

The Principle of Unity of Science and Art

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

May 27, 1995

*[Published in **Executive Intelligence Review**, Volume 22, Number 29, July 21, 1995. View [PDF of original](#) at the LaRouche Library.]*

*Lyndon LaRouche spoke on May 27, 1995 to an informal gathering of close collaborators in the movement to found the National Conservatory of Music in Washington, D.C., and then answered questions, together with his wife Helga Zepp-LaRouche. His remarks, in a slightly edited transcript, together with some parts of the exchange which followed, appear below. The dialogue followed a weekend which began on Friday night, May 26, with a concert of Classical songs, operatic arias, and spirituals performed by eminent soloists, as well as short choral works sung by the amateur choruses initiated by the Schiller Institute in the Washington area for both adults and children. On Saturday, there was a performance of the play *Through the Years*, dramatizing the history of the African-American spirituals, written in 1936 by civil rights veteran Amelia Boynton Robinson. Producing the play in Washington with the participation of local youths has been a key feature of the Schiller Institute's literacy project.*

Mr. LaRouche was introduced by moderator Dennis Speed.

Thank you, young fellow. As I get older, I take these liberties. I don't know, some of you are my age and slightly older, you know how that is, you get past 70, you begin to take more liberties like this.

As a matter of fact, I had the experience, just in Germany, on two occasions. I met one dear friend, who is a very famous singer and a coach, and she's 92 years of age, quite hale and hearty for 92, very functional. She's still teaching, still coaching. And she's still very strongly opinionated. She doesn't sing much any more. But she does have her recordings, and we did have some discussions.

We came upon a point at which she said to me, "Oh, you're a young kid!" [laughter]

Then, from Frankfurt, we went by way of Leipzig, and I want to return to Leipzig as a thematic point of relevance to us, and we ended up for several meetings in Berlin, among which was a meeting for a few hours with a dear old friend, who's a very key part of German

culture and who was a close friend of Furtwängler.¹ He's 90, and he, in the course of the afternoon discussion, also looked at me without knowing what my other friend had said earlier, and said, "You're just a kid!"

So, I guess if I live long enough, I'm going to get to that stage, where I start talking to 70-year-old people, and calling them "kids"!

I wanted to emphasize two things which were very impressive about the trip, and they were impressive because they happened in a sequence. We had a number of meetings on music, which was one of the principal reasons for the trip to Germany, to meet with several people and discuss things that couldn't be discussed here, particularly with people who are 90 years old. You can't haul them all over the world at will, so you've got to go to them.

So, we had meetings with our friend [Arturo] Sacchetti, who's an organist, who was somewhat impaired by an illness recently, but he's still doing his work, though not performing at the keyboard, and others, on the question of preparing the second volume of this *Manual*,² which I'm very eager to get into place. And we had a number of other discussions on that.

The Boys' Choir of St. Thomas in Leipzig

But one of the things which was most delicious, was we stopped in Leipzig, and I had a very unusual experience, in the sense of participating for several hours in auditing a rehearsal of the St. Thomas Boys' Choir in Leipzig, and then, the next evening, at the evening Vesper service, hearing the performance of the complete repertoire for that week at the service, and being able to compare what had been gone through with the rehearsal, and what was heard in the evening.

Now, let me just qualify, for those who may not know, and some of you here do know this. The St. Thomas Cathedral Choir is a separate school and has been in existence since the year A.D. 1212. It has, according to all reputation, an unbroken singing program. It would sing every week on Friday evening at Vesper service, and that's been going on since A.D. 1212. The nearest thing they had to a break, was in the middle of the Black Death in the middle of the fourteenth century, at which point they were down to three boys, because the Black Death was killing off the singers, but they still sang. So, the word is that they've sung for almost 800 years.

¹ Wilhelm Furtwängler (1886–1954), the great conductor of the Berlin Philharmonic, who suffered from British slander campaigns (see "New Developments in 'Furtwängler Case,'" *EIR*, Vol. 22, No. 29, July 21, 1995).

² Schiller Institute, *A Manual on the Rudiments of Tuning and Registration*, Vol. 1, with an introduction by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.; 1992.

Now, the discipline is tremendous. The cantor who was conducting the performance, is himself a product of the school. He's a very trained musician, about 40 years of age, but a full bearer of the tradition. Let me just identify the tradition, and then I'll come back, in due course, to how it bears on here.

These boys range from 7 to about 18, that is, it's a secondary school program; they are chosen for their voice and their musicality. But they are given a full *Gymnasium* education, like a secondary school, from that time until they complete graduation. Their musical work is done as a part of the total program of studies.

Each week, from the beginning of the week until Friday, four days a week (normally, except this particular week, when they only had three days because of a holiday), they start from scratch with a completely new repertoire for that week's Friday evening Vesper service. They learn from scratch. They then perform on Friday, and the following week take up a completely new program, so that in three years or so, they've gone through pretty much the entire Bach motet and cantata repertoire. And they won't forget it, I assure you; and they *never* will forget it. I saw the performance. Not only are they well-trained, but this particular discipline is very important.

I've seen, perhaps not as many rehearsals as some of you have seen, but I've seen a number; and I can tell you the *density* in the rehearsal, the density of direction, was about as intense as I've ever seen. But the boys were responsive and trained, and able to do it.

During the three-hour rehearsal, there was a break of about 15 minutes, in which these very serious, intent young boys and older boys, sitting in their chairs, cross-legged otherwise, but nonetheless singing, and very intent in the most professional manner, suddenly turned into boys, fresh boys. And they raced out of the area into the yard, played soccer, then came back in, as fresh as they had left, and sat down sedately, or as sedately as boys can do, in their chairs, and they *concentrated totally* on what they were doing. So there was total concentration, and total training, and a masterful direction.

Now the particular work, which was the featured work of the Friday program, which they were rehearsing this Thursday morning when we were in there, or Thursday noontime, was *Jesu, meine Freude*, which is one of the most difficult motets to perform adequately; not to perform it, but to perform it *adequately*, in the motet repertoire. It has challenges in there, which are rather astonishing.

The boys were learning it. The direction was intense; the management of the direction was intense. Nothing passed, everything was corrected. Diction, approaches, everything was involved.

The following evening (I missed the intervening rehearsal, which was done as the dress rehearsal in the morning, on Friday), but we were at the evening performance, and I'll tell you; it was one of the few times in recent years, hearing a musical performance, that the tears came spontaneously flowing out of my eyes. I couldn't hold them back. The performance was magnificent. *Everything that they had been taught, that they had rehearsed, every correction, came through in the performance; and better, of course, much better.*

The boys came in, intent. There are about 80 of them, two groups: the young boys, who are the pre-voice-change, and the young men, who are the older, after-voice-change, came in, with a cantor behind, *every one of them fully concentrated as a musical performer prepared to perform*, in that moment of total concentration that's required, before you've got the idea of your composition, in your head before you start to perform.

They came marching in with that idea in their head, a full program. They performed; they performed with precision, with shaping of tone. They sang not *on* the notes, but they sang *between* the notes; they knew how to do that, they were trained for that. It was the most remarkable performance of *Jesu, meine Freude* I have ever heard. And it was more remarkable, because I had experienced part of the process of its production, in the sense of participating in the rehearsal; and therefore, as you know, you have a much keener sense of the composition when you've listened through the rehearsal, and you're sweating as to how it's going to come out, in the final outcome of the performance.

From there, we went on other business to Halle and Berlin, in the course of which we heard a non-singer perform the Schubert *Die schöne Müllerin*, a non-singer whose voice was placed somewhere under their carpet, or by the wall, or in various places, anywhere but in the right place in the head, and doing all kinds of terrible things, with no third register whatsoever, and, you can imagine, that was pretty much of a disaster. The middle register was nothing to brag about, when you could find it; and sometimes he would hit a semi-placement in the first register, but it was horrible; it was a real horrible, torturous experience.

So much for Halle, where we had nicer things, of a different variety.

Music in Berlin

But then, in Berlin. Now, in Berlin, largely as avocation but also celebration of a very special meaning for me. We went to the Berlin Symphony, and we heard an Italian 'cellist performing Schumann. The 'cellist ran the short Italian 'cello Olympics, that is, his bowing was nothing to write home about, but it was fast. The shaping of tone was not exactly what I would have wanted. And apparently the orchestra, the Berlin Symphony, in its own magnificent and subtle way, managed to communicate or impart that sense, that that's what they thought about the whole thing, without saying anything, the way sometimes orchestras

can do. They then performed the Brahms Third, which was the exit piece, and that was excellent. It showed what they could do.

Then we had a similar experience, by a related body of people on the following evening, in the Deutsche Oper, which did a performance of *Fidelio*. There were some problems, the Pizarro was a little bit sick, and the soprano, who was magnificent, had nonetheless been singing too much Wagner, and her middle register had suffered a bit of that elevated Wagner; not good for the voice.

But the second act was absolutely magnificent, even despite Pizarro; and in the middle of this, they gave a punctilious performance, according to the directions which are famous because Furtwängler gave them, of the Leonore [Overture] No. 2, which is generally not done in that position, it's the Leonore No. 3. Magnificent!³

Now, I want to make a point on this experience, because I think it's relevant in a different way to the problem we face in dealing with young people and others in the community today. There are two characteristics which were outstanding in these performances: the degree of *precision* in performance, which is rare in the world, just rare. You just don't get that; and I remember some things like this, when I was much younger, that we used to have more in this direction, but the performance has become sloppy lately, the interpretation, all kinds of terrible things are happening. And you had a sense, in the Berlin Symphonic ensembles, of musicians who could do *anything*, if they had adequate direction. In the boys, you had a sense of the same thing.

This is probably the only boys' chorus in the world, which comes even close to that kind of standard. The Vienna Boys' Choir have become a bad operation; there's a chorus at Dresden, which is reportedly not bad, there's a chorus at Nuremberg, I don't know what it's like, but it used to have a good reputation. But this is *unexcelled*, I never heard anything like it. And I think I've heard a few things in my time. But this is *precision*, which meant *work*.

The other aspect, as with the boys, which is much more important to me, and is important to us in our work, is this. In order to perform as a musician, you must do something which makes music a powerful weapon to people who are not necessarily musicians. There's a difference between slopping something out, and trying to perform it, and facing problems in the performance which are real creative problem-solving problems, which you can slop through, or you can actually master.

³ Beethoven composed different overtures for each of the successive versions of his only opera, *Fidelio*, originally entitled *Leonore*. The overtures of earlier versions are traditionally incorporated into the performance of the final opera, at various points according to the discretion of the director.

I'll give an example of this, from geometry, an example which I use often, and the choice of example bears on the point I wish to make.

My primary concern is with *ideas*. Now, very few people these days, really could define what an idea is. Let me give you a definition, and let me relate that back to musical ideas.

The Eratosthenes Experiment

There's a very simple example of an idea, which comes out of Egyptian history (it's actually Greek history), of a measurement or an estimated measurement of the circumference of the Earth from pole to pole, by Eratosthenes, a member of the Plato Academy long after Plato had died, who went to Egypt and became the librarian of the Alexandria Library, who was responsible for a number of important discoveries in early Greek science and mathematics.

He measured the circumference of the Earth through the poles, by taking two positions and using a hemispherical sundial, in order to capture the angle of the Sun cast by a sundial, at noontime precisely, at two different points in Egypt, one north of the other, one in the area of Aswan and the other in Alexandria. And by comparing the difference in the angles of the sundial on that particular day, by a very simple method of geometry of similar constructions, he estimated the angle from the center of the Earth formed by these two points on the meridian and, having walked, or having had people walk the distance from Aswan to Alexandria, the point in Alexandria, and knowing the length of that arc, he thus projected that, to determine what would be the circumference of the Earth, and came out with an estimate of a circular circumference, which was only 50 miles off, approximately, in terms of the diameter of the Earth.

The importance of this particular experiment to me, is that he made this measurement with that degree of accuracy, with nothing more than those crude instruments, 2,200 years, approximately, before the first human being saw the curvature of the Earth. That is, he measured something 2,200 years *before anybody saw it*, which is not bad. The measurement involves not a measuring of something you can *see*, but measuring the *error* in what you see.

Now, this is very much like what happens in music, of course. Some people sing the notes; some people sing *between* the notes. Because the two notes don't mean anything, it's the interval that means everything, and what that interval means, is everything.

Mozart's Compositional Method

In particular, the area in which I'm most interested, is the discovery of a method of composition or improved method of composition by Mozart, who applied an idea, a discovery by Haydn to the later work of Bach and developed a method called *motivic*

thorough-composition, which is a characteristic of the Classical repertoire from about 1782 through the death of Brahms.

This method rests upon the ability to *perfect* the idea of a composition, so that as you prepare yourself to perform it, the idea of the composition, which exists in a kind of timeless sense; the idea of the composition begins with the first note and ends with the last note, and it's there all the time. It governs the way each note and each interval is performed. Complete concentration. And this is a *perfection* of that idea of music, to make a composition represent clearly and consistently and coherently a *single idea*.

Just as in the example, Eratosthenes reduced the difference between two points on the meridian to a single idea, which is the idea of the circumference of the Earth and its measurability, before anybody saw it.

This ability to develop these kinds of ideas, is important to us, in dealing with children who live in the poverty of Washington and elsewhere, and there are more of them all the time. Because it's important to give these children, and also adults, a sense of their own humanity.

We only do that, by making them see in themselves a power which lifts them up above the dogs on the street, who know the lampposts they can sniff, and similar kinds of things. It lifts them above the simple, sensual-perceptual experience, to realize that they as human beings are capable of generating ideas, ideas which are valid, ideas through which we can effectively change and improve the universe.

The job, I think, of music for us, in respect to the population in general, is to reach out to people who live largely in impoverished lives, people who are thrown into what the condition of mankind was for most of human existence, in which over 95% of the people of this planet lived in the conditions of serfdom or slavery or worse, with no opportunity. And we have, in this country and elsewhere, people who are thrown down into that kind of condition, or something approximating it. And our concern is to reach out to them, and give them a moment of experience which touches them, and makes them aware of their own humanity.

There's one example of this we had in Washington, which is repeatedly realized by a passage from Amelia's play [*Through the Years*], which deals with a slave auction. And when the preceding scenes establish the characters, and then the characters are brought to the slave auction, then the audience is touched; and some of these children, from the poorest circumstances, and also sometimes their parents or relatives, who participate in this or see their friends participate in this drama, are uplifted out of the circumstance in which they are normally entrapped, and they find something in themselves which is beautiful, and they may even move themselves to reach out, to find a better life.

Function of Music to Lift People Up

And that's the chief, general function of music for the population, is to uplift people, to bring them out of self-degradation and misery and brutality, and to give them a moment of experience in which they can approach music in the same spirit, at least approximately, that those St. Thomas Boys' Choir children and youth sing. To attack a musical idea, to experience its precision, not slop; to perform a polyphonic work with voice transparency, so it's not mud all over the place; to learn how to place their voices in such a way, that a voice part is a voice part and not a gang movement (in which you have trouble distinguishing the mezzo-sopranos from the sopranos, and it all gets mixed up somehow). But to achieve precision; to know they're doing it right, and to participate in *the idea of doing it right*, and know that it *is* right, as in the play: to reach ideas.

As you know, those of you who are musicians, it takes a lot of work to do things right. It takes a lot of training and sweat to do things right. But you find that unless you do that, you cannot actually effectively reach the audience, including those little boys and girls and others, who, if you can touch them with a perception, *not* of their ability to perform what you're performing for them, but their ability to *understand* what you're performing; and they come out of the musical events like the persons who participated as audience members, as it was said, in a presentation of one of Schiller's tragedies: the audience went into the theater, and came out of the theater, better people than they had entered it.

The object of a musical performance and a musical experience, is to take people into the performance, and have them leave it better people than they entered it. To do that, requires precision. To do that, requires delivering to the audience a sense of what's going on, to make the experience transparent to them, so they know what they're *hearing*, they have some idea of what it's all about. They can hear it done. Maybe they can't do it; but they can hear somebody do it, and know *human beings* can do it. They can see the beauty of doing it in that way. And if they can't perform the music with their hands or with their voices, *they can perform it in their minds, and hear the echo, note by note and phrase by phrase in their minds afterward.*

That appears to me to be the social and political and cultural and moral purpose of music. Music is the most concentrated expression, or the proper medium for the most concentrated expression of these principles in any form of art, the non-plastic arts in particular. Music incorporates the ideas, as anyone knows, of drama. It is rooted in Classical poetry; it is the abstraction of drama and poetry, and expresses those kinds of ideas in a very specially concentrated way.

Our job is to pick, I think, those kinds of examples that we can produce, present those examples to these people, who we would wish to uplift in spirit, give those audiences a sense of what is being done, so that they can more effectively intellectually participate in what's being done, and aim for the result that every child or other person who comes through that experience, leaves that moment of experience, that hour or two, as somewhat a better person, or a person revived in spirit, relative to the person that entered the room for that performance or event.

Thank you.

Replicating the German Musical System

Dennis Speed: As some of you may know, we are working now on a second volume of the two-volume "*Music Manual*." We've done the first volume, which is largely devoted to the voice as such, and then the idea is, a second volume on the application of the same voice *bel canto* technique to instrumental music. I wanted to ask Lyndon LaRouche two questions.

One is to ask you to tell us some of the thoughts you have about how this is supposed to be put together, and why we're doing it, but the second thing is, ever since I heard about this Leipzig business, I've been wondering: How would you do that? It's an 800-year-old institution. What do you do?

Lyndon LaRouche: I think the way is to share it. The first thing to do, when you see a performance which is that good, is not to say how you can do it, but to say: How is it done? The thing is to capture in your head how it's being done. Because if you can participate intellectually in what's being done, then you're participating. And if you go with that idea as a standard of what you do, you are improved by that.

It's like the old system in Germany, up through the time of Furtwängler. You had singing going on all over the place. You had singing in churches, singing in schools, choruses were not rare. You had local orchestras, local opera companies, all kinds of things going on, with the pinnacle of this generally aimed at a place called Berlin, where you had institutions which were the pinnacle of the entire musical system. So it was a kind of pyramid.

And then the performers at the various higher levels, including the top level, would come back to the constituency, which were the people who were singing in choruses and performing in the local theaters and churches, and would perform in that area. And the people who were by themselves amateur or professional musicians in that area, would pour out to the performance of the greatest performers of the country, who had come to that area. They would participate in that performance, they would leave it enriched, because they had

heard, what was for the nation at that time, a sampling of the best that was being done by the entire pyramid of which they're a part.

My view is that that is what we have to do; you can't do that so easily. These boys are picked for their musicality and voices, at the age of about 6 or 7. They're put through the most intensive training probably done anywhere on this planet in terms of voice training, that a child can do, and then you get this magnificent result, at the end.

Then you have a tradition. Remember that the present cantor is 40 years of age. Now, think about it. He went into the system obviously when he was about 7 or so. He went through the system until he was about 18, which meant that he had about 10 years in the system. Just think of what the repertoire was, which he worked through as a member of that system. Now think about the tradition that was involved, in passing down from one cantor to another, the methods of performance, the detail of performance, the fine-grained detail of how to handle each particular work in the repertoire.

This repertoire, particularly the: Bach repertoire, is a repertoire which in that particular institution has an *unbroken performance record*, every part of the Bach cantata-motet repertoire in particular; every part of it... And then he went on and got some orchestral and other training, just to enrich his training as a cantor, came back as the cantor, and now presents this accumulated training of hundreds of years in Bach as such, to these boys. It's there. You can't replicate that so easily.

But if you can participate in appreciating what they're doing, and how it's being done, and what's being achieved, if you can listen to a recording, if you could get recordings of some of the rehearsals, and listen to it, if you know the work, you would come away from it saying, "*That's the right way to do it.*" Or you might disagree; and you would say "*Why is that the right way to do it?*" Which is just as good, because, in that way, you're forcing people to participate *intellectually*.

Music is performed not as a physical act first. It's performed in the mind. It is heard in the mind, it is generated in the mind. Not with the fingers, not with the voice. The voice is a way of sharing what the mind is capable of knowing; and to do that, all kinds of things have to be brought into play.

So the point is to appreciate this, to work through it, to take some of the best, to learn; and when people participate in this kind of learning environment, if we can get the idea of music away from the sensual Romantic sense, to get it to *musical ideas*—

Look, why does a great performance which has no particular operatic passion to it, bring tears to your eyes? That's the point. Why? Because of the *idea*. And how do you achieve those

ideas? And to bring everything to bear to enable, just like you try to use the Eratosthenes experiment, to demonstrate to a child what ideas are, by pointing out the fact that the curvature that was measured with that estimated precision, was something which no human being had seen, until 2,200 years later? That's an idea; and the same thing is true of music. What is a musical idea?

It takes discipline, it takes hard work, it takes dedication. Some people say "Well, cook a meal." And somebody brings all the ingredients to the table, but they don't put them together to make the meal, and they say, "Eat."

Hamlet Was a Jock

Question: Are you then suggesting that music's only appeal is to the intellect, and not to the emotions?

Lyndon LaRouche: Well, it's the same thing. The question is, you have two kinds of emotion.

For example, if you see a child in the process of the child making a discovery; suppose it's your child. You see the child experiencing and solving a problem, making an actual breakthrough and discovery. The simple things that children learn. When you see a child doing that, this is something that will bring tears to your eyes, of joy.

That's an emotion. And when the children attend Amelia's play, who don't know anything about slavery; they don't understand slavery. But if they become identified with the idea of the characters, and then see the slave auction, there's emotion. But it's not the slapdash type of emotion that goes on in a bar-room or a Wagnerian performance. It's real emotion.

There are some people who teach, but I don't believe in the so-called "formal intellect without emotion."

As a matter of fact, when you face a problem-solving effort, when you have to solve a problem intellectually, which involves any creativity at all, the typical person says, "What's the answer?" That's called "intellectual activity," in the ordinary sense. I call it fakery.

But you find, that in order to solve problems, and also to perform in music, you can slap at it, and try to imitate it and fake it, without knowing what you're doing and hope that it's going to work, and then if people cheer and are happy, you say, "Well, I evoked emotion."

But the real thing is to muster yourself to solve the problem, and that requires emotion. You have to push yourself, you fight. The solution to the problem, comes to you as joy. You know it's right. And what you wish to do, is to evoke, to find out from the standpoint of the composer, for example, or in folk music to look at it from that standpoint; and to find from

the standpoint of the composer, what was the emotional experience which the composer selected for you that the composer had, in the process of developing problems and solving them, in the problem of composition? This was a very strong emotion for the composer; and that's the emotion you want. The emotion of discovery, which, no matter what it is, is always beautiful.

Let me give you an example, the example of tragedy of in drama.

In a great tragedy, the thing that always kills Hamlet or any other hero of a tragedy, is that the hero of the tragedy, clings to old ideas at a time that the old ideas are the things that are going to kill him. And the reason he clings, as in Hamlet's case, to the old ideas, is because he's afraid of the new.

Now Hamlet, of course, was a jock. He was what you might call a knuckle-dragger. You look at the play: This man is killing people. He thinks there's a rustling behind the curtain, he's talking to his mother, and he puts his sword through it! He goes out on the battlefield and kills a number of people. This guy is not a whimpering nerd.

But he is *weak*. He's a swordsman, a killer; he's a Green Beret, but he's a weakling. Because he dares not face the reality of *ideas which are strange to him*. He says he cannot think of that land from which no traveller has returned alive. He cannot face the ideas with which he's unfamiliar. He would rather die with old ideas that will kill him, than face new ones—which is a typical impotence. It's what kills societies, when they can't change their ways when they're doing something wrong.

And in art, it's the same thing. The great art always is a breakthrough. You could have tried to do it the old way, you could have just gone on doing what you were doing, but you'd have gone no place. Then you try to put some emotional spin on it, with a few theatrical tricks; but it really is nothing. But then, when you come up to the thing: "hey, this is the idea," and force it through, discovering a solution to break out of the monotony of the oldness, and to bring that idea across to the audience. What happens?

In the case of *Hamlet* or any similar tragedy, the audience goes in, sees the chief character make a fool of himself, and die. And the audience goes out of the theater happy. Why?

Because the audience has realized that they recognized that there was a solution to that problem, which this jerk missed; and the fact that they can see themselves as making the same mistake but recognize, through the medium of the play, how the problem could have been solved, and that they have the power to do that, makes them go out of the theater, feeling pretty good about themselves.

The same thing is true in music. There is this element which is not just random surprise, but the recognition that it was a surprise, but that it was the *right* thing to do, and the emotion associated with that.

Without that, if you don't move people on that level, just like the child may bring tears to your eyes simply by doing something good like that, there's no real emotion. And I think the difference between fine art and art, is that quality: If you can bring tears to people's eyes, tears of joy, with a great performance of a great work, *you've made it!* And you never can walk away from yourself after you do that, can you?

John Sigerson: I wanted to follow up on one of the previous questions, about the "*Music Manual*," specifically in terms of the singing qualities of instruments.

If you have a person who is currently a practicing Classical instrumentalist, who may not have a tremendous amount of vocal ability, what would be the primary focus for that person to work on at the present time?

Lyndon LaRouche: I think that some good instrumentalists are actually, in a sense, frustrated singers, as the case of Pablo Casals might tend to illustrate, if you recall.

Music lies in the head. You hear music in the head, and until you hear it performed in your head, you haven't heard it. That's the step. When you hear it in your head, when you play it over and over in your head, when you work through it in your head. And now, what you're trying to do, is you get these musical ideas, and can they be performed?

I've looked at, for example, Helmut Hocke on the oboe. And I had some ideas about the oboe, and this gentleman in two hours taught me more about the oboe than I'd ever knew I could have to learn; which demonstrated, that first of all, you must play the oboe, as any woodwind in particular, from the music in your head. That is, the head must sing. And the instrumentalist is coupled to the instrument. It's not the quality of the instrument, it's not the instrumentalist, but the quality of the two. The two must work together as if they were one thing.

And the *idea* of what is to be performed, *must* be performed with the instrument and the interchange of the instrument, and the physical processes of the performer. So the performer mentally has to sing.

Now when I hear Hocke doing these exercises and discussing some problems like, for example, the oboe part in Florestan's aria [in Beethoven's opera *Fidelio*], and in the overture, the introduction which precedes it, which is extremely difficult, and it is difficult for the Classical oboe; the modern oboe is easier. But we were discussing these kinds of ideas, and he

would do the demonstrations, you could see exactly that he's got the idea in his head; and it's a perfectly singing idea.

Take the case of Norbert [Brainin, the first violinist of the Amadeus Quartet] and people like him, or the few like him, in performing the violin. Now the method of the Böhm *Wiener Geigerschule* [Vienna violin school] method of bowing, is known to any well-trained violinist, what it is. Many people know it; but do they know how to use it? In order to use it, you have to sing in the head....

Or for example, let's take the three Razumovsky quartets of Beethoven. Now, how does the Amadeus Quartet achieve the effect which I would call "energy"? I asked Norbert about this, and he corroborated what I suspected.

The "energy" is not done by causing cats to yowl, by exaggerated *tempi*, by funny *rubati*, or quasi-*rubati*, but is caused by the way in which the tone is *shaped* in performing. So you use the powerful arm of the *Wiener Geigerschule* in order to achieve a tone-shaping which gives actually *great intensity* to the way the tone is shaped. It's not some mechanical effect, it's the shaping of the tone that gets the intensity.

So the Amadeus [Quartet], in performing this, perform with an absolutely *bel canto* kind of clarity, without the scraping, without the cats and dogs yowling. It's done; but with *great energy*....

I would suggest, as I suggest constantly, the key is something that every performing musician *knows*, but which is not made sufficiently self-conscious. And that is, in order to perform a composition, you must know the composition *as a single idea*, from beginning to end, which means it's an idea which, in a sense, exists in your mind independently of time. The first note you perform, is performed under the influence of this idea, and the last tone you perform, is performed under the influence of that idea.

And if you can do it that way, and if you're up physically to doing what you think you should do, then your performance will come out, if it's a good piece, as one of perfect coherence, which began where it should have begun, and ended where the composer should have ended it....

This is the secret, of course, to what Furtwängler refers to, in saying he performs between the notes....

To memorize a piece and perform from memory, you must have this, or else it will fall apart in mid-performance. And the thing is to take that idea, be conscious of that idea, what that idea means, and these things come into place. I think the way we get at it, is by dealing with this *motivic thorough-composition* conception, which is a perfection in composition of what

you wish to achieve in performance. It's a perfectly coherent composition, which begins with the right note, and ends with the right note. And everybody's satisfied the idea has been presented.

The Idea of Beauty in Art

Question: You explained how important it is to uplift people yesterday and today, and you or Helga [Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche] talked earlier about surrounding people with beauty. Is that what you mean by that? Can you explain?

Lyndon LaRouche: Yes. Beauty is the sense of something good is happening to your mind, that you are having an experience, that you come out realizing that you have more capabilities as a human being, that you're a better person, that you faced a challenge and you met it, and you solved the problem. You've done your job, and you walk with your shoulders unburdened, because you have the sense that you did the job, and you don't have to feel burdened about that any more. And a sense of things which open up your mind to the possibilities of your own ability to solve problems, or to get out from under, to get on top of a problem. All of these things are beauty.

Beauty is not something of that type, which is not easily done. You find it in great scientific discoveries, you find in great fine arts. Fine arts are the best expression of beauty, because they are creative works in which precisely this problem is faced.

For example, what I find is, whenever I'm involved in some particular chore, and the intellectual noise of the day and society around me is very burdensome, it is difficult to concentrate with the sense of freedom you want. I found, over the years, which is my relationship to music, that whenever I had to concentrate and I wanted to steep myself in the sense of beauty which would allow me to concentrate in a sustained way and do the best work, I simply concentrated on music for a while. Because in great music, there is that creativity which brings out the best in you. And great art.

For example, one of the great experiences I had in life, was standing before the stanzas in the Papal Apartments in the Vatican Museum, which is where the famous murals of Raphael are.

And later, in that same day, an hour or so later, we went to another part of the museum, where we had, on a chair, this original Raphael *Transfiguration*; and I knew these paintings, but I had never seen them *in vivo* before, and when you see them *in vivo*, your relationship to the painting is changed. And it's when you see them in that relationship, the way the artist *intended* them to be viewed, as opposed to a reproduction or a picture; when you stand in a certain position before *The School of Athens*, for example, you see something, and you go and

stand in another position, and you see something different. Then you realize what the painting does.

You get the same thing with the *Transfiguration*. There are two positions in which you can watch that. One is closer up, and the other is more distant. And the closer up, you'll see the lower part of the *Transfiguration*, you step back, you get the upper part, as a whole.

And your idea of the painting, is different. It is the *metaphor* of the two completely different images from the same painting, such that the idea of the painting is the combining of these two different central images, which is neither of them. That's art. And that's what music does.

Where musical performances fail, from my standpoint, apart from the mechanical failures, poor performances, or this technique or that sort, conceptually fail, is where they lack that.

For example, I just heard an old recording of a Furtwängler performance of the Schubert Ninth Symphony, which has some features in it, which tend a little bit toward the Romantic, which I don't like; *but* apart from that, the performance is entirely Furtwängler. It's thoroughly motivic in its composition, and from beginning to end, it's one composition, it's one idea. It's perfectly unified and coherent. And thus, apart from that part that I don't like, it's that.

For example, Claudio Arrau's a great pianist, or was; he died, got into his 90s. But he had this terrible showman-like Romantic streak of *rubato*, and he would just kill it. He was a man of great talent; but his *rubato*, or his quasi-*rubato* at the wrong places, would throw me into a fit. I realized that some people liked it, because it was some kind of an idiosyncrasy; but it throws me.

And with Furtwängler, this disturbing element in the performance of the Schubert Ninth, it doesn't bother me that much, because the *unity* of the idea all the way through, is so coherent. And saturating oneself with those kinds of musical ideas, I find reinforces, for me, the duration of the concentration span, and purifies the mind of the garbage with which it tends to be cluttered from the sensual world around one. And great art does that.

That, to me, is what is meant by the beauty of art. It makes our lives richer. Living through the experience each time, we come out feeling better than we entered it.

The Issue of Irony

Question: I wanted to ask if you would comment on a certain aspect of music and poetry together, with respect to what you're talking about now.

It's this quality of irony that I'm looking at, because the first time I heard a Shakespeare sonnet, I got into this romantic thing about how great it was, and the guy sitting next to me says, "No, I think it's ironic," and I didn't understand that. But I've worked on it, and I understand this.

Now, when I listen to a Beethoven piece, like the Third Piano Concerto, or the Op. 69 'cello sonata, it's this irony at the end, that even somebody who's not a Furtwängler or this kind of performer, understands or can convey.

Lyndon LaRouche: In Classical composition ... the best example is in the Late Quartets [of Beethoven].

Now, you get someone who's been to Juilliard, for example, and they decide they're going to play one of the Late Beethoven Quartets. They will make it sound like Stockhausen, because they will try to say, they have a theory, which has nothing to do with poetry, or nothing to do with music, though they may have some musicality in them, or it may not have been stomped out yet.

But they will say, "Music is divided into periods. [professorial voice:] There was the Rococo/Baroque Period, then there was the Classical Period, then there was the Romantic Period, then there was this and there was that." And they get a Hegelian or quasi-Hegelian idea, that these are pulsations in the history of mankind, where, as, for example, [professorial voice:] "At the Congress of Vienna in 1814–15, the Classical Period was supposed to have come to an end, and some kind of word was supposed to have gone out around the world, where all the little spirits that advise artists, would say, 'No more classics! Now you go to Romantic! The Romantic has just been decreed by the Congress of Vienna!'"

And these jerks will insist that between 1815 and 1818, every Classical composer, Beethoven, Schubert, especially and so forth, were all becoming Romantic. And if I look at the composition, I say, "There's nothing Romantic about these compositions, these are Classical compositions, they're motivic thorough-composition, where Brahms is one of the greatest polyphonic motivic thorough-composition composers in all of history. And he died after most of the Romantics were all dead. He was still composing. So where's the Romantic period in music? Brahms is Classical to the very end."

But some people say, "No, I've been taught that he's Romantic, so I'm going to play him as a Romantic. I've been taught that Schubert is becoming a Romantic, that late Beethoven is Romantic." And somebody else will say "No, actually there are elements of Stockhausen emerging in Beethoven, especially in the late quartets." And they'll get ahold of the composition, and try to perform it that way.

So you're on thorough, better ground, if you just look for the irony.

For example, let's take a song, by Beethoven, "In questa tomba oscura." People will treat that thing as if that were very sad. Well, it's a highly ironical piece, if you understand the Italian mind, which Beethoven did. This is *funny*. You're not supposed to go out there laughing, that will upset the singer. But it is funny, it's very funny. And the late Beethoven is full of ironies. All of Beethoven is full of ironies.

The nature of all great poetry is irony. For purposes of teaching, one of the simplest illustrations of metaphor and poetic composition, is this crazy Goethe with the "Mailed." I don't like it, never did like it. I don't like it in any setting, even Beethoven. I don't like that setting. *But*, I have to admit, that from a school classroom example standpoint, the "Mailed" is the simplest kind of presentation of a hilarious piece of humor (which is what Beethoven recognizes by the way he scores it).

But in any case, poetry is based on metaphor. A creative idea is one which does not derive from a literal meaning of any of the words.... He just changes the whole meaning of the poem, by the last couplet.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: The last couplet says: "*Sei ewig glücklich, so wie du mich liebst*"—"Be happy for eternity, as you love me." And it's a funny twist, it's not completely correct in terms of grammar, but the implication is, when you think about it, knowing who Goethe was, it really means, "You should be happy as long as you love me." That's the irony about it.

That happens to poetry. When you say it in prose, then it falls flat, in two dimensions, so you shouldn't do what I just did.

Lyndon LaRouche: If it's not ironical, it's not poetry. If it's not ironical, it's not art. As they say, "It don't do nuttin' for me."

Question: We had a visitor at one of our meetings the other night, who is with the Nation of Islam, who had just, after much prodding recently watched the video of Minister Farrakhan playing the Mendelssohn violin concerto....⁴ I just wanted to know what you thought of the video, but also what you thought of the way in which I see the effect of that, with having someone inspired to investigate Classical music for the first time.

Lyndon LaRouche: The whole video is overall extremely well done, I think.

What it does, is something very subtle, but also very prominent, but, in a sense, subtle. It's in between the cracks, it's not what's explicit in there.

⁴ "For the Love of Music." See "Farrakhan Plays Mendelssohn," *EIR*, Vol. 22, No. 29, July 21, 1995.

It presents Louis Farrakhan, and presents him in a way that he could not be presented otherwise. It adds a dimension of insight into him, and projects a depth of insight into him, which should not be presented in any other way, except in this relationship.

The entire introductory section presents the setting, the problems, the drama, leading up to this performance, what's involved. Then it has the performance. Then it has the epilogue, which reflects that; and so therefore, it is a play within a play. It's the drama built around the performance.

As a result, what happened is, it's an act of self-consciousness, because it forces him to be *conscious* of others being conscious of *him performing this work*, and his own problems in facing the task of doing it.

So when you do something like that, you can present an aspect of the mind of a person which would not otherwise be presented. When you can get a person who is responding to their responding to the way they are responding to a problem, that is, someone is watching them respond to a problem, and that's the problem they're dealing with; then they attack the problem, do the act, and then respond to the way this whole thing has gone on, is like a drama on several levels, and therefore you see *him* functioning on the several levels, as the person facing the performance, the person facing the people for whom he's going to perform, in various kinds of people, then facing himself in the whole process, in the end.

So he's on all these levels simultaneously. I think it's a very effective piece of communication, because he's presenting himself without actually controlling it all, but he's presenting himself in a way in which he does present himself more than he could in any other way, or in any lesser way.

It's a magnificent piece. He also has a strong right arm, which enabled him to bow his way through a lot of problems.