

and attention leads you to Mary, whose loving motion lead you to the Christ and the Lamb. So, you might conclude that the Christ and the Lamb are the point of attention of the work. But... ooopppsss! the motion and the look of the Christ lead you right back to Mary, to St. Anne, and through the sinous - compositional curves to the barren landscape in the background, and back and forth, in what seems to the eternal motion!

At this point, the normal viewer becomes throughly troubled: he knows all the element that compose this painting, he knows the literal story of St. Anne, he recognizes all the figures, but he doesn't understand what the work is all about. The work doesn't depict nature either because as we have seen the composition defies the laws of physical nature: it used nature but to creates a new thing. But why does Leonardo bring all these elements together? Is he pulling our leg? The viewer begins to realize that this image doesn't correspond to anything he has seen either in nature, nor in his own experience: it is an entirely new created image, and he doesn't know where to begin to understand it.

This is the point when our normal, though inteligent viewer, recoils in fear from his investigations, becomes nervous, - tense, bored or what have you, and moves hurriedly to the next painting in the museum, murmuring something like... "isn't he something this Leonardo"! Why? For the simple reason that he doesn't dare to look into eternity, or the sun, the source of creative throught which in this case is the mind of the painter itself, and of which the elements of composition of the work of art, are nothing but the visible footprints, which mediate the

the unreachable substance of mind which creates. Finding the solution to his "whys" means that the viewer has to reach inside the mind of the painter, and try to locate his mind into his own to begin to recognize what Leonardo might be talking about.

Once the viewer dares to look at the mind of the painter, he must solve a further difficulty in order to be able to grasp the work, and that is that the painter is not talking to the conscious self of the viewer but to his preconscious, and that this is the reason why Art, contrary to other forms of knowledge, is able to lead the viewer or listener through the actual process of recreating creative ideas.

The preconscious is that area of the mind which Lyndon H. LaRouche always helps the reader to identify in his writings by asking them to think of those moments when he or she has an idea "in the tip of the tongue", although the idea is not yet in a knowable form. At those points, the mind starts looking for the concept "on the tip of the tongue" in area of mind which precedes the actually conscious mind, the preconscious.

All conscious thought is actually elaborated or generated there, conscious thought being nothing but the end result of a process that took place in the preconscious. Thought or - what we would rather call, material of the mind in the preconscious obeys to the following characteristics. Firstly, contrary to the conscious mind. where there may exist a separation between thought and emotion as we outlined it was the case for the silver sould, where the fact that one thing something - doesn't necessarily mean that the appropriate emotion is --

attached to that thought, thought and emotion in the preconscious are one and the same, both governed by the innermost sense of identity of the individual, his soul. There is no unemotional, "objective", thought in the preconscious; cognition doesn't function in that way. Every possible idea is cathected to an emotion, good or bad, pleasure or pain, love, joy, sadness, melancholy, etc., the particular emotions cathected to each thought depending on the previous experience of the individual and ultimately on the values or ideas which govern his sense of identity.

Furthermore, this material of mind in the preconscious exists, is organized in a different manner than that of conscious thought. For most people, the silver soul, who do not know the processes by which they elaborate knowledge in the preconscious, and who cannot therefore govern those processes deliberately, conscious thought becomes that which outlined before for the silver soul: thought about objects of knowledge, stripped of emotion, and which can only be ordered into categories, the categories destroying precisely the coherence of thought/emotion and of thinking processes in general as they exist in preconscious. Thought in the preconscious obeys the laws of the universe, it obeys to the characteristics of self-organizing -- non-linear -- substance. There are no objects of thought in the preconscious. Each thought generates a potentially infinite chain of association of thought/emotions, each thought/emotion generating itself other potentially infinite chains of associations. Thought as we know it in the conscious mind, is elaborated by the continuous coming together of

these infinite chains forming potentially infinite new gestalts as they come together. We give simple example: when one thinks for instance of a certain political figure of West German associated to the C.S.U. which we unfortunately cannot name, if one allows the mind to associate ideas freely, you will find that the image of that person immediately makes you think about a fat greasy pig, or at best, of a cross between a fat greasy pig and a furious rinoscerous. These animals trigger very specific emotions in turn, and in particular if thins that fat pig or the cross between that pig and a rinoscerous are running around the german parliament, the emotion triggered in any normal person is one of total and utter disgust, and if that person - allows his feet to follow his thoughts, he will move and take actual measures to GET THE PIG OUT OF THERE! And not only -- though: emotions are triggered, but the senses are called in to the act because most ideas, in particular those about lowly subjects like this one, also have smells, sounds and colors - attached to them. In this particular case under examination, the associated sound is the one which you can produce by - - snoring several times within one breath; the smell is an obvious one: the foul stench of a pig stand! And the color tends towards a mixture between black, bran with a good dose of orange and green.

However, each thought/emotion in each chain, we said, can also potentially trigger other infinite chains of associations. Thus, if one considers the pig in and by itself, as as animal, one will think about that noble animal which allows a good part

of the human species to be adequately nurrished, and that which when arranged with a most ambiguous sweet and sour sauce is even a source of tru pleasure to both the palate and the mind!

The painter will therefore organize his conception in the language of the preconscious. He will not state a finished conception as one can read it out of a book, but he will array a series of elements, specific spacial configurations, specific themes, colors, proportions or what have you, which each do not represen the conception, but which will trigger specific chains of associations of ideas in the preconscious. The viewer in turn will work with those chains of associations of ideas and by a constant work of comparison between his own mind and that of the artist as it is mediated by the work of art, will go through the process of recreating for himself that conception, and will know at a certain point that he has recreated precisely the same conception. And the artist determines his language in an entirely scientific manner; he knows precisely if he is a good artist what chains of associations of ideas he will trigger in the viewer with at specific elements, and how he must organize his material in order to lead the viewer step by step to recreate that conception.

We can use the example of Jerome Bosch's Garden of Delights to show how this functions. We have seen previously how Bosch creates very powerfull metaphorical images of bestiality. Bosch constructed these images deliberately according to the principle just outlined: he combines in one image, the loved figure of a human being, and of the most abhorred beasts. The figure of the human being triggers in general positive chains of asso-

ciations of ideas linked for instance to man's mastery over the world, or to the superiority of the human species over all others, or what have you; the abhorred beast on the other hand triggers precisely opposites qualities of ideas. The combination of both in one single figure then puts the viewer in a situation where he has to solve the conflict posed by the image. Same for the early paradise of the Garden of Delights. Fully consciously Bosch uses the image of a swarm of black birds - which he knows will unleash chains of associations of ideas - which have the emotional coloration of fear, bad omen, man at the beast's mercy, etc. He then proceeds to locate those - birds in the midst of a beautiful geographical setting of paradise, which itself cathectizes ideas of beauty, joy, eternity, etc. creating thus tensions and ambiguities in the way the viewer normally understands those conceptions and leading him thus to create a new conception, that created by the painter. (illust. Rembrandt's St. Gerome).

This leads us into the next point, which is the fact that the language of the painter is poetical. By poetical we mean that the specific spatial configurations or elements, colors, imagery, etc. arrayed by the painter in his composition have no literal meaning as we know those elements in every day life, but metaphorical. The problem of the painter is that he must create an entirely new image/ conception, or express something in an entirely new way, more perfect, more insightful than - ever before it was expressed. In order to do this he must use existing elements of perception, elements which the viewer - identifies easily, but he must bring them together, organize

them in such a way as to create tensions and ambiguities in the way in which the viewer normally, in his every day life, perceives those elements, leading him thus to inquire into the new conception which the artist is trying to set forth. Painting we said before functions by creating the illusion of actual - physical space as we perceive it, but then playing tricks on the laws of visual Painting, we said before, functions by - creating the illusion of actual physical space as we perceive it, but then deliberately breaking those laws, as in Leonardo's St. Anne, or creating tensions and ambiguities between those laws, thematical content, and means of realization, so as to lead the viewer to go beyond the mere literal sense of those elements as they normally perceive them, and to begin to understand them as the mere tools by which the artist wants to mediate an entirely new conception.

AMBIGUITY AND THE PLATONIC DIALOGUE

We have gone now a bit into the language of painting, let us show concretely painting leads the viewer through the actual process of recreating a new conception, and how it leads him thus to the highest realm of existence, by teaching him the method by which he can generate higher hypothesis.

Let's us help ourselves of Plato once again who says the following about those objects which incite the human mind to hypothesize: "...parmi les objects qui frappent nos sense, les uns n'invitent pas l'intelligence a la reflexion, parce que les sense suffisent a en juger, (que) les autres, au contraire, l'engagent instament a les examiner, parce que la sensation

qu'ils produisent ne donne rien de sain". "les object qui n'excitent pas a la reflexion, repondis-je, sont ceux qui ne produisent pas a la fois deux impressions opposées; s'ils les produisent au contraire, je les range parmi ceux qui invitent a la reflexion..."

Leonardo takes up the same conception in his last Lesson to his Milan Academy: "La Beauté complexe resulte d'ambiquité, presque des contradictions. Imaginez une femme trop fiere pour qu'on puisse lui parler d'amour et laissant voir une impatience d'etre aimés. Ce sentiment mi partie, cette expression double et melée, il faut l'etudier chez les femmes: leur indécision, le caprice mouvant de laurs humeurs engendredt ces regards - couleurs du temps, et ces sourires indefinissables, varitables pierreries pour l'artiste qui sait les enchasser dans de nobles traits.

Ainsi se produisent ces miroitement de l'ame d'une action - enchanteresse et qui passionnent comme des problemes de bonheur. Une bachante, une nonne, toutes deux trop caracterisées, - n'excitent point l'imagination... le spectateur reconnait tout de suite leur réalité et ne reve point. Il faut, au contraire, qu'il doute de sa compréhension afin que son esprit su

ssable et n'allume son désir qu'au choc de la contradiction... le noble amour de la science prends sa source de cette tendance invisible de notre nature vers l'inexplicable. L'amour de la vérité, le plus noble mouvement de notre esprit cesserait aussi tot s'il ne parvenait a son but".

Anbiguity, contradiction, complexity in this sense, is the

key tool of the painter to tickle the mind, thirsty of discovery, and to lead it through the process of generating an infinity of hypothesis. By ambiguity we do not mean though that one can combine any elements anarchistically as in modern - painting, nor that the subject of the work of art is not perfectly defined, nor yet that one can interpret pluralistically the painting and see there what one "wants" to see. We mean the bringing together of contradictory elements, or of elements which one does not usually associate to each other, such, that inquiry into the problems thus posed clarifies for the viewer the nature of truth in the univers; we mean the bringing together of conflicting elements the resolution of which lead - people to generate successive more perfect hypothesis about the laws of the univers.

And ambiguity in that sense can only be understood through the platonic dialogue, the workings of which we will outline while trying to understand another one of the riddle of the history of painting, the St. John the Baptist of Leonardo da Vinci, in the Paris-Louvre.

Only the Mona Lisa, and for precisely the same reasons, has incited more diverse comentaries than this painting. The bestialist critics have unleashed their dirty tongue andused this work as the crucial, final proof of Leonardo's perversity and homosexuality and even the best of critics, in the neo-platonic tradition, shy away from even attempting to unravel the mysteries of these late works of Leonardo. However, it is precisely in these works that Leonardo reached his highest point and it is therefore the comprehension of these works which is the most

usefull if we are to start a new renaissance of painting.

What we mean by platonic dialogue is the following. When confronted with a work of art at first only the senses are - awakened, and man following the steps of the bronze soul, - attempts to grasp the reality of the work through his senses. As we already stated, in the case of a great work of art our viewer will not understand anything unless he moves onto the higher levels. On the second level of the dialogue, the viewer must try to locate the mental substance of the painter, as - that is mediated by the work of art into his own mind; or what is the same, he must try to locate the mental experience of the artist in his own mental experience. In order to do so the viewer must allow himself to freely associate ideas around the different themes, spacial configurations, colorings and other elements of the work. But these ideas cannot be any of the infinite variety of ideas certain elements evoke, and the viewer cannot just simple see "what he wants or feels like - seeing" in different works of art. The artist is trying to - make his viewer conceptualize around certain specific concep- tions. Therefore the viewer must look behind the mind of the artist and try to think in terms of what the artist wanted to say with such or such element. From his own side, he cannot simply react to the different elements and think whatever he wants to think but he must ask himself why is he thinking - what he is thinking around certain elements of the work. Is this what the painter wanted him to think about, or is he just projecting his own mental experience onto the work? How can one know this? Since preconsciouss throught processes which

are the subject of a great work of art are entirely coherent, that is to say, that all elements which are part of a conception are a necessary part of it, so in a work of art, all elements within the work are necessary to the work as a whole, - and coherent with it, and the viewer can check his different hypothesis, the validity of those hypothesis, through epistemological coherence with the totality of the work. In this work of comparison between the viewer mental experience as it is awakened by the work of art, and that of the painter, the viewer is actually locating concretely the mind of the painter AS IT CREATES THE CONCEPTION into his own, and is thus recreating for himself concretely the same conception. This dialogue is the dialogue of two self-conscious minds: the artist who is consciously evoking certain ideas in the mind of the viewer, and the viewer who is conscious of his own self as he is generating those ideas, and conscious of the fact that the artist is deliberately leading him in a thinking process. As the dialogue proceeds, the viewer is able to locate precisely the types of conceptions which the artist is setting forth, and thinks therefore that he knows the true content of the great work of art.

And here comes the big surprise for the best of our art lovers, and that is that the content of the conceptions the artist is putting forth is not the true reality of the work of art; this is still the second level of the platonic dialogue. On the third level, whatever specific conception the artist was developing is nothing but the end result of a process of creation which itself is the reality of the work. Once again,

reality is not located in objects, or in objects of knowledge -- conceptions per se -- but in the laws governing the generation of a creative conception. So the viewer must look - again at the work and study the means by which the artist led him in an entirely deliberate and self-conscious may to - create a new conception.

Let us see how the principle works in the St. John the Baptist of Leonardo. On the first level of the platonic dialogue, the intense ambiguity of this work provokes sheer terror in the mind of the viewer, who is not able at first glance, or second, to recognize any knowable subject all while knowing all elements depicted in the painting. It is this ambiguity and the something-otherness of this work which has sent first and second level consciousness into a flurry of slanders against Leonardo.

But let us move beyond to the second level of the platonic dialogue, let us ask ourselves what in the world Leonardo wanted to tell us through this most intriguing painting. We start from the most obvious: the literal theme of the work, St. John the Baptist. We will not analyse the biblical character of St. - John, possibly the most ambiguous character in the New Testament, so that the reader doesn't reduce the language of painting to the mere literal visual representation of bible or other - themes. St. John the Baptist, whose character is nonetheless coherent with Leonardo's painting, is nothing but the most adequate predicate available to Leonardo in that time of history, to lead people to inquire into certain specific domains. Suffice it to say here for all those who have no knowledge of the --

christian bible, that St. John the Baptist, born through the immaculate conception of., was sent by God to prepare the way for the coming of the -- Christ. It is explicitly stated several times in the gospel that John was not the light himself -- the Christ -- but was sent to prepare the way for the light, or Reason.

AS we begin to conceptualize the work, it appears to us - that it is not clear whether St. John is a man or a woman. He looks like a man, he is naked and has no breasts, his figure is too massive to be that of a woman, and there is something nevertheless too rough of his facial expression and messy hair to represent anything other than a man. On the other hand, he does have a female quality. Although too rough for a woman his facial expression does exhibit the coquettishness so typical of the female sex; although the body is too massive to be that of a woman, it does nonetheless have the smoothness and roundness typical of the less developed musculature of the female body. Is he a man, or a woman, or neither?

We try to find an answer by examining his facial expression. Like in the Mona Lisa however, impossible to pin down the quality of emotion and soul which underlie this expression. Infinite varieties of souls seem to underlie this expression: one from being certain that the expression can only be coquettishness, to certainty the it can only be evil and perversity, to yet certainty that it is intelligence which animates this soul, since why else would he look straight at our souls pointing very strongly upwards at the same time. Good? Evil? Something else yet?

We follow the strong upwards motion of his arm in the hope of finding there a clue to this impossible enigma. Our hypothesis: St. John is telling us to look upwards to the world of universals and Reason, as opposed to the empirical world of the here and now, of the senses. As we look up, we identify another predicate in the dark which we had not perceived before, the thin cross which generally symbolizes St. John the Baptist, - but we find nothing more: just more darkness. There is nothing upwards and our eye falls back on the enigmatic face. As we try to identify once more the expression, out of the corner - of our eye just under and to the right of the face we perceive the other hand of St. John, also very much in the dark. The hand points to the heart.

So, we began by looking up trying to confirm our hypothesis that St. John was pointing to reason, but in fact we ended - again looking downwards at St. John other hand pointing to his heart. Our initial hypothesis seems incorrect, although there is a strong motion upwards towards reason, there seems to be actually an equally strong motion downwards towards the heart.

Up or down, reason or the heart, light or dark, male or female, what is the clue to our puzzle?

Ahhhhh, sans an intelligent viewer, Leonardo is trying to show us the process leading to Reason, and that this is the - case in proven by the following facts. First of all, the finger pointing upwards was a well known convention of that time, to represent pictorially, the primacy of the realm of Reason; think about the unfinished "St. Anne, Virgin, Christ and St. John", of the Da Vinci, or of Raphael's Academy of Athens, -

where Plato is depicted pointing upwards to Reason, while Aristotle is pointing downwards to signal the superior reality of the empirical world. If convention is not sufficient reason, the quality of lighting used by Leonardo in this work, the intense chiaroscuro, is another element which proves our hypothesis. Doesn't this barely lighted figure emerging smoothly and progressively out of the dark, evoke the experience of growing enlightenment as one creates an entirely new conception? Furthermore, the light is falling directly on his head and face, that intelligent face which looks straight at us and commands us to raise ourselves above the world of the here and now.

"No says another enlightened viewer, I can prove exactly the opposite of this painting, that this represents an attack on the bestiality of man as portrayed by St. John the Baptist in this work. Reason is not to be found here: intense darkness actually dominated the work, the righthand arm leads us nowhere which we could identify with Reason, and furthermore, while the light is illuminating his face, the eye themselves, the true symbol of intelligence, are actually in the dark".

"Definitely, body, passion and evilness, is the only subject of this painting, although the face is well lighted, so is the body, and it is more the shining flesh of that overpowering body which actually attracts our attention. And aren't the curved forms which characterize the entire composition a reminder of that evil snake which caused the down fall of humanity? Our hypothesis is furthermore entirely coherent with the fact that although Leonardo does attempt to uplift us to

Reason, as our eye follows the movement of the right hand arm and finds nothing there, it moves back through the face which slants downwards, to the left hand which points to the heart. Ahhhhhh!. But the heart has always been in the neo-platonic tradition the image for brutal passion, when it does not ally to Reason. If we need yet more arguments, look at the bestial skin with which St. John covers his nakedness..."

We have followed now the hypothesis of two enlightened viewers, but are we more advanced now than before? Is it evil? Is it good? Yet Other? What is truth?

Truth as we have said before, is in a higher sort of reality. Truth is not located in any specific hypothesis, although each hypothesis might represent partly the truth; truth is located in the knowledge of that deliberate process by which the artist has led you to generate successive hypothesis about the work. Think back to the process by which you went from one hypothesis to the next; think and see your mind as it was using the different pictorial elements of the work to generate successive hypothesis, and you have reached the highest level of the platonic dialogue, that of Reason. Reason is not an object, or a person painted onto the canvas, nor is it the content of the work, IT IS YOUR MIND IN THE PROCESS OF CREATING NEW CONCEPTIONS.

But let us see now how Leonardo led you scientifically through that process. It is not sufficient to know that you have gone through it, but you must know HOW, by what means you have done so. Leonardo is deliberately using opposite poles in pictorial terms, opposite poles which are nevertheless -

brought together in the unity of conception. The St. John does not represent two different paintings, or an infinity of paintings, it is one single image characterized by total unity and harmony. But..... it is also, at the same time - multiple, or differentiated in the elements that compose it. It is this tension of particularity within unity which intrigued you so much in the first place and led you, back and forth, from those particular elements to the whole conception, and - through that process to the elaboration of entirely new successively more developed hypothesis.

Light and dark are counterposed in their intensity, cathexising in the viewer conflicting chains of associations of - ideas: light evokes reason; darkness, evilness. The composition is also worked out to the same purpose. The impression one had of being led upwards to what we supposed to be Reason, as well as being equally pulled downwards to the realm of the flesh was also generated entirely lawfully by Leonardo. We have drawn on figure... 1 (illist...) the compositional lines of the work where you can see the use of smooth curves leading - your eye upwards but also downwards, two sharply contradictory motions cohabitating nonetheless within one unity of conception. Same thing with the dichotomy between body and mind. In his last lesson to the Milan Academy, Leonardo explicitly - states that if one wants to draw a portrait, and to concentrate in bringing forth the infinite motions of the mind, one should never have the portrait nude, because the body exerts a too powerful attraction on the mind of the viewer such that it - detracts attention from those movements of the mind. In the

St. John, Leonardo deliberately does away with such rule for the precise aim of forcing the viewer to struggle with these two world conceptions, and not only does he use a nude, but - he uses light of equal intensity on both the face and the body, which has the effect of pulling the eye with equal insistence back and forth from the face to the body.

With astonishing economy of pictorial means, Leonardo has led his viewer to into the most fundamental issues of - humanity: unity versus multiplicity, reason and passion, light and dark, etc., but most importantly, he has proven to the - viewer that he is a creative being, and given him the tools by which to master deliberately the process of creation of new ideas. He has done so, not by explaining a concept as in the texts which accompany comic strips, nor by arraying linearly a flurry of predicates which would amount to the same thing, - but by counterposing the very bare simple elements of opposite world conceptions into one entirely new image, an image which never existed before.

THE GENERATING PRINCIPLE OF A NEW CREATIVE IMAGE

Ambiguity we have said is the key to creative thinking. In the Republic, after having stressed that only those elements in which one finds contradiction and ambiguity incite the mind to think, Plato asks Glaucon in what category one is to put - those elements in which there is contradiction between multiplicity and unity. Will these go into the category of those elements which can be grasped by the senses without help of the mind, or in that which incites the mind to reflect in or-

der to understand them?

Here is what Plato answers: "Si, en effet l'unité se laisse bien percevoir telle qu'elle est par les yeux ou par quelque autre sense, elle ne peut nous pousser vers l'essence, pas plus que le doigt dont nous parlions tout a l'heure, mais si la vue de l'unité offre toujours quelque contradiction, en sorte qu'elle ne parait plus unité que multiplicité alors, on a besoin d'un juge pour en décider; l'ame en ce cas est forcément embarrassée, et, réveillant en elle l'entendement, elle est contrainte de faire des recherches et de se demander ce que peut être l'unité elle-meme, et c'est ainsi que la perception relative a l'unité est de celles qui poussent et tournent l'ame vers la contemplation de l'être.

Cette propriété, la vue de l'unité l'a certes au plus haut point; car nous voyons a la fois une et multiple jusqu'a l'infini".

Of all the arts, painting and painting alone makes of its very subject the contemplation, or the creation of a unity which is not a simple unity; it is unity and multiplicity at the same time since it self-develops through the lawfull ordering of multiple. This is the miracle of the created image which marvels man as he goes from unity to the predicate, and back to the unity, infinitely generating new hypothesis.

Leonardo da Vinci in particular was fully consciouss of this fact, and dealt with these matters explicitly in the composition of his works. Unity and simultaneity he stressed in his polemics against poetry and music, are the major attribute of painting and make of painting the most excellent of the arts: "Ne sais-tu pas que notre ame est faite d'harmonie, et l'har-

monie ne s'engendre que de la simultanéité ou la proportion des objects se fait voir, et entendre.

Ne vois tu pas que dans ta science (poésie) manque la proportion simultanée, et qu'une partie nait apres les autres, successivement, et la suivante ne se produit pas avant que l'antecedente ne passe?

Par ce raisonnement, ton invention reste tres inférieure a celle du peintre, parce qu'elle ne comporte pas la proportion harmonique. Elle ne contente pas l'esprit de l'auditeur ni du spectateur, comme la proportion des beaux traits composant la divine beauté du visage, qui, en un meme temps, tous unis, me donnent tant de plaisir par leur divine proportion, tellement que je ne vois sur la terre rien d'aussi haut dans l'oeuvre humaine qui ne puisse satisfaire d'avantage".

And Leonardo creates this intense sense of unity in his works such that he generates an integrated space, a whole, - where the slightest shift in one of the elements, would destroy the entire unity. Philosopher and Scientist as he was, Leonardo knew what space exists as a totality, determining the different predicates that compose it, and thus composed his works so that space appears as one and indivisible, but differentiated nonetheless. Contrary to Newton for whom space was like an empty room filled only by the bodies, Leonardo views space as having a qualitatively higher reality and being defined by essential (as in essence) relationships among the elements that compose it. So Leonardo defines movement not in and for itself but as it appears when counterposed to rest; light, not in and for itself, but as it emerges when contrasted to shadow;

the figures themselves do not stand stark naked against an empty background but smoothly emerge out of the backgrounds as qualitative changes in one and the same substance. Therefore the impression as we commented for the "St. Anne, the Virgin, and Child" that there is no beginning nor end in the world.

This unity however, is not one which allows itself to be perceived by the sense alone. Motion and process within the unity of conception is the law governing the works of Leonardo. This motion, which is not necessarily generated by the physical movement of bodies or elements depicted, which is more the general process of self-development within the image, is the work of the generating principle of the image, or of the lawful ordering of the predicates which compose the image.

We want to show here through the "Virgin of the Rocks" of Leonardo (Paris, Louvre) how this image was generated concretely and how it lead us to inquire into the nature of unity and multiplicity, and to generate an infinity of hypothesis.

At first glance, one is moved by the general feeling of beauty and unity for the scene: beauty, unity, total harmony, serenity, and that eternal, divine quality that characterizes Leonardo's works, are the expression some would use to describe our first impression of the work. The sense of unity is deliberately build in the following ways: Mary is the dominant figure in the middle of the painting, encompassing with her extended arms all the other figures, the Angel on the left, Christ the child directly next to the Angel, and St. John the Baptist on her right. Motion flows out of Mary's arms on the left and on the right, the motion generated by both arms con-

verging on St. John, and flowing back to Mary who encompasses all. Other elements contributing to the sense of unity. Look for instance at the source of light coming brightly from the end of the grot, and you will see that the light is in the - same directional axis as the motion generated by Mary's left arm. Look also how Leonardo has worked out the entire composition as we have drawn it in figure..... and you see the flowing motion from the rocks to the living scene, making of the entire pictorial geometry one single integrated space.

It appears to be at first sight a simple sort of unity. - Look closer how Leonardo has generated the image. There are many sources of tension within the unity. Let's start with Mary. Mary's left arm leads you in flowing motion towards the Angel, Christ and finally St. John; but, at the same time, - Mary's right hand arm, and the position of her head lead you in precisely the opposite direction, towards St. John. The position of St. John, who strangely enough, looks ready to nose dive in the direction of the Christ, leads us then towards the Christ. So that Mary is at the same time generator of motion in two opposite directions, and there is very much tension between what we can call, the right hand scene of the work, and the left, but also the one which is holding the whole together!

Millions of questions arise from this. In the beginning it appeared that we had a perfect simple unity, and that St. - John was the focus of attention, and therefore the subject of the work, since the motion of Mary's arms converged upon him. Now it is no longer so clear. Is it not the Christ which is

the focus of attention since Mary's left arm leads us to him, and Mary's right hand arm motion leads us to St. John and - through St. John towards the Christ. Or perhaps the focus of attention is the dialogue between St. John and the Christ, St. John about to nose dive in Christ's direction and the Christ blessing him for it!!! Or yet perhaps it is Mary who is the subject of the work, she who generated all motion? Abstract yourself a bit more from the literal content and imagery and look at the PROCESS OF COMPOSITION of the work as a whole, and you will see that what Leonardo is working at is at generating motion, such that two opposite motions coexist within one unity of conception.

Contentwise these tensions are necessary to the creation of many ambiguities. Let us think again about the character of St. John the Baptist, he who was send by God to prepare the - way for the Christ; he who is not light himself, reason, but paves the way forlight, the Christ. What is the relationship of Mary, the Angel and the Christ to St. John the Baptist? St. John himself appears at first as saintly boy, praying with his eyes closed as if in deep involvement with his saintly - mission, especially as compared to the Christ, who appears - only as a very lively boy, watching carefully saint John. And Mary has her arm tenderly on his back and her loving regard on him. The first irony comes when you realist that St. John's left foot is not firmly set on the rock, and he begins to - appear somewhat of a cripple since his praying gesture and general direction make one think that he would nose dive the precipice if his foot were to give in and fall. Mary's loving

gesture to St. John appears then as a protective gesture, her hand on him appears to be holding him down so that he doesn't fall and that he is able to carry on his saintly mission of announcing the Christ. But what about Mary's relationship to Christ and the Angel? She seems with her gesture to tell them to wait, and leave the way free for St. John, to remain away from St. John. But at the same time, the Angel and the Christ are pointing towards St. John enigmatically raising the viewers expectancy about the figure of St. John and what he might do. What is then the character of St. John? Is it the saintly messenger of God, or the cripple who will fall over? Is Mary protecting him with her right arm, holding him down so as not to fall, or actually helping him so that he can nose dive and getting both the angel and the Christ, and the public, in expectancy of that nose dive? Are Christ and the Angel blessing St. John for his saintly mission or watching him in his plunge? This is another of Leonardo's enigmas!

If one still has the impression of a flat unity, let us look further, there are yet other important singularities in this work. We said that Mary was point her left arm and hand in the direction of the Angel, but Angel is also pointing her hand in the direction of St. John all while looking straight at the viewer as if to tell the viewer to look towards St. John. The Christ is also pointing at St. John who in turn is pointing towards the Christ, while Mary is holding St. John downwards also with her hand. HANDS, HANDS, HANDS, HANDS, HANDS, HANDS, HANDS, HANDS, HANDS !!! Is this a painting about hands? - Think for a minute. In the beginning you didn't see all these

hands, you just saw a flowing motion which in fact was generated largely through these specific motions of the hands. Now, looking closer, one would almost think that the real subject of the work are the hands: beautifully expressive and specific - hands. Did Leonardo want to show us what beautiful and complex organs hands are. Indeed, no two pair of hands resemble each other, and each is totally specific to beholder.

One can assume that Leonardo did want to talk about hands, but the hands also fulfill another function: they generate motion in general, but they also orient the viewer towards more specific aspects of the work, and by the viewer on those specific aspects, or characters of the work, leading the viewer to more and more complex hypothesizing about the work as a whole. The process is the following. We said earlier that it was difficult to see whether Mary was pulling the group apart or bringing it together. At that point you move your eyes towards the angel seeking an explanation there, and you find the angel looking straight at you and pointing at St. John the Baptist. This then leads you to inquire into the nature of the angel's relationship to St. John. Why, or what should you see about St. John. Am I like, in any way, to St. John. (Will I nose dive too?). I leave it up to the reader to develop his own new hypothesis about the work upon discovering this new aspect. The process then continues: what about the Christ's hands. Is he blessing St. John, because he's about to fall of because he is the saintly messenger of God? Etc. -

The general point we wanted to make is that you begin with a very general global idea about the work, and as you work -

yourself through the different predicates, following the deliberate and scientific ordering of these predicates by the artist, you begin to develop a potentially infinite series of hypothesis about the work. And it is the process which is the essential aim of the artist.

A SHORT GLIMPSE OF BEAUTY

We believe that painting thus conceived must be used, along with music poetry and geometry, to educate our children to become geniuses. We must generate a new renaissance of painting and we will do it by introducing the art of painting in the school curriculums from a very young age. It has remained as a tradition that kindergarten children and upwards are put to draw and paint. Unfortunately in most of the cases this is done on to pacify the children, to keep them busy. It is interesting to note that in children's drawing the innate ability of children to think in gestalts and to create whole new, although undeveloped, pictorial conception. This ability demonstrates that thinking processes in general are of a poetry, pictorial, musical nature. What would be necessary though in the painting curriculums for schools, is that children are directed to systematize their ability to create whole new pictorial gestalts through the guidance of the teachers. Although such a program is not yet fully developed, it would take the form of setting up "pictorial problems" which the students would solve in the creation of a painting, drawing, sketch or what have you. Thus we would educate from a young age their ability to generate new conceptions, an ability which could

later be applied to all other fields of knowledge.

And this is more as we have previously stated that just a simple intellectual operation. Through this we would afford to mankind a glimpse even if short, of Beauty and Immortality that for which man craves for the most because in the short - moment of creation man sees himself not as an isolated, momentary phenomenon, but as a product of the infinite working of the univers, and one who's task is to further that process. Is this not also the highest aim that Leonardo assigned to art when he said to his Milan Academy: "La partie s'efforce constamment de se réunir a son tout pour finir sa souffrance qui est son imperfection meme. Comme le papillon vole vers la lumiere, l'homme aspire a revenir a son point de départ. Son désir continuel se tend vers le printemps nouveau et le nouvel été et vers de nouveaux mois et vers d'autres années; il trouve les choses désirées bien lentes a venir, sans songer qu'il désire ainsi sa propre mort. Ce mystérieux et fatidique désir est la quintessence, l'esprit des éléments enfermés dans l'ame et qui tendent sans cesse a quitter le corps et a retourner vers celui qui les a formés. L'art assouvit, par ses oeuvres ce besoin impérieux, source des passions que l'esprit seul purifie. Dans cette recherche, l'homme s'éloigne du pole anima et se rapproche de la Cause qui est toute spirituelle".

We differ with Leonardo in this: that immortality is not something to be achieved after death. Man reaches immortality when through - his creative contributions to the society, in the fields of science, education, technological innovations, and art, he is able to contribute longlastingly to the progress of human society, furthering - thereby the eternal process of development of the univers. We must

use painting to make man immortal in that sense. We must educate our children to the secrets of creative mentation through Art, so that they lay the basis for the existence of the future generations. (illust. Rembrandt's last self portrait).