EIR
Executive Intelligence Review
June 15, 2012 Vol. 39 No. 24 www.larouchepub.com $10.00

Syria: Putin Draws the Line vs. Empire's War Drive
LaRouche: The End of Britain's 'Bail-Out'
Pressure Builds To Throw Obama Out of Office Now!

The Furtwängler Principle: Defying the Slavery of Sense-Certainty



Founder and Contributing Editor:
Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.
Editorial Board: *Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., Antony Papert, Gerald Rose, Dennis Small, Edward Spannaus, Nancy Spannaus, Jeffrey Steinberg, William Wertz*
Editor: *Nancy Spannaus*
Managing Editors: *Bonnie James, Susan Welsh*
Technology Editor: *Marsha Freeman*
Book Editor: *Katherine Notley*
Graphics Editor: *Alan Yue*
Photo Editor: *Stuart Lewis*
Circulation Manager: *Stanley Ezrol*

INTELLIGENCE DIRECTORS
Counterintelligence: *Jeffrey Steinberg, Michele Steinberg*
Economics: *John Hoefle, Marcia Merry Baker, Paul Gallagher*
History: *Anton Chaitkin*
Ibero-America: *Dennis Small*
Law: *Edward Spannaus*
Russia and Eastern Europe: *Rachel Douglas*
United States: *Debra Freeman*

INTERNATIONAL BUREAUS
Bogotá: *Javier Almario*
Berlin: *Rainer Apel*
Copenhagen: *Tom Gillesberg*
Houston: *Harley Schlanger*
Lima: *Sara Madueño*
Melbourne: *Robert Barwick*
Mexico City: *Gerardo Castilleja Chávez*
New Delhi: *Ramtanu Maitra*
Paris: *Christine Bierre*
Stockholm: *Ulf Sandmark*
United Nations, N.Y.C.: *Leni Rubinstein*
Washington, D.C.: *William Jones*
Wiesbaden: *Göran Haglund*

ON THE WEB
e-mail: eirns@larouchepub.com
www.larouchepub.com
www.executiveintelligencereview.com
www.larouchepub.com/eiw
Webmaster: *John Sigerson*
Assistant Webmaster: *George Hollis*
Editor, Arabic-language edition: *Hussein Askary*

EIR (ISSN 0273-6314) *is published weekly (50 issues), by EIR News Service, Inc., P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390. (703) 777-9451*

European Headquarters: E.I.R. GmbH, Postfach Bahnstrasse 9a, D-65205, Wiesbaden, Germany
Tel: 49-611-73650
Homepage: http://www.eirna.com
e-mail: eirna@eirna.com
Director: Georg Neudecker

Montreal, Canada: 514-461-1557

Denmark: EIR - Danmark, Sankt Knuds Vej 11, basement left, DK-1903 Frederiksberg, Denmark. Tel.: +45 35 43 60 40, Fax: +45 35 43 87 57. e-mail: eirdk@hotmail.com.

Mexico City: EIR, Ave Morelos #60-A, Col Barrio de San Andres, Del. Azcapotzalco, CP 02240, Mexico, DF. Tel: 5318-2301, 1163-9734, 1163-9735.

Copyright: ©2012 EIR News Service. All rights reserved. Reproduction in whole or in part without permission strictly prohibited.

Canada Post Publication Sales Agreement #40683579

Postmaster: Send all address changes to *EIR*, P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390.

EIR

From the Managing Editor

The title of this week's *Feature* may seem puzzling at first glance: What lesson does Wilhelm Furtwängler (who died in 1954) have to teach us about "The World's Breakdown-Crisis," which is happening *now*? I think you will begin to glean the answer to that question once you plunge in, beginning with Lyndon LaRouche's introduction, subtitled, "A Study in the Principles of Ontology." This is followed by a "triology" of profound and beautiful dialogues—the transcripts of three consecutive LPAC Weekly Reports, which explore the "Furtwängler Principle" in a colloquy among LaRouche and his young associates Matthew Ogden, Jason Ross, and Ben Deniston: "Defying the Slavery of Sense-Certainty"; "Creativity: Looking Toward the Future"; and "Science and the Poetic Imagination."

Our *International* section begins with "The Syria Flashpoint: Putin Draws the Line Against Empire's Nuclear War Drive," in which Nancy Spannaus reports on how British imperial strategy, using Syria as its geopolitical whipping boy, has run into the stiff resistance of Putin's Russia (allied with China). Immediately following is a report on President Putin's visit to Beijing, where he met with President Hu and attended a summit of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization; here, the two nations' war-avoidance strategy was in stark contrast to U.S. Defense Secretary Panetta's Asia trip, in which he continued the British-Obama scheme of creating a "ring around China."

LaRouche's "The End of Britain's 'Bail-Out'" leads *Economics*, in which he notes that "the present British world system is now hopelessly doomed to pass, as did the Roman Empire, in one way or another," and that the ready-at-hand solution, Glass-Steagall, must be enacted throughout the trans-Atlantic region. "Spain Forced To Seek Bailout as Glass-Steagall Push Intensifies," which follows, provides a case study.

There is good news in our *National* coverage this week: Obama & Co. are circling the wagons, as Congressional investigations and media exposés close in—and the smell of Watergate is in the air. There is also coverage of the LaRouche National Slate of candidates, and the renewed drive for Glass-Steagall, including a statement from candidate Diane Sare, on the recent New Jersey Democratic primary.



EIR Contents

Cover This Week



Société Wilhelm Furtwängler

Wilhelm Furtwängler rehearses Beethoven's Symphony No. 2 with the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, February 1948.

4 A Lesson from Wilhelm Furtwängler: The World's Breakdown-Crisis Is Now
By Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. This report provides the context for, and introduces the three elements of a thoroughgoing exploration of what is properly termed the "Furtwängler Principle," which immediately follow it. Furtwängler, he writes, opened "the proverbial 'gates' to the needed matters of physical science."

23 The Furtwängler Principle: Defying the Slavery of Sense-Certainty
The first in a trilogy of in-depth discussions on the LPAC Weekly Report, with colleagues Matthew Ogden, Jason Ross, and Ben Deniston. This, from May 23, looks at what LaRouche describes as "one of the greatest accomplishments in science in the past century or so."

37 Creativity: Looking Toward the Future
Part two of the trilogy, May 30, in which the music of Bach and Furtwängler is explored as "physical principles of the human mind."

46 Science and the Poetic Imagination
Part three on June 6 introduces a new voice into the dialogue, that of the poetic principle, as embodied in the poetry of, especially, Shelley and Keats.

International

57 The Syria Flashpoint: Putin Draws the Line Against Empire's Nuclear War Drive
Since the murder of Qaddafi last Fall, Putin's Russia has known what the British Empire is up to: ending the post-Westphalia system of national sovereignty, meaning a potential thermonuclear confrontation with Russia and China. But Russia, backed by China, has let it be known that it will not back down.

60 Putin in Beijing: Russia, China Ally To Thwart Obama's War Policy
President Putin's visit to Beijing June 4-7, and his meeting with Chinese President Hu, was an important step forward in preventing the outbreak of war, as threatened by the policies of the Obama Administration.

Economics

63 The End of Britain's 'Bail-Out'
By Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. "Without an immediate installation, by political force of leading nations, of a trans-Atlantic equivalent of President Franklin Roosevelt's original 'Glass-Steagall' law, the nations of western and central Europe (and others) will become virtually 'far worse than merely financially extinct' during the presently onrushing collapse already underway," LaRouche writes.

65 Spain Forced To Seek Bailout; Glass-Steagall Push Intensifies
The announced, but yet-to-be disbursed, bailout of Spain's hopelessly bankrupt banks, will do nothing to resolve the crisis overtaking the entire trans-Atlantic financial system.

National

67 Pressure Builds To Throw Obama Out of Office Now!
National security leaks from within the Administration are under investigation; Attorney General Holder faces contempt of Congress; Obama's macabre "kill list"—all this and more, prompted Lyndon LaRouche's observation that "Obama is on the edge of being finished."

70 The LaRouche Slate: Glass-Steagall Put Back on the Agenda
LaRouche Democrat Kesha Rogers' victory in the Democratic primary for Congress in Texas, and Diane Sare's campaign in New Jersey, combined with the multi-billion-dollar derivatives loss by JPMorgan Chase, and the collapse of the banks of the Eurozone, have put the issue of restoring Glass-Steagall back on the front burner for the U.S. Congress.

71 Diane Sare: 'I Am Proud To Have Stood for Truth'
The LaRouche Democrat's statement following the New Jersey Congressional primary.

Editorial

72 Dump the Euro! Get on with Development!

A LESSON FROM WILHELM FURTWÄNGLER

The World's Breakdown-Crisis Is Now

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Tuesday, May 29, 2012

(BREAKING NEWS:) In the midst of my writing of this report, on Friday evening, May 25, 2012, the long-simmering general financial breakdown-crisis of the trans-Atlantic world (and also beyond) has now struck. In the United States itself, as elsewhere, this means that either the original Glass-Steagall law is now reinstalled, virtually immediately, or a world crisis virtually beyond belief is breaking out, probably, by Tuesday morning or soon thereafter, unless the intention to re-install the original Glass-Steagall law is installed, and that virtually immediately. Either way, the world as we have known it, is about to undergo a sudden and tremendous change.

Foreword: (A Study in the Principles of Ontology)

The systemic error inherent in the formerly accustomed, but nevertheless errant view of mankind's powers of sense-perception, has been an effect which had been rooted in the quality of the following set of presumptions: ***First:*** *the presumption, that the foundation of human experience is to be located primarily in what is presumed, mistakenly, to be the act of simply presumable, "virtually self-evident" sense-perception of objects of, implicitly, particular "matter;" and,* ***Second:*** *the presumption that that, consequently, should be taken to be a standpoint from which we are to do the following:*

1.) To derive knowledge respecting the existence of living processes, erroneously, from what is dead, as from what is typical of the standpoint of the late Bertrand Russell's guidance to his dupe, the silly Alexander I. Oparin;

and



"There is a crucial intersection," writes LaRouche, "between my methods of forecasting and the results secured by Furtwängler's discovery of musical principle." Shown: Wilhelm Furtwängler (1886-1954) conducting.

2.) To that same effect as that of Oparin's error, we have the earlier case of Rudolf Clausius. Clausius's error is a case from which persons have derived the errant notion of the existence of the species of human life-forms as being consistent with existences of life-forms which are not human life-forms. The case of the type of systemic failure of judgment by Clausius, as of others, is derived from the ontological error of attributing the quality of the lower forms of life to the quality of existence if the different characteristics of that which is presumed to become sensed, as if that were what is to be considered to be the quality attributed to the act of sensing the object ***per se****, animal life, as if human and animal life were simply inter-changeable. Such is a common ontological error of mathematicians and others, including the relatively worst case of the economists of the virtual "flat Earth" dogma of the "Chicago school."*

It must be emphasized, in sharp contrast to the customary practices of the reductionists of all varieties, that the work of the celebrated musical composer and director Wilhelm Furtwängler, had correctly demonstrated the need for a view which is directly opposite to that of the cases of known "stop-watch" conductors on the podiums of concerts, or comparable reductionists:

3.) respecting both life as such in general, ordinarily, and, also, for example:

4.) the higher expression of specifically human life, which is located in the noëtic powers specific to the human mind. These are powers which do not lie within the presumed bounds of what have been identified as the simply "mere senses."

The same set of those four points just listed above, is appropriately restated as a principle, as follows:

That those creative (i.e., noëtic) powers which are presently known to us as being specific to the powers of the human mind, are distinct, as Wolfgang Köhler had indicated specifically, in his opposition to what had been the reductionist's customary, failed notion of the human brain. Those noëtic powers which our reductionists[1] *deny, were, thus, to be rejected by the errant, but are to be considered as typical reflections of the highest ranking authority for human knowledge, if and when they are being expressed as being presently known as our experience of "the universe."*

What I have just proposed here, thus requires the additional, principled recognition, that there is a relationship between ***(a)*** *the powers specific to the experience of the human mind, as distinct from the common presumption of the ordinary notion of the brain as such, and* ***(b)*** *the notion of the concept of a universal "Creator."*

To restate that same argument: we must rely upon mankind's expressed powers to create new states of "matter" within a universe as it is presently known to us. This works to such effect, that we are enabled to identify the efficient existence of ***a universal principle of creativity, in its effect****, as being a characteristic of our universe, in some way, and some form.*

Among the most relevant features of this kind of experience, is the evidence that the evolution of life-forms,

1. The followers of the decadents Ernst Mach and Bertrand Russell, for example.

as within the terms of the evolution among the totality of those living species presently known to us, presents us with an "upward" ordering (i.e., anti-entropic) in the general, net evolution of living species, past and present: this is an ordering which is specifically, and universally anti-entropic in its characteristics as a process.[2] *Customarily, this clearly pertains to our present knowledge of life-forms on Earth; but, the argument for both our Solar system, and which is also relevant for the case of our galaxy, is a strongly defined implication. What are called "human (over-) population crises" are not a product of the nature of man, but of the "unnatural" disease of oligarchism, a disease whose effect is an imposition of stupidity on what are often denounced as those "lower classes of society" which are nothing as much as they are the victims of the impositions of submission to be ruled by oligarchism.*



"The history of leading physical-scientific practice since the crucially important contributions of Max Planck and Albert Einstein, begs, more and more, that we consider the fundamental problems of scientific practice by considering the universe as if 'from the top-down approach': from the galaxy as a system.…" Shown, Planck and Einstein, Berlin, June 1929.

For example: With respect to matters bearing on the existence of our galaxy, the periodicities of development within the range of our galaxy, are also to be considered as powerful evidence of a coherence in this just-indicated degree, as this is already located within the observed record of the periodicities of the processes of the galaxy itself. Such is the experience of a knowledgeable ordering extended within the extent of our galaxy, and reaching beyond.

On the Subject of the Principle of Music

The foregoing, stated conclusion begs the inference of a certain specific kind of universality, that of a truly universal, and knowledgeable principle of creativity. The empirical evidence to this effect, for music, is provided to us as by the work of Wilhelm Furtwängler, and by that work's relevance to the preceding genius of Johann Sebastian Bach's C=256. This has had universalizing implications for the defining of the principled characteristics of the human mind. Indeed, the rises and declines of the Classical musical principles so defined, correspond, in experience, to the ebb and flow of the moral quality of the intellectual competence of the relevant cultural current among sections of human society.

This is reflected in the function of metaphor, when metaphor is also recognized as invoking the universal physical principle of Johannes Kepler's use of the notion of "vicarious hypothesis," otherwise known to us as the notion of "metaphor."

Consider a Related Case

I have referred attention, above, to that experimental evidence which works to the effect, that the successfully continued existence of the human species, has depended upon the function of a trend of increase in the relative energy-flux density expressed as a correlative of the role of "fire," or its equivalents, if and when such density is expressed in the evolution of the capabilities of the human species to relatively higher levels of cultural development. In a related way, the potential ability of the human species to maintain human life on Earth, is correlated with the qualities of society's intellectual (i.e., noëtic) progress toward some effect of higher levels of energy-flux density, or, its equivalent, as from simple use of fire, into (or, beyond) the known range of subjects of "matter/antimatter" actions.

The "force" of that just-stated argument, was corroborated, within the scope of the contributions by such

2. There never was actually proven evidence supporting that hoax of "a second law of thermodynamics" uttered by Rudolf Clausius.

leading intellects as Max Planck and Albert Einstein. This was shown in a conclusive fashion, by the evidence that neither space-in-itself, nor time-in-itself, qualify as simply self-evident properties of what a faulty, but persisting popular convention still wishes to employ to define the existence of a known physical space-time per se.

The trend into decadence which is exemplified by the cases of certain notable adversaries of Max Planck, as in the case of such as the assaults on science by reductionists such as the Austrian Ernst Mach,[3] *and, also, by both the utterly debased Bertrand Russell, and Russell's own products, such as the British-created Russian puppet-figure Alexander I. Oparin. Oparin's case typifies the implicitly lying influences, such as the oligarchism which Bertrand Russell induced in his pathetic dupe, Alexander Oparin, an oligarchical outlook which has tended to wreck scientific progress, that out of motives of hatred against competent science by such as Bertrand Russell and his lackeys.*

The Fraud of Euclid in Particular

That much said, we must emphasize included attention to highly relevant, other, earlier avenues of pathological thinking, such as the mental illness represented by what is often identified, as by me and others, as the Aristotelean cult of Euclid, which continues to play a significantly destructive role in the mental life of what often seems, mistakenly, to pass for "science." The pathological trend inhering in Euclid's system, was exposed, and condemned publicly by that friend of the Christian Apostle Peter, who was sometimes known as "Philo of Alexandria." This also has a significance in science, for reason of that fraud of Euclid's role as a morally degrading factor of distraction from a competent scientific method. Those ironies of the fraud of Euclid (notably, since the death of Eratosthenes) are of exemplary, historical-clinical interest for us here, on that account.

According to Philo, the still-chronic, relevant thesis of Euclid worked to the effect of asserting that the existence of mankind could not have existed until the Creator of the universe were already dead: that same thesis of "God is dead," is associated with the radically reductionist, modern figure of Friedrich Nietzsche and consistent fascists (as also worshipers of the "tradition" of the Olympian Zeus) generally. Those chronic errors are derivatives of the so-called "oligarchical principle."

Life is, after all, as the referenced work of Wilhelm Furtwängler attests, the essence of creativity, and of true love of the universal passion of creativity as such!

The systemic fallacy permeating that reductionist's fallacy which I have addressed in the preceding paragraphs, is the fruit of a reductionist fallacy rooted in the elementary error, such as that both Bertrand Russell and A.I. Oparin represented by the substitution of an ill-conceived notion of sense-perception ***per se,*** *for the ontological "content" of what is presumed have to been the common expression of the "living" and the "dead" alike.*

The Reductionist Hoaxes Generally

That much said in the introduction of the report this far:


Before we proceed further, we must emphasize the troublesome special role of those social systems which are, categorically forces expressed as mankind's willful habits of social self-destruction of our species, habits which are specific to those oligarchical social systems which are products of cancer-like disorders of societies such as what are identified, more or less interchangeably, by the categories of "monetarism" or "oligarchism."

Such epidemic expressions of social-mental diseases, have been customary for many human cultures thus far. They are issues of a type which has been typified by, but not limited to oligarchical systems such as the case of the modern, approximately "world wide," nominally "British" imperial monarchy, the monarchy that has been the imperial system which was spawned by "The New Venetian" empire, and carried, like a kind of epidemic, into the British Isles, by that incarnation of a vicious disease known as William of Orange.

Such expressions are properly identified as a wicked scheme cooked up as the typical "social expression" of "childhood cultural diseases" of entire human social systems, and must be recognized as, and treated as social diseases which are either simply chronic, "wasting diseases," of some infectious cultures, or a characteristically fatal one.

To recognize the crucial character of the point I am presenting, consider the case of two-term U.S. Presi-

3. As in Berlin during "World War I," as reported by Albert Einstein then. Mach's influence was then superseded by the campaigns wrought by the evil Bertrand Russell during the Solvay Conferences of the 1920s.



Ralph E.W. Earl

President Andrew Jackson, a scoundrel and London/Wall Street puppet, participated in the genocidal campaign against the Cherokee nation; the intention was to spread the London-steered slave system into the former Cherokee territory. Shown: Jackson (right); the Cherokee "Trail of Tears," by Robert Lindneux.



dent and scoundrel Andrew Jackson, who served as a puppet for the London and Wall Street speculative interests in cahoots with British and Wall Street swindlers such as Aaron Burr, Martin Van Buren and their immediately leading accomplices.

It was that trio of principal schemers and their followers, which bankrupted the United States of their time through a swindle conducted against the essential economic bulwark of the U.S.A.'s economy in that period. This was done by a fraud against the Second National Bank of the United States, thus creating the terrible financial Panic of 1837 which left a trail of blood and tears through our nation, down into Florida, up to and beyond the site of the Cherokee nation, which led into the outbreak of the Civil War. This was done through such dirties as Andrew Jackson's part in a genocidal campaign against the Cherokee nation, which was intended to clear away that nation by means of a deliberate genocide in which Jackson was a prominently culpable figure, a campaign whose intention was to clear the territory of the Cherokee as part of the spread of the London-steered slave system into that same territory. This was done by such means, combined with the British intention of destroying the United States, to prepare the way for the U.S. Civil War launched by that British monarchy whose reign must always be remembered as the pestilence of the New Venetian Party which had spawned the British empire.


The politically illiterate U.S. citizens today, still sing the praises of Andrew Jackson, and manage to overlook the swindles against the United States also done by such swindling bankers of Boston, Wall Street, and the British monetarist empire, as by aid of the roles of Aaron Burr, Martin Van Buren, and their other London-based Wall Street leaders.

It would be most urgent to take into account the effects of the looting of not only the purse, but also the minds of so many of our citizens, still today: poor citizens, who profess themselves admirers of the scoundrels, fooled admirers who believe foolishly in the doctrines they associate with the so-called "Jacksonian tradition."

On the basis of the two points whose types I have just emphasized, we should consider the evil effects of the show of ignorance by past and present advocates of the mixture of the evil represented by the stubborn ignorance among both leading, and other political figures of our republic. This has been the source of the sheer maliciousness and the ignorance of those who defend

malicious expressions of ignorance as their pathetically misguided basis for their notions of legal authority. Such ignorance as theirs should warn us of the citizen's obligation to condemn, more or less equally, the crimes of intentional malice and those of the kind of seemingly innocent ignorance whose practiced foolishness amounts in effect to serve as also a true crime against our nation, and relevant other nations. Thus such pitiable folk also betray themselves.

Certain qualities of ignorance, when shown by even a simple citizen, or a citizen with the qualifications of a professional, must be considered as a fault which demands relevant corrections, or those remedies against negligence, which, in principle, also require appropriately prompt and efficient remedies.



The doctrine of Bertrand Russell, and of his dupes, such as Oparin, denied universal principle, "in favor of mere social conventions among the members of oligarchies."

I. The Idea of a "Future": A Systemic Clue

To rephrase my opening argument above:

Unfortunately: heretofore, the commonplace presumptions respecting the basis for assumptions respecting man's knowledge of his imagined "world outside," the citizens' reliances on sense-perceptions *per se*, had been commonly tied, widely, to the often deadly, inherently deceptive notion of an "elementary, bare" human sense-certainty as such.

We might properly choose to regard the simplest illustration of this troublesome point, as typified by the case of the relationship between Bertrand Russell and what I have identified above as his notable dupe, Alexander I. Oparin. For Oparin, life had existed only as the presumed effect of a statistical freak-show of a type which was close in character to the pathetic fantasy of John von Neumann's cult of a statistically random universe, which was also his belief as to his situation within the bounds of an infinitely increasing density of "random numbers." Oparin's hoax had been a virtual copy of the super-densely hollowness of the pathetic numerology of von Neumann, as both of them, like Professor Norbert Wiener, were the essentially sly, but foolish dupes of Bertrand Russell.

It is notable, that the doctrine of such dupes of Bertrand Russell, had no actual principle of physical science; their belief, at the bottom of the matters before them, was entirely negative: the denial of any actually universal principle in favor of mere social conventions among the members of oligarchies. It must be noted that the root of that substitute for any actual physical principle, was essentially the same denial of the existence of efficiently existing physical principles which had been put forward by Rudolf Clausius' launching of the oligarchical hoax which came to be known as the "Second Law of Thermodynamics."

If only in a curiously malicious sense, there is no physical principle within the dogma of Clausius and its like. The so-called "Second Law" is, as the British empire's oligarchy insists, a denial of the actual existence of any actually physical law. The social, not physical law, professed by the British imperialist monarchy's reign over Africa, among other victims, is the tradition of the same "oligarchical principle" associated with the Roman Empire and with such among its still famous predecessors as the triumphant predators of the Trojan War. It is the typified expression of the legendary tradition of oligarchical tyrannies' intended denial of the right of the victims to use "fire." It is the commitment of the British empire of today, to reduce the human population of this planet by means of methods of systemic mass murder known as the "oligarchical principle," and also known as "The Second Law of Thermodynamics," which repeatedly unleashes, as, again, today, and as Bertrand Russell had prescribed as a permanent form of practice, the means of genocide common to the Roman empire and to the British empire, as to Adolf Hitler, Britain's Tony Blair, and Blair's Brutish President Barack Obama, and their like, throughout so much of the world, then as now.

For my own purposes, as in this present report, real-

ity is presumed to be in correspondence with the system associated with the expanding map of the history of "life" developed thus far within the range of the work on the history of life by our team's Cody Jones et al., as to be found among "the Basement" studies up through the present update of our team's, and related references. The "translation" of the content of those studies, is to be referenced to the work presented under the category of my developments in physical-economic science, developments which I trace from the work of Nicholas of Cusa's **De Docta Ignorantia** and the consequent function of *vicarious hypothesis (i.e.* ***metaphor*** *which was crafted by Cusa's follower Johannes Kepler.*

For such cases as the opposing, pathological policies and conceptions of Bertrand Russell and his foolish puppet, Oparin, their selected subject is only asserted to be a living quality of personality in the arbitrarily adopted intention of each of them; in fact, what might be termed as "the conventional opinion," provides no evidence of the type which we might consider as self-evidently "sense-perception." Their dogma represents a shadow of something to be considered more or less precisely as likenesses of the aprioristically numerological presumptions of Bertrand Russell dupes Alexander I. Oparin and John von Neumann.

Now Comes the Subject of Wilhelm Furtwängler

We must properly discredit the frauds of the so-called "applied mathematics" of Russell, Oparin, Norbert Wiener, John von Neumann, and their like. However, for this occasion, we have a far better choice of subject available to us: therefore, we turn our attention here to the crucial physical-scientific discoveries which deeply underlie those relative certainties already well established by the discoveries of one certainly among the greatest musical directors of the recent century, Wilhelm Furtwängler. Furtwängler's proofs are not musico-mathematical; they are, as I shall emphasize that point in the course of this present report, ontologically human in the deepest and fullest, scientific sense of that choice of terminology.

Therefore, it will be shown in the following pages, that the statements which I have just presented are neither wrongful, nor unduly emphasized. Quite the contrary, what we shall have claimed on such account, will have only begun to treat what we can claim on that account, here; it only scratches the surface of what wiser persons than we might not properly dare to consider as being entirely their own. What the best among them have created, has been, in each instance, chiefly their nourishment of a precious inheritance which they have adopted as their own, as the case of Wilhelm Furtwängler should make that point of universal principles clear.

For contrary cases, such as the intimately related, but contrary and pathological policies and conceptions of Bertrand Russell and his virtual puppet, Oparin, the *subject-matter* as that pair define it, was merely asserted to be the creation of a living creature, or personality. It was adopted as the fruit of the arbitrarily selected intention of each of them. Each of them is to be treated as if he, or she, (or, "it") were self-conceived to perform a function akin to that of a "wind-up toy running down." In this matter, the fact of the defects inhering in a reliance on "facts" attributed to from-the-bottom-up opinions respecting sense-perception *per se*, has been much more evaded than it had been avoided, despite the relevant, warning words of caution on this account to be found in such locations as the relevant, concluding section (*i.e.,"Application to Space"*) of Bernhard Riemann's celebrated 1854 habilitation dissertation,[4] or the later discoveries of Max Planck and Albert Einstein.

From that standpoint of the several references thus presented here thus far, what is already customarily regarded as physical evidence is, merely, in fact, a shadow cast by reality, rather than the relevant reality as such. To restate this same point: from an alternate standpoint: what is often taken for facts in "hard" evidence, even about a century or more earlier, is merely a shadow cast by what has remained, so far, customarily, unknown.

Therefore, on that subject, the history of leading physical-scientific practice since the crucially important contributions of Max Planck and Albert Einstein, begs, more and more, that we consider the fundamental problems of scientific practice by considering the universe as if "from the top-down approach": from the galaxy as a system, as this is implicit in the work of Riemann, and, emphatically, the standpoints of such among his revolutionary followers as the highly relevant cases of Planck and Einstein, as in the latter pair's considering the universe from its mega-galactic vantage-point as a whole (rather than the currently "bot-

4. Bernhard Riemann, **Über die Hypothesen, Welche der Geometrie zu Grunde liegen. Werke**, B.G. Teubner, Teubner, Stuttgart,1902, "III. Anwendung auf den Raum," pp. 283-287.



The Russian biogeochemist Academician Vladimir Vernadsky (1863-1945), a contemporary of Furtwängler, identified the ontology of matter, as the non-living (inorganic), the living (organic), and the noösphere (human cognitive life).

tom-up" vantage-point of the particular as located, as if generated from within the extremely small).[5]

On that account, consider certain crucially relevant discoveries by that great modern scientist *in the field of the physical principles of musical practice*, Wilhelm Furtwängler. Furtwängler had done a great amount to free the full range of a valid physical science from the inherent fallacies of the search for the futile pursuit of alleged origins in the domain of the infinitesimally small. He had done so, by opening the proverbial "gates" to the needed matters of physical science, when science is considered from the relevant standpoint of that which is the universal domain of the seemingly tremendous.

In an essentially related aspect, we must deal with the troublesome issues of the fact of the ostensibly paradoxical existence of an ontological distinction of living processes from the non-living; this must be done, provided that we are being very careful not to fall into the wicked sophistries of such as Bertrand Russell and Russell's silly dupe, the self-described, poor, wind-up toy among similarly self-defined wind-up toys, such as the relevant case of Alexander I. Oparin.

5. The interlinked work of Lejeune Dirichlet and Bernhard Riemann has common qualities directly linked to the consequent work of Max Planck and Albert Einstein, in their characteristics.

We shall put the case of Russell and his dupes to one side for a certain amount of time, after we have examined the notion of a universal (but not bounded) universal reality, a reality which we shall locate in the principles which we must more than fairly consider as discovered and developed by Wilhelm Furtwängler.

Therefore, I now proceed as follows.

The Role of Vernadsky

To attain the insight into the work of Furtwängler which later considerations now bring into view, we must look into the work which a relative contemporary of Furtwängler's, Vladimir I. Vernadsky, brings to bear on these same matters.

Since the work of V.I. Vernadsky, the essential elements of what is named "matter," are identified ontologically, respectively, as: *(1) non-living; (2) the living; and, (3) the noëtic as specifically the principle of human life*. The common distinction of the latter two categories, which is locatable in the qualitative distinction of living from non-living processes, is that the qualification of "life" depends upon *an anticipation of life* as if existing both "prior to", and, "later than" the moment that the "whispered" prescience of life's existence, is experienced. It must be experienced in a distinguishable, foretasted moment, prior to, and also following the apprehension of the association of a life-form *per se.* Use the respective terms "foresight" and "hindsight" to denote those such special qualities of the relevant subject-matters. Those, and closely related distinctions, as Wilhelm Furtwängler demonstrated and emphasized the importance of that aspect of the matter, are to be treated by us here, as being ontologically, crucially significant experiences.


This coincidental feature of the work of both Furtwängler and Vernadsky, is crucial for the purpose of the commonly shared ontological basis, and I shall treat that matter so at the appropriate moment in this present report.

However, there are some additional common roots to be considered here. My own expertise, for example, lies within the domain of what has remained the little-known branch of science properly named as that "sci-

ence of physical economy," in which I have been uniquely successful since my first such professional ventures as a long-ranging economic forecaster, since my professional appearance in the instance of a remarkably successful forecast which I had presented in 1956-57.

The notable difference which my discoveries have represented, lies essentially in the fact that the generally taught methods of what is usually, mistakenly, considered as professional forecasting, have been, predominantly, essentially, merely statistical extrapolations of the past, and are therefore intrinsically incompetent; whereas, my own are based on what usually remains as my relatively unique practice of physical-economic considerations as such. The crucial point to be emphasized in that context, is: "To foresee the future, one must have actually physical knowledge of that future," as this continues beyond mere "economics" into the history of the present and future life within the Solar system and its subsuming galaxy.

The principle of true success, as in economic forecasting, is usually not popularity, but service to the needed intentions of mankind, especially when and where those services are rarely found.



LPAC-TV

The investigations of the LaRouche Basement research team, using galactical, solar, and other measurements, have demonstrated that "the existence of life within those known spans have been regulated by a principle directly contrary to the intrinsically fraudulent 'Second Law of Thermodynamics.'" (See www.larouchepac.com/node/21941 for further information.)

At this point, let us examine the argument for what I have actually done successfully in this matter.

The "statistical method" commonly used (or, merely pretended to have been used) as an asserted basis for "economic forecasting," precludes, by its very nature, the most essential requirement for an actual forecast: the existence of a certain future, may, or might not be a new development. The fact of that matter has been subjected to a crucial test by the fact of the role of the original "Glass-Steagall Act" from its 1933 installation by Franklin Roosevelt, until the tragic cancellation of that same Glass-Steagall Act in the closing months of the Administration of President Bill Clinton. In effect, the cancellation of Glass-Steagall had been demonstrated to have been an act of virtually criminal insanity, as recent suggestions for a "modified" version of Glass-Steagall would also be a willful act of virtually criminal sanity.

A team of my associates has mapped the known existence of forms of life on Earth with excellent approximation in use of the best standard sources. The outcome, using galactical, as also Solar and other measurements, is that the existence of life within those known spans has been regulated by a principle directly contrary to the intrinsically fraudulent "Second Law of Thermodynamics." Life on Earth, and as considered otherwise, has been governed by progress to more successful forms of life, as this may be measured in thermodynamic terms as evolutionary progress with respect to increases not only in what is recognizable as the effects of ordered increases in relative energy-flux density, but also in willful choices of practices and effects of such changes on existing expressions of life.

The complementary consideration is, that lowering the rate of increase of energy-flux density tends to the effects of cultural, or even human-species extinction.

This latter consideration has what some might consider to be an interesting parallel consideration. In the domain of military policy, the general trend has been that military success requires increase of the effective equivalent of "energy-flux density applied," as "the principle of the flank" only illustrates the point. Now, with the advent of thermonuclear capabilities, war has entered a terminal stage in practice. When the effective equivalent of applied energy-flux density reaches a thermonuclear weapons phase, the attempt at warfare approaches the virtual certainty of human self-extinction, as is presently the case. ***War must then submit to the principle of reason.*** In brief, that means that a fixed system of economy, must now submit to scientific principles of reason. Similarly, economic practice, and the principled ordering of such practice, is no longer a matter of an available choice of modes; war and economy must now submit to reason, rather than arbitrary means of political power.

It is notable that that does not mean "world government" as those words might be considered in the sense of what those words would signify today. Quite the contrary. "World government" in the sense of the meaning of those terms today, must be banned as signifying the evil most to be despised and feared. "World government" means, in fact of practice a form of tyranny known as the tyranny of a Roman-style empire over the world. The sovereign form of separate nation-state has proven itself to be the mandatory guardianship against the oligarchical tyranny which the presently reigning British monarchy represents in fact, and by inherent intention.

It is "world government" in the sense intended by such a scoundrel as a Tony Blair, which is disqualified from control over the practice of government. It signifies that figures which do not meet the intellectual and moral standard implicitly specified by our original Federal Constitution, or "populist" figures in general, such as the properly considered Andrew Jackson, are not qualified to enter our Federal Government, for example. The retreat to the intrinsic bestiality of repealing the Peace of Westphalia remains, thus, a crime against humanity: reason, not tradition or incumbency must rule.

That just stated fact has been defined, from the work presented by relevant professional sources during recent decades. The principle of life, as known to us presently, is expressed through evolutionary processes which are characteristically directed by the effect of anti-entropic trends in the evolutionary processes which are, in their general expression processes in a system of anti-entropic processes.

In human behavior, as counterposed to other forms of life, the essential distinctions are specifically voluntary choices of either adoption of, or negligence of the requirement of "upward-directed" human changes in the potential productive powers of human labor, as measurable per capita and per unit of increase of physical productivity. The relevant unit of measurement for this function is "increase of the energy-flux density" per capita and per unit of volume. These elementary considerations are willfully disregarded by the general practice of economic policy-shaping in respect to long-terms trends in policy-shaping through most of the Americas and western Europe since those bench-mark times, as we have experienced exactly this downward trend in physical fact, in net results since the assassination of U.S. President John F. Kennedy.

There is a crucial intersection between my methods of forecasting and the results secured by Furtwängler's discovery of musical principle.

Vernadsky & Furtwängler Again

Compare the heydays of Vernadsky and Furtwängler, to the history of the leading physical-scientific practice under the crucially important contributions of Max Planck and Albert Einstein. This presents a history which begs, more and more, still today, the important contributions of the outlook provided by considering the fundamental problems posed by considering the universe "as if from the top, down": emphatically from the galaxy as a system, as implicitly foreseen in Bernhard Riemann's habilitation dissertation.

Now consider the physical principle on which Furtwängler's unique discovery in music was based, a great physical giant step apparently beyond the work of Johann Sebastian Bach, but, at the same time, a realization of what was implicit in what Bach had defined. Not replacing Bach, but as one great giant step beyond, as if into a new physical dimension of our universe. The new giant step which Bach had made possible.

For reasons which I shall clarify later in this report, let us imagine that the experience of a musical note might be described as like a "bubble" within which the bare idea of the note-as-such is contained. In the preferred case, as by Furtwängler, the actual hearing of the note may be sometimes anticipated immediately prior to being heard, but without actually being heard, and, in some cases, after the core of the tone has been heard. Furtwängler elaborated the relevant phenomena for his

readers under the descriptive term of "Between the Notes."[6]

It would not be impossible, but next to impossible, to attain any competent insight into the nature of the systemically ontological distinction between "sense-perception" of non-living processes and actually living processes, unless we relied to a large degree on discovering Wilhelm Furtwängler's insight into those ontological implications which separate putatively "merely spoken," from "Classical musical" utterances. The same problem appears otherwise in the distinction of Classical prosody from what is relatively a mechanistic quality of prose, as this distinction is to be made for the case of Johannes Kepler's notion of what is otherwise named "metaphor," or, by Kepler, "vicarious hypothesis" (as a relevant example).



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

The corruption of Classical music under the influence of 20th-Century modernism, notably, as peddled by the "soulless" Congress for Cultural Freedom, is to be contrasted to the "impassioned scientific rigor" of such as LaRouche's "late dear friend," Norbert Brainin, principal violinst of the Amadeus Quartet, shown here performing with pianist Günter Ludwig in 2007.

We have now reached a point of interpolation from which the body of this present report will now proceed toward the deep implications of Wilhelm Furtwängler's profound scientific discoveries in music (and much more).[7]

Franz Liszt as Czerny's Puppet

Illustrate the point being made on this account. For example, look to the following background with the immediately following comment:

Ludwig Beethoven once received a tutor known as the piano teacher Carl Czerny, who came accompanied by that tutor's pupil, the young Franz Liszt. After Czerny and young Liszt had departed, Beethoven declared that "the boy has great talent," but added that "that criminal, Czerny will ruin him!"

That incident is typical of the process which produced the corrupted simulation of Classical artistic poetry and music which came to be identified as Nineteenth-century "Romanticism" as experienced in the setting of the notorious salon of the ill-fated Queen Marie Antoinette's sometime resident parasite, the notorious Madame de Staël. The split between the legacy of J.S. Bach and the Nineteenth-century trend in Romanticism, was a precursory phase for the entry into Twentieth-century Modernism, which, in turn, led into the post-World War II depravity known then, and later, as that collectivist set of performing soulless puppets known as "The Congress for Cultural Freedom."

To illustrate the crucial point to be emphasized in this immediate location, among leading modern directors of symphony orchestras, Wilhelm Furtwängler is unique for his achievements in bringing the great talent of notable directors of Classical orchestral performances to an explicit state of literally physical-scientific insight, although a significant number, such as my late dear friend Norbert Brainin, the Principal of the

6. During the late, post-"World War II" interval, I concentrated my attention frequently on the profound difference between the performance of Schubert's **Ninth Symphony** by Furtwängler and Bruno Walter, respectively. Although Furtwängler defended Bruno Walter personally, against Hitler's gang, the, later, post-war Schubert performance by Bruno Walter was a musical disaster—it was really bad; while the famous, post-war performance by Furtwängler was among the greatest accomplishments of his time, reaching specific qualities which are to be fairly characterized as among the few greatest performances on record. The recorded performance by Furtwängler has the special importance of illustrating the specific scientific principle which is my subject in this present report.

7. It has been my intention to bring as much of Wilhelm Furtwängler's discoveries into play here as needed to bring the specific physical principles of his great, and unique, musical discoveries into focus.

Amadeus Quartet, remain notable for their impassioned scientific rigor in the scientific matter of Classical tuning. Arturo Toscanini and Bruno Walter, were typical of a different matter. However, it was the plunge into "elevated pitch," as promoted by the post-World War II Congress for Cultural Freedom (CCF) which has led into the actually criminal intentions and practice which has tended to take over, and destroy Classical musical composition and performance since that time.

The downward cultural trends have worsened at an accelerating rate since the modernist-tending trend of the Twentieth and, now, Twenty-first centuries. As I have just emphasized, the Congress for Cultural Freedom, founded in June 1950, as typified, according to my personal experience back on December 2, 1971, by the case of the now-deceased Sidney Hook, represented one tier of a continuing series of successively deeper plunges into moral and related degeneracy, whereas President Barack Obama's crony and evil-man-of-the-dark-chamber, Cass Sunstein, now typifies those lower "White House" depths of what has been a currently aspiring form modelled on the precedent of what has been, literally, "the frankly fascism" of the Hitler-era type encountered today.

Now, henceforth, our preferred subject in this report is human creativity as the working principle on which all categories presently, conditionally depend. To that purpose, let us now proceed to consider the principle of "fire."

The key which opens the doors of everything pertaining to almost everything, is that only mankind chooses to use "fire" intentionally. On that same account, the evolution of the living processes which have emerged on Earth has been directed by a chronic increase of what is identified as a general increase of energy-flux density in the evolution of living processes, as from the simple use of fire by "primitive mankind," to mankind's presently willful command in mankind's willful use of thermonuclear fusion.[8]

Discovering the Power of Reason

The essential, practical question which this present line of reporting intersects, is expressed by the words: "What is the shadow cast, as distinct from what is actually the ostensibly unseen, 'but actually efficient' substance? What is the unseen reality which appears to our sense-perception as the pseudo-substance, 'the mere shadow' of experienced sense-perception?" The implication of the line of discussion to which I have steered us here this far, is, thus, the crucial question to be addressed now. Are human sense-perceptions real? Are they, essentially, "real shadows" of the unseen? The common curse of mankind thus far, is to be located in the attribution of certainty to falsehood, such as that of Cass Sunstein which is properly sensed as being merely another evil shadow cast by the horrid stench of an unseen substance.

To illustrate the direction of progress being emphasized here, consider: What is the state of affairs in Solar space produced by the successive stages of optimal acceleration-deceleration of flight, at optimal thermonuclear velocities, from Moon to Mars, and in return flight, each within about a week's flight, each way? Suddenly, then, what had been accepted as space and time, respectively, no longer exist as "standard values" within the relevant, matter/anti-matter domain of the human species' experimental realities. Mankind no longer exists within the imagined confines of the sense-perceptual domain of the beasts.


Such considerations are forced upon our imagination by the implications of the notion that the continued existence of the Solar System might be expected to become extinct within the coming two billions years, and mankind excluded from existence in that domain much sooner. Would our human species become extinct in the course of such time? Consider the existential implications of such a question as that. Could the conquest of a threatened extinction warrant a triumphant shout!?

On the Subject of Alternatives

With the presently existing knowledge of the inherent error of the belief in the simple certainties of sense-perceptions, it is no longer "self-evident" that the existence of the human species is defined by the parameters of human sense-perceptions. The notion of a week's thermonuclear flight from Moon to Mars, helps to bring the reign of the familiar old delusion toward its close. We are now compelled to discover radically new kinds of parameters for human existence, an existence within bounds which, so to speak, lie outside what we tend to consider presently as "natural."

Therefore, pause to consider the Classical standards of music which are intrinsic to the natural potentials of the human mind. But, also, look more closely at what has been discovered by V.I. Vernadsky. With Furtwän-

8. Hence, the intrinsically, intrinsically fraudulent character of Rudolf Clausius' "Universal Principle" of Entropy.



Fidelio

Johannes Kepler's use of the notion of "vicarious hypothesis," is otherwise known to us as the notion of "metaphor."

gler's discovery of the principle of Classical composition, and with the implication of that discovery, now respecting music, which was experienced from Nicholas of Cusa's acquaintance with Filippo Brunelleschi's process of construction of the cupola of Santa Maria del Fiore, a change in society's view of the universe had occurred. The marvelous expression of genius which Wilhelm Furtwängler had adduced from the higher principles of Classical musical composition, has presented us with access to something which is presently much overlooked, but which, when considered aptly, presents mankind with a reality which is, otherwise, intrinsically superior, by orders of magnitude, to mankind's estimate of his reality otherwise.

Admittedly, the experience of Furtwängler's treatments give us something qualitatively superior to those of his putative "rivals" in every respect. The quality of the mental-life performance associated with that change, represents, "objectively," a qualitatively superior state of mental life, to that of "the formerly conventional system," in every relevant, practical respect. This was to have been noted in respect to the uniquely original discovery of the principle of gravitation by Johannes Kepler, still today. The relationship of this to the impact of Bach, is clearly definable, as the cases of the physicists Max Planck and Albert Einstein also illustrate the point.

The same physical principle, of Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, as echoed by the great principle of Cusa's **De Docta Ignorantia**, was echoed, intentionally, by Johannes Kepler's notion of the great principle of "vicarious hypothesis"—i.e., metaphor, on which the discovery, by Kepler, of the universal principle of gravitation had depended. It was the same principle which underlies Albert Einstein's emphasis on a domain of "the finite, but unbounded," the domain of "metaphor," and the notion of "matter/antimatter."

The correlative of physical scientific progress and Classical musical composition, represents a more broadly defined notion of "type," one which applies efficiently to both scientific, and the other Classical artistic modes of progress generally.

II. The Domain of the Unbounded

What I shall now indicate as having been the great physical-scientific discovery made by Wilhelm Furtwängler, will serve to carry this present view of mankind into the promising beauty of a previously undiscovered dimension, as I shall demonstrate that bare fact of the matter, by the means of what I shall have written within the completion of this present report.

That dimension already existed in fact, and that is exactly what Furtwängler demonstrated. Admittedly, few musicians, even among the leading artists, fully grasped what Furtwängler had accomplished, even while they might have admired the result, even greatly. (It were easier to admire effects than to create them.) The actual performances we have known, as both our experiences and what we might expect to experience, have often demonstrated that much, or more; but, this recognition was achieved within the reach and bounds of a presently retrospective standpoint.

Thus, within the limits of what I, for one, came to recognize, the best of all of the relevant musicians and scientists tended to recognize, that there was something

very precious, still to be recognized there. The difference was, first of all, that Furtwängler made the fact of his discovery explicit in his practice.

For example:

Some among my circles, here in the United States, and abroad, had become devoted to the work of both the great, and, also, not so great composers and performers. All of the best of such experiences, still lead toward something even more than the exceptionally wonderful experience of Furtwängler's conducting.[9] I have spoken, thus, of music. My intention here, is also to present the implications of something more profound than music itself, and, then, next, something now to be added from me, personally, here. That means something to be added from my experience of the work of Furtwängler, something which is to be added, now, from the subject of the great advances in contemporary physical science, including the domain, most emphatically, of V.I. Vernadsky, and certain others. The resulting two sets of contemporaries converge in a very special way, in a manner and degree which I shall present here.

I identify the most crucial conception as follows.

What I had come to recognize, since early 1946, from outside Calcutta, as the most crucial quality of the accomplishments of Wilhelm Furtwängler, is that his accomplishments as a scientist encompass both a transcendental state of what is fairly identified as the quality of his performance of musical composition, and what, as I shall emphasize here, are still, today, and have been not only great music, but, implicitly, reflections of the deepest aspects of presently knowable, far frontiers of physical science. It is the living connection of his approach to music which has supplied that great achievement for physical science, which I point out, here and now, as leading toward his greatest achievements as a personality. It can, and must also be said on that account, that his magnificent discoveries in music, express the very soul of physical science. That is a crucial fact which I must emphasize here, at this point.

Those discoveries express the great principle of metaphor which an avowed follower of Nicholas of Cusa, Johannes Kepler, identified in the notion of a ***vicarious hypothesis,*** and which the poet Percy Bysshe Shelley presented in the closing paragraph for his **In Defence of Poetry**. It is a connection of the kind which both Max Planck and Albert Einstein understood, at least implicitly, and that very well. They, both of the latter, each as master-musician and scientist alike, were, in fact, Furtwängler's *necessary* forerunners.

The crucial point of those concerns of mine which have arisen from as much as I have written here thus far, is locatable in the fact of the inherent tendency for error arising from the belief in reliance on sense-perception as such. What we must seek here, as in related settings and intentions, is a shared understanding; that means the distinction of the intention which Furtwängler's work expressed as its apparent literal, heard intention in performance, from the substance of that work. The notable point to be emphasized at this present instance, is attention to the role of Furtwängler's two essential added elements of communicable effects in the hearing of appropriately composed, and also appropriately performed, "ghostly" elements of the communicable performance. In my own life's repeated experiences on this account, Wilhelm Furtwängler's post-World War II conducting of Schubert's Ninth Symphony, became, in my experience, most prominent among the compelling achievements in orchestral performances. This virtue is specific to the true substance functionally sensed as of the metaphorical elements implicitly "heard" in the performance: the true "effect" experienced by the performer and audience alike.

What is contrary to the sentiment of "die Hauptsache ist der Effekt" of **Das Spukschloss im Spessart** [1960 German satirical comedy film] in this is that the "effect" remains, in principle, as merely the shadow cast by the substance. Such is the essential nature of the entirety of this report.

Once that warning is set into place, we are freed to proceed to the specifically physical-scientific significance of this experience, as this is to be related to developments respecting the extraordinary importance of the role of the principle of "insight" in the exchanges between Wolfgang Köhler and Max Planck on the subject of defining the substance of the human mind. This connection of "insight," also pertains to Kepler's *vicarious hypothesis (again: to "metaphor")*. I shall return to that fact at an appropriate point here below.

All the subject matters which I have enumerated just now, are of profound importance for me; however, there is one among these subjects which lies the most within the reach of my competence and also the bounds of my concern in this present report. That case is the following.

9. Another, precious case in this connection has been the late Norbert Brainin, who remains a genius on this same account, in his own right.

The Much Neglected Concern

The most fundamental of the issues of physical science which I presently know, is the frequency of an apparent lack of any mode of access to the deeper matters of physical science in what is provided by the currently still prevalent definitions of "physical" science. The essential fact of that indicated difficulty, is the habituated dependency of human beings respecting the bare belief in the faculties of sense-perception. In short, how often, and where may we discover a proof that sense-perception were not entirely an act of sense-deception, were not simply "axiomatic" in the worst sense of that term? Sense-certainty were, in that respect, the greatest of all follies, that of being left dumb.

The creative power of the human mind reaches outward, seeking to reign over us, as a creature in the likeness of the Creator, whereas, we, the living "see ourselves as if in a mirror, but that in a darkened space," as the Apostle Paul had stated.

It is time to be specific! The answer to that question lies in Furtwängler's notions of the "near" and "far," the very small, and the very large: two qualities which envelop, and, thus, consume the reductionist's notion of "sense perceptions," and which, therefore, escape the perversion of what was virtually that "Euclidean self-evidence," which is the ontological folly of the notion of "sense-certainty" as such. My thought on that subject can be read, still today, as the thematic "bending stars like reeds" from my lyrical poem of nearly sixty years ago.

My intention, nearly five decades past, and today, represents the self-same implication. The essence of mankind's existence lies not in words, but, rather the physically efficient power which seems to lie behind them. It is the Classical poet's intention which casts mere sense-perception's intention as in the guise of shadows. Words are merely footprints; the words are merely the ghosts of the intention which moves them; it is the passion which is the reality; the words are footprints.

Now, towards the present mission:

First, next, we must bring the subject-matter into proper order. The commonplace, "elementary" folly, is the presumption that "non-living matter" envelops the universe, which, in turn, surrounds living processes, within which human mentality is wrongly presumed to be confined. *How silly that presumption is!* The fact of the matter is, that the most powerful and inclusive aspect of the universe known to us, creativity, contains the possibility of our existence. Whereas, the most powerful force which we encounter within the bounds of life on Earth, is human creativity as such. The creative power of the human mind reaches outward, seeking to reign over us, as a creature in the likeness of the Creator, whereas, we, the living "see ourselves as if in a mirror, but that in a darkened space," as the Apostle Paul had stated.

We live, hopefully, as being the children who inhabit the inner bounds of the decaying century which we presently occupy; but, our mission is to create the coming centuries which we inhabit, as if surrounded with the consequences of our deeds. Whether I live to actually reach the range of a century, or not, our intention must be to change the age which we inhabit, such that the consequences of our willful business of living, shall, indeed, be the goodness of what we shall have been.

Not to do good is a terrible thing!

We must, as I have written and spoken, each practice the art of my "bending stars like reeds," or it will be as if we had never lived.

So, we reach out, literally, as to the stars, and that which exists beyond. We live as children of the stars, learning to reach out to seek control over what we had thought ourselves powerless to control, as if only yesterday. We are the child-like apprentices of our universe, destined always to reach to higher missions and higher destinies. If we do not accept this mission, we were already as much as dead by one's own silly choice.

This is a thought—a choice of decision—which has efficient consequences.

As those associated with my intention have seen, we are aware that long before two more billions years have lapsed, our Solar system should have been destroyed. In as much of that lapse of time's duration as mankind might inhabit, we shall be confronted, as a species, by many missions to complete, if our species were to have become enabled to surpass the Solar system, even, perhaps, the galaxy which we presently inhabit. That must be the practice of our species' profession.

It can be said, frankly, that that to which all that is

leading, is not yet known; yet, we have no appropriate different mission than that intention. In that, we must be content with our unquenchable commitment to our work, the work which the universe has set before us. That is the true nature of mankind's work, insofar as we are presently enabled to know it.

On the Subject of Physical Principle

On reflection, and, perhaps, it comes only as a matter of reflection, that the idea of life does not actually exist as what ordinary sense-impression could conceivably know as a real force in the universe. We do experience the effects of life, that among things we identify as "living." Similarly, we experience the effect of mind, but we know no sensed object as mind-as-such.

That same issue arises in the realm of assessing that quality of "intention" which distinguishes the great performance of a great musical composition from those mere shadows which the performance of mere notes leaves like footprints-in-the-mud in the course of their performance. I could speak of forceful performances which leave behind the sense of a well-embalmed corpse, or a mere puppet-like construction which leaves behind the effect of being as a synthesized embalming. The qualities of life and mind are qualities whose essential existence dwells outside the reach of mere matter, sculpted or in motion. Such is the difference between what A.I. Oparin's or Bertrand Russell's mere opinions represented, as compared to actually living processes. The same irony confronts us in the attempt to evoke sincere qualities of belief from mere words; great Classical works, even less impressive communications have real intentions and related effects, but those forces do not reside within mere words, or other sorts of symbols.

The Classical achievements in composition, gained by drama, poetry, and kindred beautiful compositions, like song, bespeak real forces which can not be properly mummified as mere words or other symbols. Such real achievements are actually experienced only in the immediacy of experience of the process of Classical artistic creation, which actual life lives inhabits, and shadow of life's passing may be interred. The challenge to mankind, is to recognize that difference between the reality which creates the poetry, and leaves the footprints, perhaps only briefly, behind.

Substance exists; the problem is that of choosing where to find it.

III. The Real Physical Principle

"The forces which do not reside within mere words, or…"

Just as a reminder, as we now enter the concluding chapter of this report, the governing intention in this composition's entirety, presents a solution for overcoming what has been the stubborn error of relying on sense-perception as a standard of evidence bearing on the role of any actual physical principle. As I have already indicated in the preceding chapter, the actual effect of what has often been considered "elementary" reliance on sense-perception, creates the fatal folly of mistaking a man's mere shadow for his actual self. As I have already indicated, here, above, the indicated remedy for that error has been implicitly provided by the combined role of respectively "the nearly heard" and "the distant heard" of the great argument by Wilhelm Furtwängler. That argument, by Furtwängler, had depended on crucial, related arguments by both Max Planck and Wolfgang Köhler, all considered in the light of Köhler's correction made to Planck on the correct principle of the human mind. This requires that we also take into account the important contribution of principle by Albert Einstein on the subject of matter/anti-matter. Furtwängler's final treatment of the performance of Franz Schubert's Ninth Symphony has presented us with a relevant demonstration of Furtwängler's discovered principle of "nearly" and "distant" heard, just as Köhler's argument on mind persuaded Max Planck.

The array of illustrations which I have just summarized, must be subsumed by J.S. Bach's principle of the fugue, which is the essence of all competent composition of music, inasmuch as the principle of the Bach fugue is the principle of employing the future to define the present. Furtwängler's use of "near" and "far" hearing, expresses the principle of the concept permeating the Bach fugue. The music which does not serve that same Bach/Furtwängler principle of the future, including the case of the inherent failure of so-called "popular music," is to be considered as seriously defective. Just so, the argument of the so-called Congress for Cultural Freedom (CCF), introduced in 1950, not only imposed a worsening trend toward cultural trash on Europe (and elsewhere); the effect of the influence of the CCF had manifestly lowered the cultural/intelligence-level of the trans-Atlantic world in a disastrous succession of accelerated "steps" since that time.

Unfortunately, the expulsion of Germany's great Chancellor Bismarck, had turned out to be the crucial first actual step of the world into a virtual simultaneity of the first "world-wide war" launched by the British empire. From that moment on, there were steps virtually into Hell, such as ominous effects, in France, of the assassination of France's President Sadi Carnot, the Dreyfus case, and the British Prince of Wales' alliance with Japan's Mikado to launch the first major outbreak of the first of a series of World Wars, a series which actually never ended since the series began (actually) with that 1890 ouster of Chancellor Bismarck which actually unleashed the first "World War." The assassination of U.S. President William McKinley on a globally ominous Sept. 6, 1901 enabled its unfolding to proceed.



Furtwängler's notion of "the nearly heard" and "the distant heard" "depended on crucial, related arguments by both by Max Planck and Wolfgang Köhler [shown here], all considered in the light of Köhler's correction made to Planck on the correct principle of the human mind."

It is of crucial importance that that aspect of modern history be treated exactly as I have done here: it is not events which make history, but the process of human history which creates the important events which actually shape that history in a truly meaningful sense in such matters. We, as individual nations, or peoples, are often, indeed, enabled to play important roles in the shaping of some of that history's events. Admittedly, often those who play such roles have no competent insight into what they do, or why they do it, but, with rare exceptions, it is not the event itself which actually shapes the unfolding course of the history of a process in history. Considering the view on this matter by Wolfgang Köhler, is a useful approach to insight into this aspect of historical processes.

It is therefore important that the crucial argument presented here, be restated as follows.

During the course of the few recent years, the so-called "Basement Team" of my associates, had succeeded in bringing about an important leap in their knowledgeable proof and understanding of the role of creativity as a "mandatory" rule of the experimental evolution of life in the known universe. The demonstrated principle of what are to be classified as "world wars," is that the array of successive advances in the ordering of species is not merely successive, but that the succession is systemically self-ordered. This applies, as broadly, and safely said, as being inherent to human intellectual progress, and so to manifest "choices" of human extinction, and so to biological extinction generally, as it is to mere biological ordering otherwise.

It is fairly said, that the universe is governed by a principle of universal anti-entropy: progress, or extinction, are each notably available options.

Some Implied Options

Sit here for a moment in contemplation, that we might reflect on a few important conceptions.

Actual progress is not statistical; it is systemic, even implicitly "organic." Hence, the sudden collapse of progress, which had been imposed willfully (not statistically), in the immediate post-war economy, and, once again, in the aftermath of the succession of assassinations of President John F. Kennedy, and his brother and Presidential pre-nominee, Robert Kennedy.

In the U.S. and most of Europe today, for example, progress is not generally systemic, but only statistical, and has been downward most of the time since the assassinations of John F. and Robert Kennedy. That is to emphasize, that, when physical economic growth is the standard employed, the net physical growth of the U.S. economy has been consistently negative in direction since approximately the immediate aftermath of the launching of both the "Warren Commission" and

the U.S. war in Indo-China.[10]

Consider the most disgusting of all popularized hoaxes. The usual economists, or lunatics of that category, consider the gain of money itself as "an intrinsic advantage." Thus, we have the great hyper-inflation which has just destroyed both the U.S. and western and central European economies. Why was such accumulation of nominal money counted as growth, when the Glass-Steagall law enacted under President Franklin Roosevelt was required by all actually intelligent people? How, and why, could the repeal of Glass-Steagall have been considered a sane behavior of a government and its people?

Or take the case of the popular commodity, drugs-for-addiction? Popular opinion has been recently, speaking clinically, insane. The evidence is that the U.S. government has been predominantly insane most of the time since the election of President Richard Nixon, and that the preferences of most citizens have been, predominately, worse than disgusting. How can "better" be helpful, when we consider the public, and also public standards of what have come to be considered as "useful prospects"?

If we were so awfully-smart, how did it happen that we have destroyed the U.S. economy, more and more, each time our citizens had voted since the close of 2001?

The essential point indicated by all this, and much more besides, is that the standard measures for progress are clinically insane when measured by the popular preferences for effects. Wealth is being measured today in the acquisition of public satisfaction secured by the consumption of loathsome pleasures and, usually, the pleasure sought from the enjoyment of painful diseases of various kinds.

What Has, Therefore, Gone Essentially Wrong?

It is fairly, truly, and usefully emphasized, that it is almost never the individual, qua individual, who actually determines the effective course of history. Admittedly, the individual's behavior often does act to what appears to be such an effect; but, the individual who views his or her intervention as an individual in the course of the history of nations, is intrinsically a fool. The fault here is rooted, essentially, in *the error of an a-prioristic belief in the categorically autonomous "sovereignty" of the human individual. You must view your role as that of an agent of the making and shaping of history; you must, in effect, treat the mortal self as an agent of an essentially immortal process. If you are truly wise, you view yourself as obliged to participate, as if immortally, in shaping the history which you must participate in pre-shaping from generation to generation. "The rugged individual" is often the silliest of fools to be found on precisely that account.*

I explain that point: you are sovereign only when you assume responsibility for the outcome of that future course of history in which you are participating as an initiator of progress. In real history, "the notorious rugged individual" is a fool virtually born from the depths of foolishness. In real economic science, success is located in the improvements which the present generation forges as the accomplishments of one's progeny.

I explain that crucially important point, as follows.

I had emphasized earlier, in referring to the characteristic of upward trends in evolution of human achievements, that your successors from future generations must be developed to effect a net increase in the ability of mankind to increase its power to exist in the universe. Not what you do, as much as what you are prompted to shape your descendants to achieve, as a succession of actual net increases in the human species' power to exist in the universe.

"You say that you do your part for mankind? How dare you propose such a fraud!?

"You are responsible for the needed degree of improvement in the productivity of each of your several generations of progeny. You are morally obliged to make your successful contribution to that net effect on the future of mankind." You are obliged to ensure that the several successive generations of mankind will be committed to bring about fundamental physical-economic progress during coming generations. To argue that: "Each of us can only be held responsible for what we do personally," is not only a fraud, but a very wicked one. You are your children's and grandchildren's keepers.

That is the principle of, for example, the proper design of the Bach fugue, as Wilhelm Furtwängler's principle of counterpoint demands. Your absolute obligation as a human being is not to repeat the past, but to create the basis for the production of the future. This is

10. The fraudulent trick used, is that of a practice or product is "considered popular," the promotion of that product is treated as proof of progress, even if the result is disastrous, in fact.

as if to say, that you must live in that future, rather than your own past. That is the principle of creativity in our universe; that is the essentially underlying distinction of the actual existential identity of man from those men and women thinking and acting as beasts, thinking and acting in their past, as beasts also do. Animal and related life can exist through biological evolution and related ways. The difference for man is the human mind, the ontology of living within the future, rather than the mere present; that is the true essence of the actual meaning of human creativity, and, also, even the meaning of humanity itself.

Mankind's New Physics

The characteristics which I have just employed, above, to distinguish the essential quality of the human being from the beasts, must be recognized as the essential characteristics of a person fit to be judged as an expression of the uniquely distinct quality of what the individual citizen must be, that done in the process of rising to a quality of species of higher order than what each has recently achieved since yesterday, and, then, into tomorrow. In other words, this is the moral principle which distinguishes the properly developing human individual personality from both the beasts and the bestialized humans. You must become what you must become since yesterday, or you are in danger of becoming nothing after all.


This is my presentation, here, of what I (and, you) must become in our self-improvement to become the higher quality of human species than you were today. True human creativity is the activity of becoming a higher quality of human species than you were, hopefully, yesterday.

What does that mean in actual practice?

This means emphasis on human creativity per se. Take two examples of this notion of creativity as such into consideration.

The power of man on this account lies in part with man's creation of instruments which supply the human prototype with devices which increase the quality of the productive powers of labor in principle of design of the combination of mankind and mankind's power to act creatively in the universe. This power just identified points to the role of both the development of the human mind and the tools which it creates, to the effect of recreating the human phenotype into becoming, in practice, a species more powerful, more highly developed in its own quality of species-in-action in nature, than anything earlier.

What we are enabled, and devoted to accomplishing, according to this perspective takes man out of the domain of a specific type of a fixed image, into a truly creative being, a being which absorbs and uses what had been, earlier, powers of actions reflecting states of the universe which had previously not been included in our human nature; but absorbing elements of a higher state of the processes which have acted upon us, we create in the practiced imagination powers as of mankind, which we have seemed to have absorbed into our own being, and made, thus, an efficient expression of our will to develop what the universe must be intended to become. As we absorb higher states of organization within our universe into our own nature, as through absorbing powers taken from outside the ontology of things presently "in our nature," we expand those powers of our person, and become, thus, beings of a higher state of nature than we had been before. Creative mankind is not simply using means previously beyond the means of our willful control, but thus changing our own nature in the universe accordingly. We can only be what we are willfully committed to become.



On Sept. 20-22, 1995, the Schiller Institute sponsored a series of seminars/master classes, featuring Lyndon LaRouche's close friend and collaborator Norbert Brainin (1923-2005), the first violinist of the legendary Amadeus Quartet. The seminars, held at the DolnáKrupá castle in Slovakia, trace the revolution, begun by Hadyn's discovery of *Motivführung*, through the works of Mozart and Beethoven.
The 40-minute LPAC video is a montage from the seminar; the full videos can be found at: larouchepac.com/culture.

http://larouchepac.com/node/20178

The Furtwängler Principle: Defying The Slavery of Sense-Certainty

Lyndon LaRouche orchestrated a trilogy of in-depth discussions with colleagues Matthew Ogden, Jason Ross, and Ben Deniston, on what LaRouche described as "one of the greatest accomplishments in science in the past century or so." This is expressed most powerfully in the musical ideas of Wilhelm Furtwängler (1886-1954) and the scientific work of Vladimir Vernadsky, Albert Einstein, and Max Planck, and the relationship between the two domains. The discussions took place over the course of three consecutive LPAC-TV Weekly Reports (May 23, May 30, and June 6), hosted by John Hoefle, all of which are available at www.larouchepac.com.



Société Wilhelm Furtwängler

Classical music, as performed, and understood by the great conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler (show here in Berlin in 1938), frees us from the prison of sense-perception. With Furtwängler, LaRouche says, "You know you're listening to the future!"

We present here edited transcripts of all three discussions, beginning with May 23 (http://larouchepac.com/node/22793).

Lyndon LaRouche: Today, we are going to inaugurate something which is unusual for this theater, shall we say, but it is quite relevant to what we do in this place, usually. The subject itself is one of the greatest accomplishments in science in the past century or so, and that is the development of the principle of Vernadsky and company, as others, which come into, what is music? What is musical composition; what are the principles of it, what is the relationship of this to physical science? What is the relationship of this to the way in which mankind should organize his and her affairs?

Matthew Ogden: Well, I think that the subject of our discussion can come under the heading today of "Escaping the Prison of Sense Experience." And as you've said many times, now recently, on this forum, and also in some recent writings, the best means by which we can escape the walls of sense-experience as such, is via Classical art, and specifically, Classical music, as performed, and understood, by Wilhelm Furtwängler.

Furtwängler was a conductor in the first half of the 20th Century. And just as a cautionary note, the standard of Furtwängler is the key to this: that we are not discussing Classical music as it's conceived of today, the kind of entertainment that you usually get over the radio. But this is a rigorous standard, which has the quality, in and of itself, of scientific principle, which is unfortunately lost in our culture; after two to three generations of a real *de*-generation, most people in our culture today have lost a living connection to the understanding, to the experience, of what the Furtwängler Principle is.

And it's precisely this: I would call it the "Furtwängler Principle." Because the principle which he expressed repeatedly, not only in his performances, but also in his writings, is not only a principle, which must inform how music should be performed and understood, but, in fact, the Furtwängler Principle is a *universal physical principle,* which must inform and redefine our view of the entire ontology of the physical universe, as such.



Furtwängler's predecessor and mentor Arthur Nikisch, in his conducting, imparted an "ineffable" sensation, that existed "between the notes," a phenomenon which we find also in Furtwängler's music.

'Between the Notes'

Now, just to introduce the subject: What is this phenomenon that we describe as the Furtwängler Principle? What is it that makes Furtwängler's performances so characteristically unique? It has been described by Mr. LaRouche, that his first experience of hearing a recorded performance of a symphony, in this case a Tchaikovsky symphony, by Furtwängler, after the conclusion of World War II, while he was stationed at an Army base outside of Calcutta, was that of total shock—something completely distinct from anything that he'd experienced before. And I believe the way you described it, Lyn, was being practically pulled off of your chair, physically, by the relentless suspension of this performance, from opening to close. This remarkable coherence of the entirety, as a unity, from the beginning to the end.

Also, this has been described by another conductor,[1] who had the experience of sitting in on rehearsals of Furtwängler's, when he came to Milan, as an "electric tension," which would pervade the orchestra pit when Furtwängler would even walk in. And it's a tension which was all-pervasive, which pervaded not only the tones as such, but the silences between the audible tones, when there's no sound.

And then, most recently, Lyn has described this as the "pre-tone" and the "after-tone," which one hears in the mind, as distinct from the audible tone, as such, as heard by the ear.

Furtwängler's predecessor and mentor was a conductor named Arthur Nikisch, to whom he grants much of his experience of what this living principle was, having heard Nikisch's conducting. Nikisch was described as a conductor who was able to give an ineffable, indefinable, mysterious feeling which existed "between the notes." And I think this idea of what happens "between the notes" is the characteristic phenomenon which we hear in Furtwängler's music. And for the sensitive mind, for someone who has not been made mentally deaf, and whose soul has not been crusted over by popular music and a generally cynical culture, which we have today, upon listening to a performance, a recorded performance—anything, of Wilhelm Furtwängler, one will hear this immediately—and it will grab you, too! And you will have, invariably, extreme difficulty in putting this into words.

It's this "mystery" itself, which allows us to, as I said, peek into that world, which lies outside the prison walls of our sense experience.

What Furtwängler's secret was, ontologically: If the mind can experience something other than, something which is independent, and comes prior to sensation as such, then that means that the mind is not contingent upon sense experience. It's not an aggregate, the summation of all of its sense experience, prior to that moment. Rather, the sensory experience itself, which

1. Claudio Abbado, as quoted in *The Devil's Music Master,* by Sam Shirakawa (pp. 349-50). "Even when Furtwängler walked into the pit, there was tension around him like electricity. In the rehearsals, he would go over certain parts again and again, patiently explaining what he wanted, patiently, everything patiently. And slowly, this wonderful warm sound came out of the orchestra, and the tension, always this wonderful tension from beginning to end. He was one of the few musicians who could create tension even in the pauses when there was nothing but silence. That continuity, that flow was something I will never forget. Those rehearsals and the performances were something very special for me."

comes from a lower chemical or physical domain, becomes subordinated to, and contingent upon the more necessary substance of mind. And not only does this turn on its head the reductionism of the way that we're told to view the human mind today, and invert it, turning it completely inside-out, but it also allows us to invert the entire bottom-up ordering of the universe, to establish what's actually a clear, top-down hierarchy, an ontological hierarchy of a creative universe as such.

So, with that said, I would assert that Furtwängler understood this, in its *full* implications—the full universal implications of this idea—which he discovered from inside his world of music, but understood this as a universal principle of the creative human mind, and of the creative universe.

Just to put some meat on that assertion, this is one short passage of one of the writings of Furtwängler. He said: "Let us consider the activity of artistic creation. When we look more closely at this process, we find that we can distinguish two levels. On the first, each individual element combined with those adjacent to it, to form larger elements. And these larger elements then combine with others, and so on, a logical outward growth, from the part to the whole. But on the other level, the situation is the reverse. The given unity of the whole controls the behavior of the individual elements within it, down to the smallest detail. The essential thing to observe, is that in any genuine work of art, these two levels complement each other, so that the one only becomes effective, when put together with the other."[2]

Classical Music and Physical Science

This is one of the most ontologically precise statements of scientific principle that you could ask for, from anybody, in the entirety of the 20th Century. And it's not a coincidence that this echoes several of the greatest scientists that were alive at exactly the same time—two specifically, Albert Einstein and Max Planck. And not coincidentally, both of these scientists required as their recreational activity—actually, the moment in which they, as Einstein said in his own words, made their greatest scientific discoveries—the practice of Classical musical performance. Planck was a very skilled pianist and organist, and Einstein was a skilled violinist, who played in many string quartets. Vernadsky himself, also a contemporary, said that some of his greatest insights into the living quality of the universe, came when he was listening to great Classical music.

So, this is not a coincidence: that Furtwängler, a musician, also turns out to be a great physical scientist in his own right. Because the very playground of the human mind, for the human mind to discover its identity as a creative substance, and to then see the reflection of the universe in that, *is* physical science. And this is what we're participating in, with the performance and understanding of great Classical art.

So, it's also not a coincidence, that what Furtwängler stated in the passage that I just read—that the given unity of the whole dictates the behavior, down to the smallest detail of each individual elemental part—that this echoes the greatest philosopher of the last three centuries, at least, Gottfried Leibniz, who, in many places in his writings, in the *Principles of Metaphysics*, in *The Monadology*, in an essay he wrote on the "Ultimate Origination of the Universe," everywhere in his writings, exactly the same idea is expressed: that nowhere in finite things as such, or the aggregate of all the finite things, can we find the sufficient reason for that finite thing. But rather, the existence of a superior substance, which necessarily has to lie outside the finite thing, or the aggregate of all finite things, a dominant One, which lies outside and above these things as such, is the only place in which we can locate the ontologically sufficient reason for the existence of finite things.

And so, it's absolutely not a coincidence, that what Furtwängler discovered is not exclusively a principle of music per se, but rather, is a universal physical principle, which contains within it the ontology of the entire universe. Because—and this is the significance of Leibniz, and also the significance of LaRouche: When you start from the standpoint of the existence of a Creator, which is that necessary substance, which has created all of the finite things; and then the fact that man is in the image of that Creator—when you start from that, then, only then, can you understand what we're experiencing, as a sacred experience, with the performance and composition of Classical music.

Now, what I want to have some fun with momentarily, is taking a look at what the Furtwängler Principle allows us to do, to overthrow all of our ingrained and habituated notions of linear, chronological clock-time.

If it's true, as Furtwängler stated in the passage that I quoted, that you have a simultaneous, dynamic,

2. *Furtwängler on Music: Essays and Addresses*, Ronald Taylor, trans., "Thoughts for All Seasons" (London: Scolar Press, 1991), pp. 123-124.

mutual reciprocity between the whole and the parts, with the dominance belonging to the whole, then, where—and also when—does that whole, in a piece of Classical music, exist? If the reason, or the cause of the existence of any of the parts can not exist in the parts alone, can not exist in the finite parts themselves, then it's this superior whole which dictates the behavior and the very existence of all of these parts as such, then where does that whole exist, if it can not exist in any moment of experienced, so-called time?

So, if we're talking about something which can't exist anywhere in sensed experience, and can't exist anywhere within the parts of this mere succession of tones, as such, then at no moment, can the sensed experience, can the mental experience of the whole be perceived by the senses. However, if this whole must exist *at all times*, and always dictating the behavior of all its parts, the question is: Where and when can we locate the existence of this unifying whole?

If you put yourself into the shoes, for a moment, of a performer, and understand that at every moment of this experienced process, as such, there has to be, necessarily, the yet-to-be-completed totality existing within the *mind's* ear of the conductor, then you're dealing with something which contradicts *all* ideas of linear clock-time as such! You're talking about something which lies completely outside of the moment in time, lies completely outside of the idea of mere sequential time, and you're dealing with a domain in which the conductor himself—and Furtwängler describes this vividly—is as if listening to the future, as if listening to the whole upon completion, which has not yet occurred in sensual experience. You haven't yet arrived there, for the experience of the senses, but one is listening *backwards*, from the standpoint of a non-experienced, or not-yet-experienced, future totality of the whole.

And so, this listening "from the future," as he navigates the unfolding of each of the parts in the present, *this* is the experience of the performer, this is the experience of Furtwängler, the conductor. And this is what Lyn, in various places, has called "the memory of the future," where you actually have the echoing of the future, into the "ear" of the present.

And so, this can not exist as isolated from the other, because the coming-into-being, the becoming of this whole, is something which is unfolded over the course of experienced time, but the other directionality of listening backwards from future-time, is this interaction of the whole, as situated above time as such, and outside of experienced time, the interaction of this whole, and then the process of the parts of the temporal performance in time: The interaction of the "above-time" with the "in-time"—this is the mental experience of the performer.

'Near' Sound and 'Far' Sound


And one way in which Furtwängler expresses this, what I would call a "dynamic quality of musical space-time," is, he uses two terms: He uses the expression, the *Nahören*, which you could say is the "near-sighted sound of the present moment"; and the *Fernhören*, which is the "sound from afar," the "far-sighted sound" of the whole, of the future upon completion of the totality.[3]

And it's this constant interaction, the constant collision, between *Nahören* and *Fernhören*, which is the experience, *in each moment* of passionate performance, of this piece of music. Furtwängler says that the two of them meet and intersect at each moment. And it's this collision, this intersection between listening to the present from the future, and listening to the future from the present, which is the relentless tension, which expresses itself as the experience of preceding preconsciously, and also the ghostly after-presence of the tone, as such, as simultaneously experienced in the human mind. So, this dual directionality, of listening to the present from the future, and to the future from the present, is what Furtwängler described.

Now, significantly, this same *Fernhören* of Furtwängler was rather famously described by Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, in a passage from a letter I think he wrote to his sister, that describes his experience, what it means to be inside the mind of a composer. And in the same way that Furtwängler describes this *Fernhören*, Mozart's description was an "overhearing" of a piece, "as if from above," which is not a succession of parts, it's not a sequence of tones, or a mere succession of phrases, but something that occurs one after another, not something which occurs all at once, instantaneously, as if in a single breath, in a single moment. He uses the description of seeing a beautiful face: We don't see its parts, we see the face in a single instant.

So, this experience, of the "hearing from above," or

3. For example, see fragments in *Wilhelm Furtwängler: Notebooks 1924-1954*, Shaun Whiteside, trans. (Quartet Books, 1995). See also: Wilhelm Furtwängler, *Ton und Wort: Aufsätze und Vorträge 1918-1954* (Wiesbaden: F.A. Brockhaus, 1955).



LPAC-TV

"The characteristic of a successful economic forecaster, which I claim to be," LaRouche declared, "is precisely that you are anticipating the future." Figure 1, first published in EIR in 1987, documents the success of LaRouche's forecasts, contrasted to the failures of his opponents.

the *Fernhören* of the whole, of the unity of the whole—where does Mozart say that this experience takes place? Nowhere in sense experience, nowhere in the succession of mere chemical or physical sensations as such, but in the imagination.

And if we're understanding the mere shadowland of sensed experience as the pale shadows cast, as if from the unheard melodies, from the imagination—to bring this back to our point of ontology: If the whole is more real, in terms of substance, than the contingent, subordinate parts, then must not this imagination—the only domain in which this supra-temporal whole can all at once exist—be therefore necessarily more real in terms of substance, than the world that we sense? The world that we think we taste, see, hear, and we think of as being real?

As we saw from Leibniz, this is necessarily so.


And so, therefore, I think, with this understanding, and allowing ourself, out of the corner of our eye, to understand this world which exists, which can be accessed most efficiently for the sensitive soul and the sensitive mind, through the standard of performance of Classical art as set by Wilhelm Furtwängler, we've at least glimpsed the world that lies outside of the walls of the prison of our sense-perception.

The Future Shapes the Present

LaRouche: There is a complement to what Matt's just presented, in my own work in economic forecasting. Because every forecaster I've run into—that is, in the formal area of economic forecasting—has been intrinsically incompetent (**Figure 1**). And the reason is simply, as we've done studies at this table and so forth on the life-cycle, the process of living processes within our universe as we know it: that the future shapes the present.

Now, that's what I do. Every forecaster I run up

FIGURE 1
How EIR Predicted the Volcker Collapse



against, would-be forecaster, has been intrinsically a failure, incompetent, because the future, just as in the case of our studies of living processes of the principle of the future, which we call "growth," or "development," or "revolution," or whatever, a principle is added to the repertoire which changes the character of the whole process.

Now, most people in economics are conditioned to believe that the deductive method is the method that determines the present economy. And every economist I've known on this matter has been incompetent, and is incompetent, because they always take the so-called "realistic," deductive approach. Now, the characteristic of living processes generally, and the characteristic of the human mind, the characteristic of a successful economic forecaster, which I claim to be, is precisely that you are anticipating the future.



Creative Commons

Johannes Brahms (1833-97) is almost the last scientist of music; when he died, music was almost dead, except for echoes from the past. Brahms is shown here in 1853.

Now, the question of the future in economics takes a very specific form: You are defining a change, a change in what you're doing. You are not deducting from what you know, you are creating something new that takes you beyond. And all creative artists, all creative scientists think that way. Economists, generally, do not. There are some economists who have a stroke of genius in them, but it's not the way they were trained in their profession. They've gone outside their profession and they become competent by reaching into the area of creativity. Creativity is simply recognizing a future which lies beyond experience. Creativity means searching for a future event, a future development, which does not exist in the present or past. That's creativity.

And what does that mean? Well, in physical science, as applied to economics, you have an innovation of some quality. The easiest way to explain this kind of thing is with physical science, when you make a new discovery of a new principle, and essentially that's what they call it. Creativity in mathematics or in physics, is always discovering a new principle that you didn't have before; it's discovering a principle the other guys didn't have. The other guy will take the deductive approach, stick in there, defend himself deductively by saying, "experience has proven to me, that BOOM!"

And it means the guy's a failure! He has failed from the beginning, because he has failed to recognize the importance of the discovery of a principle. And to have a principle, we do that, by what? We define a problem: We define a failure in the system. We seek out, to imagine what the secret to that failure can be.

And that's the same thing in music.

Mankind is essentially distinguished from the animal by creativity. That's the nature of mankind, the essential nature of mankind—it's creativity. It is always reaching into the future. It is always discovering a principle that did not exist before. And in making discoveries like this sort of thing, once you get into a state of anticipation, a moment of suspension, in any time you're doing something creative, in all my experience in this sort of thing, there's always a moment of tension, and you wonder if you can make the next leap to the next level.

And the competent economist—they're very rare; they mostly imitate something that was forgotten and they figure it out again, and say, "Oh, this was wonderful, we should have considered this before." But in all scientific work, it's the same. You recognize that everything you now are doing, is probably intrinsically stupid. Not that it was stupid in the past, but it *is* stupid going into the future. And if you can not make that gesture of getting into the future, as like a surprise, the effect of having a surprise of discovery—not only a surprise, but you realize that it's valid, that it works, it can be used. And the same thing in music. The same thing as all Classical artistic composition.

And the problem in today's society is, there are very few people who are capable of thinking creatively. What happens in music is an example of this: the degeneration of music which has gone on, both in discovery—I mean, Brahms is almost the last scientist of music; there are other cases which reflect the same thing, but when Brahms died, music was almost dead, except for echoes from the recent past.

And that was a long process: You had a period from Bach on, which was a great progress of discovery! Bach was a complete discovery! Discovery upon discovery, upon discovery! It's the same as the principle of forecasting.

So, the difference between man and the beast, is the beast is like an accountant. The beasts think like accountants, and accountants often think like beasts. Whenever you've had to deal with one, you'd know that. So that this principle of the future, the experience of the future, the future as a change for the better, a change for advancement, is a discovery of a new principle.

And this is expressed concisely in the work of Furtwängler, and all of us who have been exposed to Furtwängler as I have, have always had this sensation: You know you're listening to the future! That whatever his subject is, you're talking about the *future* of that subject-matter. Just as we should be doing in everything.

But we live in a society which is highly decadent. There's not much intelligence. Even the so-called scientists aren't too intelligent these days. They get less and less so. There is a process of degeneration which is going on now, which is carrying us toward the threat of the destruction of the human species. We're close to that now: Why? Because we didn't discover. Because we adopted looking into the past, or looking just to the present—like an animal, not like a human being! You try to keep pace with current opinion, you try to fit in, which makes you stupid.

And only with this sense of shame, of not being creative, the sense that you're doing the same old thing, when you should be doing something new, and fresh, that solves problems, that opens doors to things that you have never done before. Going to new planets, hmm? Going into space. Facing the problems of the defense of mankind, in terms of the Solar System. Something new, something fresh! Keep ahead of the process of deterioration and stagnation.

Anyway. And I think we should also point out some of the implications of our dear friends.

On the Subject of Riemann

Jason Ross: Well, on the subject of Riemann, first, that was really fun: Because music really provides an affirmative view of what so often seems to be created negatively or provocatively, or in an anticipatory fashion in the sciences, and in music you can affirm it in a much clearer way. And for Riemann, the creation of new entireties was the primary substance of the universe, it wasn't the parts. When you take that away, you've got a real flatness. You don't have a lively personality any more. When you're in the prison of the senses, everything is flat, and there's no room for actual growth in it any more. In reality, the universe itself has a very complex personality, one in which you could say we play a role in developing, by our ongoing dialogue with it, by our changing conceptions of it, by our work that we do in changing it and shaping it. It is a real dialogue, it's a real musical dialogue.

Just one thing about Furtwängler: With some conductors, you can describe their conducting style almost as a *shtik*. Like, "this guy really likes to draw out things," or "this guy really, he's got…" You can describe something about the notes and the way they perform notes and passages. When you try to describe Furtwängler, it ends up becoming a series, if you're talking about pieces or the actual notes, it ends up being a very dense specificity. Because the pieces are distinct, they have a distinct idea, a distinct personality. So, at best, when you describe him as a person, or as a conductor, you end up doing it in a very different way from the way you describe other conductors, I believe.

So, on the use of Riemann in this, and understanding economics in particular, just yesterday some of us went to a Global Space Exploration conference in Washington, D.C., and one of the discussion panels was about understanding the value of the space program. And it was a clear problem for everybody, that they didn't really have a way of distinguishing—I talked to the people afterwards—between the physical profit of science, and the financial profit of investing in the stock market; that they didn't really have a way of getting that across to people, or really have a good framework for understanding it themselves.

I'd like to bring up one specific example of what Riemann did, in terms of developing a non-localized idea of change. Typically, these terrible economists, these bad forecasters that Lyn was just describing, they see an economy as a system, at best, but a system that is composed of pieces, and then ordering among them.

To give a geometric example: The difference between a sphere and a watermelon is one where a large variety of local changes have been made. The sphere has been stretched out, and if you looked at it as a bunch of little pieces made out of watermelon skin, they've changed, they've deformed; you've gone from a sphere to a watermelon (**Figures 2 and 3**). The distinction be-

FIGURE 2





FIGURE 3



tween say, a three- and a five-axis mill, or the U.S. economy before and after the Apollo program, where the payback from Apollo was measured, when it's measured in dollars, has the problem that the dollars after Apollo weren't the same as the dollars before.[4] With a scientific investment, the payback isn't measurable as a scalar with the cost. With financial investments, you invest money, you make money.

When you do that with Apollo, the different transcendental economy that you've got afterwards is expressed in a direct analogue, geometrically, with the difference between a torus and a sphere. Just to describe one difference between the two: On the sphere, any loop that you draw on a sphere, you can condense down to a point (**Figures 4-7**). That's not the case on a torus. If you've got a torus, and you can draw a loop that goes around it, like a little meridian line, you can't shrink that down to nothing. It's an irreducible loop (**Figures 8 and 9**).

That distinction between the two is a global difference. It's not one you can arrive at by any series of local changes: If you took a sphere, there's no way of changing any of the relationships among all the parts of that sphere, to arrive at a torus. It's a qualitative distinction.

The Personality of Creation

When you look at the problems that are plaguing modern science right now, say, just the failures in quantum mechanics, where, with Niels Bohr and others, the solution they proposed was to give up on ever finding the real cause of quantum effects, they ended up saying, "Look, we're going to stick with the senses. We're going to stick with the description of appearances, and we're going to, in fact, try to prove that it's impossible to know what the cause of these events are."

In reality, you don't really get a proof of randomness with their work. What you get is a lack of real study into the principles that are driving it from the future.[5] For example, life and cognition, where time doesn't operate the same way as it does in the abiotic.

4. See May 16 LPAC Weekly Report at http://larouchepac.com/node/22713 and Ross's report at science.larouchepac.com/riemann.

5. See "A New Quantum Physics: Rejecting Zeus" at http://larouchepac.com/node/18081.

FIGURE 4




FIGURE 5




FIGURE 6





FIGURE 7



So, I think, overall, if you look at what the method of science is, what the method of Kepler's vicarious hypothesis was, you have a system that you're inside, you've got a way of thinking that you're inside; and then, you end up getting outside of it, through discovery, through metaphor, but not in a way that you're reaching to an already-existing outside. That is, the complexity is created from within, by a process inside,

FIGURE 8





FIGURE 9



however, which creates a higher complexity. So it has the feeling of stepping outside of a current state. However, that creation exists from within it, exists from what we do, standing inside of it.

On the universe as a whole, that characteristic activity is the personality of Creation. I was thinking about the issue of the pre-tone, that was being discussed: That when you've got the approach of Kepler's vicarious hypothesis, he creates an insoluble paradox that causes the hearer or the reader, to get a premonition of the sound of a solution, that doesn't yet exist; and creating that premonition in the mind of the hearer, is the key to communication. *That creation of a premonition is what exists in successful musical composition, that doesn't exist in a collection of sounds.*

So, I was struck by how well music, affirmatively creates a concept of what we might call it "outsidedness." It creates affirmatively a very clear idea of creativity, that you just can't do without it. The lessons we can learn from music are essential for a scientific approach, and the lack of a scientific, the lack of a Classical musical culture, is one of the major factors in the deterioration of science, because the concept of the universe as a whole becomes degraded to one of a world of sense-impressions that are around us, and the ability to grab onto the true reality, fades.

So, Planck and Einstein referred to this explicitly, on the question of quantum mechanics, where, in a discussion, the reference was made to Bach's fugues, that the standard idea of time, sensory time, is going to have to go, if we are to resolve some of the most troublesome problems of modern physics. That the standard concept of time will not allow a resolution if they have the quantum paradoxes. And the higher idea of time that we get from life, or most clearly, from musical composition, that's going to be key, to then resolving, what might seem to be a physical problem, but one whose resolution can't lie in abiotic physics. There's no way in an abiotic laboratory that we're going to resolve quantum physics, for example.

LaRouche: Yep, exactly. It's the same thing. It's always reaching toward the relative future. And also, it's the difference between dead things and living things, because the process of life is what's crucial. All the things that don't fit the calculus, usually belong to the department of life. So that the action in the universe is motivated and controlled by life, the action of life, not life being controlled by the action itself. And that's the difference. It's the precursor viewpoint.

Ross: And they're precursors of a very specific, new type of personality, a very specific new kind of life. It's not flat. It's not a combination of the already-existing, it's something that's new in a way that's newly specific.

The Precursor Principle

LaRouche: Well, this goes back right to the musical question: The composition of Classical musical composition as such, depends upon the precursor principle. Otherwise, there's no music. The music lies in the precursor function. It does not lie in the elements, but only in the precursor function. And if you don't have an efficient precursor function, you're just making noise.

And that's the point! That's the difference. Because the sense of life always involves this kind of precursor sense; you always get a precursor, an anticipation, that sort of thing. The solution lies there, the meaning lies there.

And we train people in schools and otherwise, "behave yourself," they say. And you say, "Just when you say that, I'm going to defy you, because you make me angry. I'm disgusted with you. You're trying to tell me to shut up about my precursors! And I don't want to hear any more from you, because we've heard that stuff before."

And that's exactly it: We have, in every area of life, in every area of human activity, specifically human, we have this precursor function. That's what distinguishes us from the dead. The non-living processes are what we call "dead" processes. Now, there are dead processes that function in the universe, but the dead processes function only because life drives them! If it's not the life from inside the process, it's life from outside the process that defines it.

And as in music, in actually performing it; for example, what moves it? What moves it is the mind of man, the power of the creative imagination, specifically, the principle of life. It's the fact of life itself, which defines the meaning of life. It's self-defining. Life itself is creativity. So, we have the three categories: We have the non-living; we think that's a category, and foolish people think that the non-living practical stuff is real; then you get the animal life, which has the instrumentality of life, but isn't able to create new forms of life; then you get the human prototype, and the human prototype is distinguished by the fact that we can innovate new *forms* of life. We create new forms of life, even though we don't change our own biology, we change our behavior, our biological behavior.

And this, then, becomes our connection to creativity. Just like you do when you're forecasting in economic forecasting: What are you looking at? You're looking at, on the one hand, dead things, and you're talking about what's controlling the motion and development of these dead things? Well, there's something living.

Ross: Right. That's real economics, as opposed to accounting, which, as you said, that's basically dead or beastly. Because when you make a system, if you try to create monetary economics, which is just such a ridiculous term; I mean, in a sane society, putting "monetary" and "economics" together, should sound like the beginning of a joke, because it can't possibly exist. You know, you're basically saying, "We're going to take the projections, we're going to take the shadows of the real lively characteristics of mankind's power over nature, we're going to look at the shadows of the effects of that, and try to run our society based on a bunch of shadow puppets on a wall," as opposed to the specific, lively powers that're allowing us to exhibit such mastery.

An Act of Love

LaRouche: It's anger against being bored to death, is what's important. That you know the fact of your doing the same old thing, all the time—that's boring! And therefore, life, and the meaning of life, and the meaning of creativity, is always rejecting the idea of a closed system, of a fixed system, of a system of perfection: This is the permanent rule. It's always inventing a new condition and discovering it's valid, that you can make it happen, and it actually is a principle of creativity.

And what you get in music, in Classical musical Composition: It's an organized system. It is absolutely unique. Like the role of, say, religious music. Now, there are a lot of problems in that area, but intrinsically, when you look at Bach, for example, the development of Bach, you get the same thing. That creativity, per se—and it gets outside of anything you know now—what you have to do is, *do what you never did before.* And now discover what it is, what it is appropriately.

Ross: That's another one of the problems of people getting economic concepts today, is that because we have so de-industrialized, people, certainly younger people, don't have much familiarity with the real insides of what the human species does. And then, with education, it's similar to what you've got with the death of real musical culture, is that education just ends up being formulas and rules; you don't get inside it, the way you get inside of creativity, like really rediscovering how a piece ought to be performed, for example.


Ogden: And I think there's another point about that, is why is it, that with the influence of organizations like the CCF, the Congress for Cultural Freedom—which launched a *vicious* attack against Wilhelm Furtwängler. You know, he was actually interned, then there were denazification trials. He was not allowed to conduct for two years. This was a *vicious*, concerted attack, with a political intention. Why is it, since that point, that you had as a corollary of the decline of musical performance and composition, a decline of the moral standard of society as a whole?

And also, inversely, why is it, that the greatest scientists—Einstein, Planck, others—invariably, come across as being fundamentally good? And Furtwängler identifies this, precisely this. He says: Look, the deductive intellect can comprehend the parts as parts; can take this part, understand it; take that part, understand it. Maybe assemble these parts as blocks to built together. But the deductive intellect can *never* comprehend the unity of a whole.

The opposite of deduction, Furtwängler says, is love.

And it's only the passion which we identify as the intensity of love, of a religious, sacred quality of love, that can possibly allow the mind, the imagination, the passionate imagination, to tie the unity of the whole together.

And so, what's been done to musical composition, what's been done to scientific education, what's been done to culture generally, has actually amputated, has cut off the access of the young child, for example, to the experience of real passion, or love in this sense, as the opposite of deductive…



The Congress for Cultural Freedom (CCF) perpetrated a vicious attack against Furtwängler, as a result of which he was not permitted to conduct for two years. The destruction of Classical culture, wrought by the CCF, has its corollary in the decline of the moral standards of society as a whole. This pamphlet was issued by the LaRouche in 2004 Presidential campaign.

LaRouche: See, it's the proper role of the parent and the teachers. It *is* an act of love: It's always bringing the young people up to a higher level. This is the essential thing, it's actually the passion in the teaching process, which is the same thing with the parents trying to develop their children. It's the passion that's involved in getting the child to discover a next step. It's not always "teaching the child what you want to teach them." It's stimulating the child to discover for themselves. The function of the parent and the teacher is largely that. It's not to teach somebody how to behave! It's to inspire them to discover how they should behave! And discover the experience of doing that. Then, that becomes a higher order of passion, as opposed to simply learning.

Ross: Yeah. Planck spoke about this. Earlier in his life, he got into a lot of big fights with Ernst Mach, who had this sort of dead, systemic approach to how science is moved forward.

LaRouche: It was more than apparently dead—really dead!

The Passion To Discover The Cause of Things

Ross: Okay, yes! Deadly, in fact.

And Planck had addressed it, also, from an emotional level. He said: You might be able, retrospectively, after scientific discoveries have been made, Mach, to come and lay out your categories of what these discoveries have in common. You know, Mach was a big fan of "economy," whatever the simplest description is.

Well, Planck, in a letter to him, had said, or in an article, had said: What steels the researcher in his most difficult moments of demanding thought? It's not the hope of finding a principle of economy! It's the passion to discover the cause of things. So, there's an emotional problem here, with this—he addressed the emotional problem that was represented by Mach's dead outlook.

LaRouche: And then came Bertrand Russell, after that: The worst!

Ross: Yes! It's passion. You know, kind of like "monetary economics" is a silly term, so should "evil genius" be. You know, that really doesn't exist.

LaRouche: Well, in addition to what I think on this question of music, which is actually crucial, because there's nothing which is comparable with Classical musical composition, there's no other medium that has exactly that same quality. It doesn't exist. But we can learn from this process, we can learn this question, that the driver of it is passion. That's what makes it work!

But this idea, creativity, the experience of creativity, of creating something new, and being a participant in causing people to go through a new experience.

Ross: And it's a very direct kind of participation, it can't be at arm's length. To really hypothesize, you yourself are in it, you can't do it at arm's length.



Société Wilhelm Furtwängler



Société Wilhelm Furtwängler

Furtwängler's parents (right) had a great influence on his development: His father Adolf was a famous archeologist; his mother Adelheid was a Classicist, and a painter; her father was a philologist who translated the Greek Classics into German. Left: Wilhelm, as a boy, at the piano.

LaRouche: No. You can't educate people *at*. You can't *at*-educate people!

Ross: No!

LaRouche: You have to inspire them! And that's the way it's done. You get the child *fascinated* with a problem, but bring the problem within the child's reach, give the child help to make that reach, but don't suppress them, don't tell them, "This is what you're going to learn." Tease them, provoke them, evoke in them the sense of a desire to solve the problem, and just drop a few hints here and there, which might help them solve the problem. Then they will have the benefit of the learning experience, the actual learning experience.

Ogden: Even on that subject, it's very much worth the exercise of going through and looking at the young Wilhelm Furtwängler. The development of him, the education of him, where did this genius come from? And constructing some of this context of him, it's fascinating! His father was a very famous archeologist, who worked with Heinrich Schliemann, the man who discovered the true existence of Homer's Troy.

His mother was also a Classicist, and a painter; her father was a philologist who spent his entire life translating the works of the great Greek dramatists into German. And in fact, he was a close friend of Johannes Brahms, and dedicated one of his books of translations of Sophocles' plays to Brahms! And similarly, his father was also a very close friend of Mendelssohn.

So, this is the family. And then, Furtwängler's teachers, significantly, one of the main teachers that he had as a child, was a man named Joseph Rheinberger, who also happened to be the composition teacher of Max Planck, and lived in Munich. So these two geniuses had a teacher in common.

And the way that Rheinberger would teach counterpoint, was not according to deductive, dry, blab school rules. The way he would teach the young Furtwängler counterpoint, is he said, "Here's a copy of Beethoven's Late String Quartets. I want you to study it, and discover the secrets of Beethoven. And so, Furtwängler—you can imagine this young child, walking around the ruins of Athens with his father—his father took him to Athens to do these archeological digs with him—and in one of his back pockets, he would have a mini-score of Beethoven's string quartets, which he was intensely studying, and committed all of them to memory! He was famous for actually being able to sit down and play on the piano, note perfect, Beethoven's Late String Quartets, all four voices, without the score. And then, in the other pocket, his passion was not only for the tragedies of ancient Greece, but also of Shakespeare. And he said that his favorite play was *King Lear*.

So, this is the kind of childhood development of a *great* genius such as Furtwängler. And if you compare that, to what most people are *robbed* of today, then that very sense of injustice, should serve as motivation to win the kind of political fight that we're waging right now.

You Have To Know Mankind

LaRouche: Very good. What do you think?

Ben Deniston: This is the fundamental fight. This is what politics is, on the most fundamental level. That's always so unique about the work you've done, is actually taking it to the political crisis, the economic crisis, this is what defines the entire thing. So, actually looking at where we're at right now, and taking it to the most fundamental level of what actually defines mankind's ability to go forward, is this exact discussion right here.

LaRouche: Yes, this is what's important about it, which is why I thought it was important to push it at this point. Because we have to get a sense of the integration of the human mind, and avoid the dangers of specialization, in the sense of this compartmentalization. Unless you can see the active relations among things which are ironically juxtaposed, and see that this juxtaposition is necessary, and that if you don't have Classical artistic composition, you don't have mathematics, you don't have physics, in the same kind of consideration. You have to know *mankind*, and to know mankind, you have to take all, except the garbage. You have to take mankind as a whole, and take the aspects of what goes into mankind, in terms of human knowledge, human behavior, human experience. And make it an integrated experience! How everything affects everything.

Deniston: Because it's one subject.

LaRouche: Yes. Knowledge is one subject: And I think, the useful thing in having this thing taken up at this point, was to get to exactly that thing. And the way you do it, is you take Classical musical composition, and take the best example of it: And in this case, he is the best example of it, Furtwängler. The best way to get an immediate, broad, all-absorbing kind of conception. And then look at the other aspects of the departments of knowledge, so-called, and see how the principle which characterizes the goodness of these departments, all converges upon a *single result*. And the single result is: The human mind, dealing with the challenge of reality, and all these different facets which you experience, now, and your ability to bring them together, and to see their interconnection, defines you as a human being.

And therefore, when you get to physical science, you have to look at it in this way, you have to have all these characteristics; you can't fragment this thing, into isolated departments. You have to have a conception, of *mankind*, and what it takes for mankind *to move things forward*. And in order to move things forward, to discover what the problems are you have to overcome!

And music, this music, Classical music, and *only* Classical music—because what's happened is, with the degeneration of Classical music since the death of Brahms, in particular, just to get a point on this thing, we've had a destruction of the quality of *mind* of the population! And you find, if you know Classical composition, if you know artistic composition, if you know these things, then these are familiar to you. But if you don't have these things, if you're just a johnny-one-note, so to speak, in some specialty, you are actually dead most of the time! You may know one thing, but you don't know anything else. And when you leave that one subject, you go plunging into something, from which you will never return.

And this is what's crucial, is to get this total view of what *being human means*. And what it means in terms of challenges before us. And that makes the rest of it work.

Ogden: And just to put the point on the present moment in history, it's exactly what you just expressed: this oneness of humanity itself, this is, in this series of articles in the Russian publication *Terra America*,[6] the final point, is that it's precisely *this*, about Lyndon LaRouche's world outlook, which makes this the *only* valid outlook which will carry nations through this crisis now. Replacing all of the failed systems of the last 50 years.

LaRouche: Yes. That's what the point is! That's the intention. And now, the question is, carrying out the intention, if you like to put a note on this.

Deniston: It sounds like a good opening salvo: You said this is going to be a series of discussions, so.

LaRouche: Yeah.

Deniston: I think we definitely shocked people a little bit.

LaRouche: Yes, necessarily. And also to get this broader view, take what you can from Furtwängler's is ideal for this purpose. The broader view, take this as the central point, then bring everything else in, together with it, and see how these things interrelate. And the quesiton of interrelationship gives you a sense of wholeness of yourself, as opposed to being a johnny-one-note, or something. So that's it.

6. See *EIR* April 20, 2012, and May 25, 2012.

Creativity: Looking Toward the Future

Lyndon LaRouche: We're going into the second phase[1] of the discussion which we began last week. This time we're back with Bach again, but also our dear friend Wilhelm Furtwängler. And what we're going to be dealing with are the physical principles which underlie music, and specifically those of Bach, today, added to our original schedule....

In Bach and in Furtwängler, we're not talking about just music as such; we're talking about universal physical principles of the human mind, and they are *physically* efficient principles of the mind, such that people who understand these principles are actually superior in their intellectual capabilities and scientific capabilities to those who do not. Because there are fundamental principles of physical science, which are little understood these days, because of the particular character of the educational process, in the universities and so forth. And fortunately, we have been, in terms of some of our operating members here, we have people who have skills in both these areas, and are able to bridge the gap, apparently, between physical art and physical science. They are the same thing.

What Bach represents, and what Furtwängler represents, is a leap into a higher dimension of physical science than otherwise exists: That is, the ability of the human mind to understand the physical universe depends upon actually understanding the significance of the contributions, of Bach first, and of Furtwängler second. And people who don't like Bach and who don't like Furtwängler, are really not fully qualified in physical science.

This is, therefore, the second presentation at this table, which will have been done on this subject, and there will be a third one coming.

The Case of J.S. Bach

Matthew Ogden: Good, and that's precisely what I want to address today....

1. The video is at http://larouchepac.com/node/22876.



EIRNS/Ali Sharaf

Furtwängler described Bach as "the Homer of music, whose light shines through the musical firmanent today, and who in a very special way, we have not ever surpassed." The statue is at the Thomaskirche in Leipzig, where Bach was the choir director from 1723 until his death in 1750.

I think we can come back to the discussion that we had last week, and maybe this time around, we can class it under the heading, "Defying the Slavery of the Commitment To Simple Sense-Experience." That is what we explored last week, from the standpoint of the Furtwängler Principle, as we defined it, as a physical principle, not just of Classical art, but an ontological understanding of the physical nature of the universe itself. This week, as Lyn just said, I'd like to come around and revisit this Furtwängler Principle again, this time, a little bit more specifically through the personality of Johann Sebastian Bach. And especially, how Bach was understood, uniquely, by Wilhelm Furtwängler.

Now, this is something which is substantial, which can be heard *immediately*, when somebody listens to the performance of Bach's music by Furtwängler. This

is completely different, yet again, from the way anybody else, practically, performs the music of Bach. Furtwängler, also some of the other artists that were directly influenced by Furtwängler: You can listen to the performances of Edwin Fischer, for example, a great pianist who worked with Furtwängler, and who recorded many of Bach's keyboard works.

Just like Furtwängler, Bach was no mere musician. Bach was not just somebody who was concerned merely with the musical art, as limited to that subject-matter as such, but Bach was a scientist also, in his own right, whose highly developed understanding of a universal scientific principle, explicitly, as such, we hear expressed in a very highly developed form, in his works of Classical musical composition.

And it's not a coincidence, I think, that not only was Bach working for most of his professional life in Leipzig, which was considered the intellectual capital of Europe at that time, the center of learning, also the center of publishing; it was called the "Little Paris" because of the level of the culture that was present among the general population, no matter who it was. And it was saturated with the ideas of Gottfried Leibniz, who resided in Leipzig merely one generation before Bach.

We also know that Bach was directly influenced by not only the ideas, but the method of Johannes Kepler. And I think with these two scientists in mind, when we look at the personality of Bach, you'll recognize that both Leibniz and Kepler are the exemplary avenue by which we can begin to understand what Lyn has described as the "great principle of metaphor."

When we understand, as we elaborated last week, that, for example, with Leibniz,[2] we can know that in none of the so-called finite, created, elementary things that we find in the universe, the things as such, or even in the aggregate of all of those things, can we find the sufficient reason for their existence; that the causes of what we see, the causes of what we hear, the causes of what we sense, do not lie in the objects that we sense.



Société Wilhelm Furtwängler

"Through Furtwängler's view of Bach and the application of the Furtwängler Principle as a scientific principle," said Ogden, "we escape the prison of sense-experience, and we defy the simplistic notion of absolute space and absolute time as such."

And then, similarly in Kepler,[3] that understanding that the causes of these finite things must lie outside and above, in a substance which is superior to the shadows as such; that it's only through the disagreement among these shadows, the disagreement among these finite things, that we can come to see what's unseen, and escape the ghostly shadow-land of our sense-experience and step outside of those prison walls into the real world which lies outside, in what we call the domain of substance.

This is what was in Kepler, this is what was in Leibniz, and this is the profound scientific understanding that we hear through the work and the performance, the proper performance, of the music of Bach. And his role was as the father of all Classical music, a real revolutionary as such, somebody who created, who introduced something which had not been understood in any physically efficient form before that time, that changed the course of all artistic composition after Bach. And Furtwängler knew him as such. Furtwängler described Bach as the "Homer of music," the founder of this science, he says, "whose light shines through the musical firmament today, and who in a very special way, we have not ever surpassed." He described him as a "creator, sitting on his throne above the clouds, who is beyond the reach, practically, of all others."

Now, but a word of caution: This was not mere empty admiration, and I think we hear, through musical

2. Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, "On the Ultimate Origination of the Universe" (1697), Paul and Anne Schrecker, trans. See also Leibniz, "Discourse on Metaphysics" (1686), and "Monadology" (1714).

3. For more on Kepler's method, see http://science.larouchepac.com/kepler/harmony.

commentary today, again and again, empty words: admiration for Bach, because of an admiration for an effect that's experienced, but the lack of an understanding of the cause behind that effect.

That's *not* the case with Furtwängler. Furtwängler's admiration came from understanding the scientific principle as such, which lay behind the work of Bach. In his writings, Furtwängler came to understand that the same principle of performance which he associated with his own idea of the superior substance of the whole, which dictates the behavior of all of the parts, was absolutely the principle which lay at the root of the composition by Bach.

For example, in one of Furtwängler's writings about Bach,[4] he compares him to some of the other contemporaries of the day who are skilled composers, including Handel, a very skilled composer, whose music, in fact, Furtwängler performed and did a brilliant job. You can hear the *Concerto Grosso* by Handel that's performed by Furtwängler in a way that you'll never hear it otherwise. But even with Handel, Furtwängler realized that in comparison with Bach, there was something still strangely arbitrary, strangely capricious about Handel's music, as compared to what he described as "the serene sureness of purpose," which runs through every work composed by Bach.

And he identifies it by saying, "With Bach's music, we hear a concentration on the moment, linked with an immense breadth of conception, richness of detail linked with a grandeur of overall vision, with its simultaneous view of the microcosm and the macrocosm, with its concern both with the here and now, and with the ultimate goal, its union of what is close at hand and what awaits us in the future, Bach's music offers us an experience of the unshakable power of nature, such that we find nowhere else in the annals of music."

And so, as you can see, the principle of composition that Furtwängler *uniquely* understood as what lay at the root of Bach's music—for example, in his fugues—becomes clear when we see it, and hear it, through the lens of the Furtwängler Principle, as we elaborated it last week. Think about what he just said, in terms of the macrocosm existing in every microcosm, the superiority of the whole over the parts, the reciprocally dynamic relationship between those parts and the whole, where the whole is always primary and always dictating the behavior of the parts, but you have a collision at each moment, between these two.

And this union of "the here and now … with what awaits us in the future," the simultaneous hearing of what's "close at hand" and "the ultimate goal"—that's how Furtwängler describes Bach's music, and that's what we experience through the Furtwängler Principle as Bach's music is performed, always listening both from the present to the future, from the microcosm to the macrocosm, and always also, simultaneously, *from* the future, which is not yet physically experienced, to the experience of the present, from the macrocosm to the microcosm. And this is the same, obviously, as what Furtwängler described as the *Nahören* and the *Fernhören*: the hearing of what's near and then the listening to what's far, intersecting at each moment of the experienced performance.

And so, through Furtwängler's view of Bach and the application of the Furtwängler Principle as a scientific principle, we escape this prison of sense-experience, and we defy the kind of simplistic notion of absolute space and absolute time as such. And from this standpoint, we can begin to understand that you have a knowledgeable principle of universal creativity, which Furtwängler clearly elaborates,[5] as Bach, as the architect of a universe in and of itself, but in the reflection as a mirror of the Creator of the universe.

A Universal Ordering Principle

LaRouche: And this is clear in the question of the *Preludes and Fugues* in Bach. Because the question you're referring to, is this question of what is priority? Now, from a standpoint of physical science, which is where I'm approaching this thing, you are proceeding in reverse order: that we take dead objects, as a first category of organization, dead objects, dead planets, dead

4. "Bach," *Furtwängler on Music: Essays and Addresses,* Ronald Taylor, trans. (Scolar Press, 1991), pp. 27-31. Other quotes immediately above are included in this essay; for example: "Bach remains today what he has always been—the divine creator on his throne above the clouds, beyond the reach of others.… It is this that makes him for us the greatest of all composers, the Homer of music, whose light still shines out across our musical firmament, and whom, in a very special sense, we have never surpassed."

5. Ibid. Furtwängler writes that in Bach we find "the power to create an entity which is a true experience in itself, an experience which reaches its own climax and fulfillment independently of its creator.… Every piece is carried to its fulfillment—or rather, finds its own way to its fulfillment—in terms of the law under whose aegis it was launched into the world. The creator of these choruses and these fugues—Bach—seems to be not a human being, but the spirit that rules the world, the very architect of the universe."

material; then you have another thing, the living thing, human beings, animals even. So you have animal life, which is the living, as opposed to the dead. Then you have a third category, the human mind, which actually is able to see the future, in itself.

So what happens then, is you have an order: We have dead things; we have living forms of animal life, all kinds; then we have human life. The difference is fundamental. First of all, they are dead things. Secondly, and which some people never understood, they are always trying to find life in dead things. And that doesn't exist. *Life* is a principle of the universe.

The problem here is really fascinating. The assumption is, that first, there were dead things, then there came life in the form of what we call animal life, thirdly, there's human life; and they assume that you got living processes in embryo out of dead things. And that from the living processes which couldn't think, actually *think* as humans can think, you would get human beings thinking. They would assume, that if you wanted to start a universe, you would start with dead things, and then somehow you would cook dead things until they become living things, or have animal life; then you would cook human beings out of animal life. You put in the roast, and it becomes a human being.

Well, this is obviously a little bit screwy, isn't it? The fact of the matter is, that contrary to this common conception of ordering, it is in the opposite direction. Now, how can you prove that? Well, there are many ways to prove it, but in the case of this context of music, it's elementary: The process of creativity, of human creativity, is the highest form of existence of life known to us. You don't get life out of non-life, and you don't get human life out of animal life: They come in a different order. Human life is the highest form.

Now, what we call human life, we think of human beings. Fine. But is it restricted to human beings? Is not this higher form of life, existing in the universe? Is man not therefore a descendant of the universe, rather than the other way around? Animal life is real life, it's a product of life, but you also get a higher form of life somewhere in this universe. We recognize that it's happening, because the universe is organized in a certain way which reflects intelligence of the type we call "human intelligence." And therefore, we are merely a variety of this higher form of intelligence, which we share, in principle, as mankind, as distinct from the beast.

Now, what do we do? Put this from the standpoint of Bach, and then put this again from the standpoint of Furtwängler. What's the result? You realize that what Bach represents is a higher form of life than people who don't like Bach! Right? For example! You just want to make the point a little bit cruel, right?

Mankind is the highest form of organization of life as we know it, in the confines of this planet; but there must be, in the universe, still higher forms of life than we represent, and the animal is simply something which was popped in, in the oven so to speak, on the way to producing human beings as a reflection of this still higher form of life, which we know as the mental creative powers of mankind.

Now, what we call scientific discovery, the discoveries of principle, as opposed to a mechanical innovation, all principled discoveries have this same characteristic; the idea of a principle of nature belongs essentially to this category, that mankind reflects a special kind of principle of nature, which reflects this higher form.

Therefore, what's the significance of Bach? The significance of Bach is—the Bach fugue is based, as in the *Preludes and Fugues*, precisely on this concept of a transvaluation of valuations! Therefore, Bach is expressing this form of *human* intelligence, as distinct from a kind of mechanical attempt, like an animal imitation of human intelligence.

Furtwängler makes this very explicit, and he does it with great, free passion, which, because he rests upon not only Bach, but he rests upon the work of the followers of Bach, such as Mozart, Haydn before them, and Beethoven. The great composers who precede Furtwängler in his work are reflections of this process.

So when we say we "like music," that's kind of silly. We admire what the universe represents, and admire man's role in the universe, and admire it as something which we *have to* admire, we're obliged to admire, and to emulate.

A Cultural Degeneration

And therefore, you have a problem: that European civilization has degenerated, under the influence of the opponents of these musicians; that the intellectual life of the typical citizen of the United States and Europe is *inferior* to that of their ancestors, of the relevant ancestors. There has been a moral and intellectual degeneration of human life and activity, and the thing we're fighting against is this degeneration. You saw it in music, you saw the opposition to Bach, the opposition to Beethoven, and then the attempt to *exterminate* those who went further, like Furtwängler.



Deutsche Bundesarchiv

Herbert von Karajan, whom LaRouche calls "the oompah band director, best loved by the Nazi Party," conducted the orchestra using a stopwatch. He is shown here in 1941.

Furtwängler—there was a campaign of *extermination* against him. They took a man in Germany, who had been the oompah band director, best loved by the Nazi Party, and they took Furtwängler, threw him in the rubbish bin, and took this oompah band conductor—he would conduct a symphony by stopwatch at the podium! He was caught by the members of the orchestra, using a stopwatch!

Ogden: And von Karajan was an official member of the Nazi Party! He had *two* membership cards in the Nazi Party!

LaRouche: Yes. What the British did, the Liberals did, the German Liberals did, is they replaced a *human* conductor of music, with a fascist, a Nazi conductor of music. And this Nazi conductor of music, and all the people who liked him, and liked the way he did things, were Nazis! Not because they had joined the Nazi Party, but because they had a *state of mind* which is specific to the same thing as the Nazi Party mind. And the British, of course, are richly endowed with that same Nazi kind of mind. Matter of fact, they sort of invented it: It's called the principle of the Roman Empire, as a British version.

So that's the point: that when we don't have this understanding of things which are typified by the Classical music composition of Bach and of Furtwängler, we really do not have music, and we do not have the competent development of the intellect.

The human intellect in, say, the 20th Century, in my lifetime, has *degenerated*. And I can trace the degeneration to what happened during the 19th Century, in the so-called Romantic movement in music. The Romantic movement was a form of decay which got to stink more and more, as it got older into the 20th Century.

Generate the Future

But this is what the issue is. This is not just "what is good music." This is what is "good human." Good human thinking. If you're not really steeped in Classical music, *you do not know what humanity is.* Because the very essence of the ability to perform a Bach fugue, say, from the *Preludes and Fugues*, and to understand what the distinction is, the change from the First Book and the Second Book; then you go to what Furtwängler was arguing; you go to the changes in composition developed by Mozart, which Haydn was astonished by; what the accomplishments were of Beethoven, which would have astonished Mozart.

And now you get what Furtwängler represents: He represents a reflection, a determined reflection as a great scholar, as a great thinker, as well as a great musician; he represents this. But this is not just *music*! This is the way the *mind must work.* This is why you must use the Classical mode in composing prose, because you must generate within the prose itself.

This becomes clear on the question of dramatic presentations on the stage: The great Classical works presented on stage are qualified because they compel the performers, as a group of people, to interact on the same basis, the principle of the future.

What is a great drama? It shows a principle of the future. Then you look back at this stuff, and you see, "Well, it works exactly that way." And therefore, this is a quality, which, if you want to have an intelligent community, a community of competent scientists, a community of competent thinkers, of competent statesmen, what does a human being require? Or what have we lost? We have lost the connection to the future. We don't understand the future, we don't *think* the future. We don't think living processes; we try to deduce from dead things, what man must be.

But the key thing for humanity is, the purpose of humanity is the future. We have to generate the future, by ourselves; and by generating the future, we are creating what distinguishes mankind from the beast. People who like rock music are beasts! And they demonstrate

it every time they open their mouths, or whatever other organ they open up for these kinds of performances.

And the purpose is to enable the development of the human being, to become a truly creative human being, which is the only *human* being; and you see this reflected in particular in Bach and in Furtwängler. Because the question is, what is the inspiration? The sense of the future. A thought of the future. To generate the future, onstage! To generate the future, in the mind of the personality, which is called "creative invention." These are the issues.

So, we have come into a society, which is *intrinsically morally decadent. Morally degenerate.* And its social values, its popular sense of popular things, its admiration of popularity—what is popularity? It's death! Because everyone goes there. You become dead, therefore you're "popular," because *you do not challenge the present with the future*; therefore, you're not really human. You only come as a human being in the box. But when you open the box, there's no human there, there's just a remnant of what was once the intention to create a human being! And that's what you get.

You get this sense which comes out in this forward and future, the future and the past thing in Bach, and in Furtwängler—it's exactly that; we have to find, in ourselves, an anticipation of the necessary future, and to act on that basis, and to create a future, as opposed to repetition of the past. And thus, this is not just music; this is something much higher; this is a devotion to mankind and to mankind's future. This is the only thing that distinguishes us from the beasts.

And you want to doubt that? Look at what you see on the streets now. Look at what you see in these young kids, on the streets now!

Look at what you see in our political leaders! The political leaders of the United States, with very few exceptions, are intrinsically cowards of a special kind. *They don't challenge the future.* They play it safe, *by being stupid. Dumb, clumsy, failures.* Look at them! Look at the leading politicians! The leading politicians, the leading political figures of the United States, they're all a bunch of stinking cowards, who have no sense of the future, they have no sense—"Oh, that's not for me. That's not for me, I'm not going to go there. That's not established. That's not established, that's not accepted. I'm not going to go there." They are the living dead. They are committed, intellectually, to be dead.

Most of our leading politicians are that. You see that—I can go name-by-name. I can prove the case, case-by-case, in our leading politicians. The problem is, *they are morally dead,* because they have no commitment to the future. They don't hear the voice from afar! They don't enter the future. "I don't go there," they say. "You may be right, but I don't go there. You may be right, but that's not popular. I'm not going there."

Living in the Future

Ogden: And just to make the point, the moral principle, as a musical principle: Furtwängler himself was famous for this. He criticized this "cult of personality" around the conductor; after a performance, everybody would go and want to have a "society evening" and everything, and he would slip out the back door, and he'd be walking home, at night, in the dark streets, thinking about what he had just done. He rejected all popularity.

And he said the same thing was true about Brahms: that Brahms, although he was a very sociable person and really liked people, when it came down to praise and admiration, and talking about his music, he hated it. He would shut down, and he would block that out. Because, he—as Furtwängler said—Brahms always lived every moment of his life with the future, with eternity in mind.[6] And that's a moral principle. Brahms was one of the last of those, in the 19th Century, even. And then after the death of Brahms, and over the course of the cynical 20th Century, we lost that sense of even the human principle of living for eternity.

LaRouche: You see that, also, in physical science, the same development: Einstein reflected that; Planck reflected that, specifically, and others who followed expressed that.

No, it is in science, and that's what we've lost in science. That's why science has gone dead in performance; we put things together still, we make gigantic things based on principles we've known, like thermonuclear fusion: We've known that for a long time. Now, we use

6. Ibid., pp. 97-104, "Brahms," the text of an address to the German Brahms Society in 1933 in celebration of the centennial anniversary of Johannes Brahms. Furtwängler writes: "Brahms's distaste for external show, his complete and utter lack of vanity, together with the 'passionate objectivity' about which I spoke a moment ago, were equally characteristic of his daily life. His need for independence and his cast-iron determination not to allow himself to be disturbed by trivial interruptions, led to his living an unobtrusive, almost anonymous life.... He was loath to talk about his works at any time. Like all truly objective artists he was fully aware of the distinction between the real creative act and the sophisticated theorizing about it which was just beginning to become fashionable in his day.... Particularly in the last years of his life, he lived with the future, with eternity, in mind."



LPAC-TV

Matthew Ogden: "How do you compose like Bach? That's based on the future. How do you compose, and perform and direct, like Furtwängler? That's the future." Shown are Ogden and Lyndon LaRouche during the May 30 webcast.

it as a threatening weapon to destroy mankind, we don't think about going into space with such power. We haven't gone to Mars. We should have gone to Mars already! We *could* have gone to Mars already! And the only way to go to Mars is actually to develop a thermonuclear system of propulsion. We didn't use it.

And you need the thermonuclear technology, also, in order to transform the territory of Mars, to make it somewhat livable, so that mankind can operate there. We haven't done that. We haven't even thought about that: And that's because we've lost this sense of the future.

The characteristic symbol of the future is what you see in Bach; that's the future, the principle of the future. In order to solve the problem of how do you find the future, how do you compose like Bach? That's based on the future. How do you compose, and perform and direct, like Furtwängler? That's the future.

So, this is not just music. This kind of music, and this conception of poetry, which is part of the same thing, is the point that if you want to live as a human being, *be a mensch!* Join the future! Get into the future! Be part of building the future!

Be a *mensch—endlich*!

Creativity Is the Primary Substance

Jason Ross: Yes, there's an existence in the future. People who can't understand how the future differs from the past in a way that's different from being just the opposite, aren't going to be able to understand this musical question, aren't going to be able to understand science. The correlation is between this, and then what Riemann did, where he definitely saw development as primary. He saw creativity as the primary substance—not the present, but what the direction was, the creation of the future. That was what was most real. And obviously, that means that you're not building the future—you didn't build the present from the past, you didn't build it up from pieces. *There's something that's drawing you from the future.*

And in terms of getting beyond the senses altogether, I want to take up as an example, Riemann's habilitation dissertation, which is the key work in physics of the 19th Century.

You have to go into a little bit of geometry, to set the stage for this, but, in Egypt, in Greece, people studying the relations between shapes and things like this, started to develop a whole geometry of different axioms and conclusions. People were seeking for the most basic assumptions, from which everything else would follow. That ended up being Euclid's approach, where Euclid took all of the discoveries of Greek science and then—he formalized it. And formalism is evil. Because instead of presenting discoveries as where they came from, from the process of mind that created them, he said, "No, we're going to start with basic geometric hypotheses, and show how everything follows from geometry, rather than from the mind."

So, in laying out his basic definitions, and axioms and whatnot, one of them, the 5th postulate, caused a lot of trouble for the future: This is the one that says that you can have parallel lines, that it's possible to have two lines that just go along next to each other and will never meet, even if you extend them infinitely. Now, obviously, no one had ever checked; no one had gone to infinity to see if this was right. And it's actually not true!

Let's say you had a city, where the streets were laid out in an east-west grid, and you and a friend are on parallel streets and you're both going north. Now, if this city covered the entire Earth, what are these streets going to do at the North Pole? They're going to meet!

So, on a sphere, for example, there are no parallel lines.

The same thing is the case with space. So, in the 1700s and 1800s, people like Lobachevsky, Bolyai, and Carl Gauss realized that you could create geometries that didn't start from Euclid's presumptions, that didn't start from the idea that you could have parallel lines, that space was flat. They created other geometries! Lobachevsky created one, where you could have multiple parallel lines and none of them could meet.[7] He even got Bessel, the astronomer, to help him test out whether this was true, by making astronomical measurements, to see if space was curved or not. He wasn't able to determine it.



Bernhard Riemann (1826-66) "saw creativity as the primary substance," said Jason Ross. "Not the present, but what the direction was, the creation of the future."

These guys—not Gauss, but Lobachevsky and Bolyai—were what you might call "non-Euclideans." They said, "Euclid made these presumptions and I don't agree with all of them. This one I don't agree with, and I'm going to make another geometry while changing this one assumption that he made."

Riemann said, "No, the problem isn't in having a wrong geometric assumption. The problem is in starting from geometry in the first place! You're basically starting from perception, from appearances, from relations in space, as opposed to starting from physics." So Riemann worked out fully, the total generality of different curved spaces—this is the work that was later used by Einstein, in eliminating space and time as concepts, with his Theory of General Relativity.

But Riemann said, "Forget geometry. The only way you're going to provide a real foundation for understanding the relation of these things is in physics! What are the principles that cause everything to occur? That's the basis for understanding their relations: What made them come about? You have to look at everything in terms of what made it. That's what it actually is."

The thing with this anti-Euclidean approach, where the whole outlook of Euclid is rejected by Riemann, is you end up realizing that there's no actual answer to this question. There's no final answer to the shape of space, because we are never done. Physics isn't done. There is no Second Law of Thermodynamics; there is an unending density of development that lies in store for us in the future, with the discoveries we have yet to make, of principles which are currently, although unknown to us, governing the processes that we see. Like right now, the unexplained quantum processes, or life, or a number of other things.

So, the fact that we're never done, also means that our activity is itself a principle of the universe. You can't say, "I'm going to study the universe outside of human beings," because what we do shapes it. *When we make new discoveries, we literally are changing the shape of space; we're bending it.*

No Fixed System

Take that, and look at the problems of thinking in terms of money, because, obviously, our financial system right now is disintegrating, as we speak, but there are some people who are seeking a different monetary system to replace it. Some of them even call it a "credit system," without knowing what the word means, where they say it's a different relationship of money. But the problems we've discussed with using money in an economy, the foolishness of even the term "monetary economics," or the fact that money isn't able to distinguish this sort of specific new liveliness that's embodied in a new physical principle; money isn't able to understand qualitatively the introduction of fire, or agriculture, or nuclear power, or space technology; that the inability of money to "understand" that, is the same thing as what you get with trying to make a geometry based on *things*, as opposed to *principles*.

Under a credit system, we're not going to have a final credit system. It's not possible to lay out what rates of interest should be, how the banking sector should work, and everything, in a way that will be everlastingly eternal. Because it's always based on what your specific intentions are: Right now, NAWAPA and space,

7. For Euclid, given a line and a point not on it, there is only one parallel line through that point. In Lobachevsky's geometry, there are multiple parallel lines through that point. See http://bit.ly/KOH4z7.

for example, space defense and Mars: These are goals that are going to change in the future, as we develop.

So, it reminds me of *The Republic* by Plato, where everybody's discussing the ideal republic, and they start thinking, "Okay, how are we going to make sure that this republic continues into the future? How are we going to lay down a basis for future generations to maintain this republic that we're creating?" And they realize that no set of specific rules will work! Both because people in the future aren't going to know why those would be good rules, and they end up coming to the conclusion that their process of deliberation is itself the only enduring foundation for an ideal republic. That future generations have to rediscover what the principle of the future is, and improve upon it.

It gets scary to think about that with a credit system; that there is no outside, non-human system that we're going to create, that will then govern economy; that economy is a lively thing, it's a human thing, and human intention has to be there all along the way, guiding it.

Changing the Universe

LaRouche: The question then is, what is the limit of mankind, in terms of development of the universe? Changing the universe, changing the rules, extending the rules? Well, we have the question of matter-antimatter conceptions, which is the so-called boundary condition today, what we think the physics boundary condition is, in terms of the speed of this, speed of that. But then, we say, that's impossible! And we just haven't created it yet. When we think about what we have to do with galactic systems, for example; things happen there that we're not conceiving of doing from Earth; but there's a part of the universe, in which things are happening which don't fit the matter-antimatter convention!

When you start to think about time, the time factor—well, we've blown up the time factor totally, with thermonuclear fusion. Right? The clocks don't mean anything in the same way any more. And when we get to matter-antimatter and we look at the universe, we just stare at it, and "See, that's a boundary condition, we're locked here forever! We're in a dungeon." Well, it's a self-created dungeon: You didn't get the key yet, to get out of it.

Because, obviously, when you look at the cosmic system as a whole, you see ratios of time-action and so forth there, and bounding conditions there, which go way beyond matter-antimatter as it's simply defined. Matter-antimatter is actually a general principle, of many kinds of matter-antimatter! Of many qualitative stages of development of matter-antimatter! We're already yearning for that! Once we start thinking about the limits of our universe as we know it, about the Solar System, then we go beyond the Solar System, and go into the galaxy, and we sit there and we look at our charts, and we find out, how many million years do we go back in this process? How was this system put together? How were these changes organized?

So with matter-antimatter, we have a definition of an assumed limit, based on the assumptions of experiments that you have now. We are now getting into the matter-antimatter function much more familiarly, as something which *does* extend further, and we know that it's cognizable by the *mind of man!* And that fact tells us that's where we're going to go.

Ross: Yes, and the sense of finality is more a psychological quirk than anything you get from actual science. I mean, people in the past, at all sorts of times, have said, "We're basically done. What we've got right now, we can't imagine anything beyond it." Well, of course not, if you're just looking at the system of what you know right now! But it's through the cracks that you're mentioning in astrophysics right now, things like that—there's plenty to discover that's out there, and it's just a matter of an intention to go ahead and do it. I mean, we could have had fusion energy by now, if there was an intention to make it happen: If there was a political will.

LaRouche: You have the intention to find the final answer to all questions? That's a very barbarian concept of a universe!

Ross: It sounds like an indecent desire.

LaRouche: It does, intrinsically very indecent.

Ogden: And I do think that's the key, as you mentioned: We're sitting here, right now, in the midst of a breakdown crisis, and nobody who calls himself a professional economic forecaster saw it coming. Except for one, and the question is, how are you going to be able to develop the ability to think like Lyndon LaRouche, and carry this civilization out of the fallacies that were embedded in how we reached this point right now?

LaRouche: You have to adopt that as a question. It's that simple. As a fungible question!

Ogden: And it's very possible. The barrier standing between us and that, is this refusal to defy the slavery of trust in sense-experience.

Ross: Yep, it's internal.

LaRouche: That's exactly it. And we've got further to go, but we're going to get into that next week.

LPAC Weekly Report, June 6

Science and the Poetic Imagination

Lyndon LaRouche: The subject today[1] is an extremely important one, under modest circumstances. It often happens that way, that some of the most important things happen under modest circumstances—or, ostensibly modest circumstances, which soon turn out to be something quite different than modest. And that's the way it should be today.

There's a piece I've written, called "Our Universe Beyond," which pertains to the fact that we have to now begin to understand that Earth is merely a part of the Solar System, and the Solar System is merely part of the galactic system, and these systems are so intertwined, that there is no integral separation of them from each other. We're now going into a point where a few billion years from now, the Sun will have been no more, and the Solar System will obviously be gone, too; the galaxy will probably persist. And we, as human beings, or whatever remains of us, or whatever our consequences are, will probably be part of that galaxy.

But where will man be? Well, man will probably be under, if we're fortunate, completely new circumstances, much more intelligent than we've been recently, and playing a different role in the universe than we were playing before. But hopefully, we shall have that consequence, and our consequence, then, is a part of the meaning of our life, now.

We had a gentleman, Wilhelm Furtwängler, who had some insight into this, who's known as a great musician, and he had an accurate insight into the general idea of this principle and this perspective. So what we shall do today, is we shall have a report from my associate here [Matthew Ogden], who will report on the great achievement which this great man made, and this gentleman [Jason Ross] shall respond to this, and I shall respond to it, and we shall have a discussion.

So, anchors away!

A Musician and a Scientist

Matthew Ogden: Good. So, if people have been watching, over recent weeks we've had a lot of fun here, and we've revealed something that has been a secret for far too long: that the great conductor and musician, and composer in his own right, Wilhelm Furtwängler, was much, much more than what he is normally perceived as being. He is a great musician, indeed; there's no doubt about that. But *we* revealed him as being much more than anybody has previously acknowledged him to be, with a far greater significance than most people even recognize. We've revealed that this great conductor was a uniquely significant figure in the history of scientific discovery, on a par, I'd say, with several of the greatest scientific minds in the history of human civilization, and somebody whose own, uniquely demonstrated discovery of universal principle, actually allows us, now, to touch what still remain as the frontiers of physical science, to plumb the depths of the unanswered questions that remain before us, regarding, what is man, and regarding man's relationship to the universe as such. And in fact, I'd even assert that Furtwängler's scientific insight goes even further than that, and has immense implications for a domain that we could class as the theological.

Now, what I'd like to focus on here, in terms of overall subject-matter, is really the same question that we've been addressing in recent weeks, but this time in a slightly more specific form, informed by what we have presented here previously. The way the question can be asked is, how can we know the future, before that future has been experienced? Can we know the future, before that future has become the past? Or maybe to ask it in a slightly different way, but the same question: Can the mind escape the bonds of physical sense-experience?

Shelley: The Future Moves the Present

For the sake of surprise, actually, I'd like to introduce a new voice into our dialogue here, today: I'd like to continue to explore the Furtwängler Principle, but for a moment, I'd like to look at Furtwängler through the eyes of another unacknowledged physical scientist: the poet Percy Shelley.

Now, Shelley was a great poet, as Furtwängler was a great musician, and he's been recognized as such. But he was not only that. And again, going far beyond the domain of what people normally perceive as art, and artistic principles, Shelley was no mere "weaver of words," no mere poet in that sense, but as we've dem-

1. The video is at http://larouchepac.com/node/22946.

onstrated with Furtwängler, Shelley's, also, was a mind on a par with some of history's greatest scientists. And Shelley's insight is one that penetrated the very depths of some of the most significant ontological principles that lie at the root of the universe, and man's relationship to the universe.

Now, Lyn has repeatedly emphasized the importance of Shelley's *A Defence of Poetry*, and the closing paragraph of that essay is something which is often quoted, but which is very rarely understood. Why is that? Reductionism. The same reason why Furtwängler's music is admired, but is not understood. Reductionism will tell you that time extends linearly, from the past to the future, from backwards to forwards. That the future is somehow the fruit of the "now"; that tomorrow is merely the extrapolation of today. And that every moment follows moment after moment, as cause leads to effect, so-called.

But what does Shelley say? At the end of the *Defence of Poetry*, he makes the point that real human history, especially in extraordinary moments, is never such that the elements which exist in the now, are something which logically lead to what will happen in the future. But rather, it goes the other way around: that the future is that which is constantly taking the present by surprise! The future awakens an effect in the present, that that present's past did not contain, in and of itself. And the individuals who exist in that present, will find themselves startled, will find themselves taken by surprise, as they're suddenly compelled to action that did not occur to them previous to that point, under the influence of a power which did not exist for them in their past, "moved by a spirit," he says, that didn't originate, in a sense, from inside them.

So, Shelley says, the future has a power to move the now, an impulse to action which didn't exist in any form in the experience of the present or in the experience of the past, outside of the bounds of sense-experience. And in this way, it's the future which gives birth to the present, rather than the present somehow creating that future. Shelley calls it "an unapprehended inspiration" which moves the soul, or "the gigantic shadows which futurity casts upon the present."

This statement by Shelley completely violates everything that we're taught about physics, all reductionism, all bottom-up ideas about the physical universe, all ideas that you just put together elementary particles, elementary building blocks which then create the bigger object or the next moment in time. Because the reductionist would say, "Well, if the future does not yet exist, how can the future create the present?"



Percy Bysshe Shelley (1792-1822). His work, said Matthew Ogden, "resonates with everything that we've explored over the last two weeks, in regards to the Furtwängler Principle in music."

But, does the future really not exist? Or, is it merely, yet to enter the domain of physical sensation?

I think people can probably now get a smell of how this question that we're approaching through the eyes of Shelley, now resonates with everything that we've explored over the last two weeks, in regards to the Furtwängler Principle in music.

To recapitulate, as Furtwängler asked, in very precise, scientific terms: If the unity of the whole has to always be that which determines the behavior of the individual parts, where—and when—does that whole exist, relative to the present moment? And, if every moment of a performed composition, say, is merely the subordinate shadow of a higher and more dominant substance, where, if not in any of the temporal moments as such, can we look, to find that unity of substance?

Now, I don't think it's surprising, but people might not have looked far enough; actually, the beginnings of the answer to that question, lie right there in Shelley's

essay. In the very opening paragraph of the *Defence of Poetry*, Shelley identifies exactly this very rigorous scientific question. He says: Look, there are two different, distinct types of mind. You've got two classes of mental action. On the one hand, you've got what he calls "reason," but on the other hand, you've got "imagination." And he defines them successively. He says reason is the contemplation of what already exists. But imagination is the creation of something new. Reason is that which is concerned with objects, and with their synthesis into larger objects. But imagination is that which contemplates the intervals between things, understands relations as such.

He says, "Reason is the enumeration of qualities already known; imagination is the perception of the value of those qualities, both separately and as a whole." And he concludes this opening, saying, "Reason is to imagination as the instrument to the agent, as the body to the spirit, as the shadow to the substance. Poetry, in a general sense, may be defined as 'the expression of the imagination. . . .'"



A drawing of a Grecian urn by John Keats (1795-1821). Keats's "Ode on a Grecian Urn" invokes the relationship between the "heard melodies" of the senses and the "unheard melodies" of the spirit, that which allows us to step from the temporal into the eternal. The Furtwängler Principle!

And now, what does this allow the poet to do, that the mere deductionist can not? Shelley says, if the deductionist is only concerned with what happens in the moment, with what already exists, then in no way can the deductionist—he who relies on pure deduction—see what will come to exist in the future; he who is only concerned with the "enumeration of quantities already known." But the poet "beholds intensely the present as it is and discovers those laws according to which present things ought to be ordered, but he beholds the future in the present. . . ."

And so, all of a sudden, we've discovered that we've uncovered a state of mind, which, if it does not exist for the scientist, the scientist *is* no scientist. But the poet, or the artist, or the musician, in Furtwängler's sense, or in Max Planck's sense or in Albert Einstein's sense, is he who is able to see the real domain of substance which lies beyond the shadowland of sense-experience. The poet sees the substance of the future, which is what's casting the shadows onto the present, and in this way, Shelley says that the poet can, indeed, foretell the spirit of the future, if not maybe the form, which would be superstition or prophecy.

But it all comes out of the ability to escape the prison walls of sense-perception, to escape the reductionism of mere experience of the present and the past, but to carry the imagination outside of sense-experience as such. And this is what Shelley identifies directly, and it speaks to exactly what we discovered is at the root of the Furtwängler Principle, also. Shelley says the poet, uniquely, has the power to participate "in the eternal, the infinite, and the one; as far as relates to his conceptions, time and place and number are not."

A very good example of this, something which Lyn has also brought up repeatedly, is something you can find from a very close friend of Percy Shelley, and a collaborator of his, John Keats. If you just think for a moment about the example of the "Ode on a Grecian Urn": that this moment of frozen time actually has the ability, as Keats says, to tease us *out* of time, that we can escape the bounds of chronological time, as experienced, through the shadow which we find of the substance which is cast onto the present moment, that this "doth tease us out of thought, as doth eternity."

And Keats has a very beautiful way of saying what we have discovered as being at the root of Furtwängler's principle, also: that the relationship between the heard melodies of the sensual ear, and the unheard melodies, the spirit melodies of no tone, is what allows us to step from the temporal into the eternal . . . and suddenly, we're back at the Furtwängler Principle. You have the relationship, as Furtwängler described it, between what's "near at hand" and what's "far away," the near and far. The relationship between the moment and the eternal, the parts and the universal, the dominant whole, or the shadow and the substance.

Menuhin, Philo: A Theological Principle

And I think this is what you recognize, in terms of what echoes so loudly behind the notes and between the notes, of Furtwängler's conducting. This was recognized—just for fun—by Yehudi Menuhin, who was a very close friend, and also defender of Furtwängler, when Furtwängler was under attack by the CCF [Congress for Cultural Freedom], by the people who Menuhin identified as the "real Nazis," they who appeased the Nazis for so many years before we opened the Western Front.

Menuhin said about Furtwängler: "There are many conductors, but very few of them seem to reveal that secret chapel that lies at the very heart of all masterpieces. Beyond the notes, there are visions, and beyond those visions, there is this invisible and silent chapel, where an inner music plays, the music of our soul, whose echoes are but pale shadows. That was the genius of Furtwängler, because he approached every work like a pilgrim who strives to experience this state of being that reminds us of Creation, the mystery which is at the heart of every cell. With his fluid hand movements, so full of meaning, he took his orchestras and his soloists to this sacred place."



Furtwängler (left) and his friend the violinist Yehudi Menuhin, in 1952. Menuhin said about Furtwängler: "There are many conductors, but very few of them seem to reveal that secret chapel that lies at the very heart of all masterpieces. Beyond the notes, there are visions, and beyond those visions, there is this invisible and silent chapel, where an inner music plays, the music of our soul, whose echoes are but pale shadows."

As I said in the beginning, the Furtwängler Principle extends far beyond music and mere art. It extends even far beyond just scientific principle as we know it; but what it tells us about man's relationship to the universe, and the ongoing, living process of creation of the universe as a whole, and what man takes part in, reaches to the point of actual theological implications.

What we're going to explore in the rest of the discussion here, is something which we have touched on in previous shows. We've taken what Leibniz had said, for example, where you realize that within this shadowland of mere experience, what the reductionist would understand as just an endless series of nows—now, now, now, now—can not contain within it the cause of the being of those moments. That sufficient reason, the active cause for those parts, can not exist in the aggregation of those parts. So we have to look outside of that, look beyond, look behind the shadowland.

Another figure, who also addresses this, maybe somebody we could call the "Leibniz of the early Christian era," Philo Judeaus of Alexandria, who also vividly understands this as a theological principle, that if the active reason, if the cause of something must come from outside of the thing as such, then at no point can the future be born out of the present, but it has to be always created as something new.

And it's this continuous process of creation in motion, which is a *vividly* living principle for Furtwängler. And in fact, Furtwängler was insistent, that the death of the music comes when you enter the domain of routine, that there can be no mere replication, that there can be no mere repetition, that it's always a fresh and new process of creation, and the conductor must have the personality of an always-living creator, a creator who's always alive.

Economic Forecasting

LaRouche: Now, just a comment on this, at this point, as an interlude: I have been forecasting economic processes for a long time—actually, since the 1950s—and I have been, in forecasting, not always delivering a precise forecast, but in my forecasting I've always been right, and everybody else has always been wrong. There's a very simple reason for this: that the human mind, creative mind, is quite different than the ritual mind. And all of us have, within us, as born people, the

possibility of creativity, expressing it, that is, actually seeing the potential of the future. You can not really see the future as such; what you can see is the potential on which people can act, and that's the best you can do. At least the best I can do.

I've always been right, and they've always been wrong. Why? Because they always depend upon a literal conclusion of deduction. They come up with a complicated deduction, or a not so complicated deduction, or simply a fraud, just simply out of the air, belief out of the air, a wild wish. "Oh! This is going to work!" or, "No! That's not going to work!" sort of thing. But I've always been right, in these terms of reference.

We live in a post-Roosevelt society; Franklin Roosevelt was the last real leader of the United States who really had a sense of the future, that is an active, effective sense of the future. And that's what I have. And that's what I do.

And the problem I've seen, and every time I've run into a forecast, where I've made a forecast, and others have made a forecast, and where they've always been wrong, and I've always been right, is the fact that I believe in the future. The problem with most people is they don't believe in the future. They don't understand it. They believe in the deductive view of reality; they take the things that exist now, and try to find a deductive solution, or deductive prediction that's going to flow from these factors. And in all major forecasting that I've known in the postwar period, since the death of Roosevelt, every one of these forecasters has been *wrong* on these issues. And I, in my own modest way, and I do mean modest way, have always been right.

Because you never really know all of the future. What you know is what is wrong about the conclusions concerning the present, at best. And that's exactly what you've been discussing, exactly this, this poetic principle. We have, as human beings, the ability, to forecast things that don't arise out of deduction, deductive processes. Most people are trained *not* to do that. They say, "That's a baddie, you're not in the game, you're not playing by the rules." And that's the nature of the problem.

My joy has always been to have the power of imagination. I have a creative imagination, I know what it means in Furtwängler's sense of the imagination, also, and that's what we require. Most people will never be able to save humanity from disaster, because they will always reject the insight into the future. They will always try to find a practical, deductive explanation of the present, and impose that on the sense of the future.

We have now entered a period in which the entire human species is in danger of destruction by its own stupidity, its own rejection of understanding the meaning of the future, of seeing the future. And I know *exactly* how the minds of these people work. I know exactly how the minds of all these economists who do forecasting work. They're all incompetent, they're always wrong on these kinds of issues. They're always wrong. And they're stubbornly wrong, because they believe there are *rules* which they must obey, obedience to custom. "Well, that's not customary, that's not the way our people think. You're saying something that most of us don't agree with." But that's why I'm right, because I reject their assumptions.

And that's exactly what you're expressing. That's exactly what Shelley is expressing. And we have lot more to say on this, but I just wanted to interpolate that. That's the issue. The issue is the human mind, as is exemplified by our hero today, what most people just lack: a sense of the future. They lack a sense of the future; it's not something that's mechanically produced by the past. But the future is something which the creative powers of the mind, in particular, in society, can create: a future which would otherwise *not happen*, except for the intervention of the creative powers of the mind. And that's what's at issue here.

If you want to survive, if you wish to exist, if you wish this nation to continue to exist, if you wish this planet to exist through this particular type of crisis we face now, you have to learn the song of the future, which is something that most leaders today, in society, do not know. That is why they're intrinsically incompetent. That's why their leadership intrinsically tends to lead toward the destruction of mankind and civilization, because of their very ego, their pride, in saying they're "practical people." And the practical man is the greatest traitor to humanity that was ever invented.

Discovery: Beyond the Senses

Jason Ross: The concept of "future," itself—I was just thinking during the discussion, that people often think of it as a thing, like a noun, but really, when we're acting on it, it's a verb, or it's certainly a result of action. It isn't a *thing* that exists out there. Even the concept of "the future" can be troublesome sometimes, because there isn't "a" future already, outside of what we do. And indeed, different people's ability to conceptualize the future, if you're a creative thinker, the way Furtwängler was or Shelley was, you're able to create an



LPAC-TV

Jason Ross: "Music is going to be an essential aspect of getting a real idea of what a discovery is, to bring science really forward now."

experience, a new future, that no one was capable of even imagining before, because you've got a new degree of freedom, you might say, you've got a new path for creative thought that lets you think differently.

What I want to address is how communication works, and how discovery works, or education, rather, because it's really all the same thing, and it gets at this going beyond the senses. So, if you go back, quite some time, to Aristotle, or we've been talking about Euclid, but with either of these two guys, you've got a fixed world system, that basically, everything's done, and future discoveries aren't really there, so much. At least nothing revolutionary.

If you read the works of Aristotle, they're kind of boring, because they're so declamatory. Aristotle says, "This is how things are, you know, slavery is the right way to go, because some people are meant to be slaves and some aren't. This is how physics works," etc. There's no germ of discovery in it, it's just sort of "Here are the way things are," and it's all very external. The same with Euclid. Rather than the product of discoveries, what he presents is sort of an external world of geometry, the way Aristotle presents an external world, which we might discover more about, but from which the mind itself is abstracted.

Now, contrast that with—you mentioned Philo; I wanted to read a quote from Philo, or Socrates. Here's Philo, in his work *On the Creation*: "For some men, admiring the world itself rather than the Creator of the world, have represented it as existing without any maker, and eternal; and as impiously and falsely have represented God as existing in a state of complete inactivity, while it would have been right on the other hand to marvel at the might of God as the creator and father of all, and to admire the world in a degree not exceeding the bounds of moderation.

"But Moses . . . was well aware that it is indispensable that in all existing things there must be an active cause, and a passive subject; and that the active cause is the intellect of the universe, thoroughly unadulterated and thoroughly unmixed, superior to virtue and superior to science, superior even to abstract good or abstract beauty; while the passive subject is something inanimate and incapable of motion by any intrinsic power of its own, but having been set in motion, and fashioned, and endowed with life by the intellect, became transformed into that most perfect work, this world."

Now, sometimes it's difficult, bringing up the "God"-word, because people have got a lot of different ideas of what's behind that, and I'll let what he said stand for itself.

But take a look also at Socrates, at the way he communicated things. We discussed *The Republic* last time, but in all of Plato's dialogues of Socrates, the point is often not the conclusions that are reached, but rather *the way* conclusions are reached, the means of discovery itself. And so, in one of them, in the *Alcibiades*, Socrates is making fun of this guy Alcibiades, who thinks he knows everything, and Socrates points out that usually when you come to discover something, you discover it after you didn't know it. And he's sort of probing Alcibiades to see when he didn't think he already knew everything, and Alcibiades really can't think of a time when he didn't think he already knew everything; and Socrates points out: Well, if your thoughts aren't the fruit of a discovery that you can identify, then really, what value are they? How are you certain that they're true, if you didn't come to them by overthrowing some other thought, or as a necessary idea, or something like this? It's just sort of a conclusion that you have, that you got from somewhere, that didn't really come from your own mind.

Kepler vs. the Empiricists

Now, jump forward a couple thousand years. If you look at the [15th-Century] Renaissance, if you take a

look at a map of population in the world, specifically in Europe, after the Renaissance, population just—*whew!*—it just takes off. Something happened to the human species. If you're looking at us in biological terms, you would say, "Something happened to the human species during this period. All of a sudden the human population is exploding! What happened?" And it wasn't that the climate was very nice, and there was a lot more food available, or people just had more kids or anything like that, you know—they were all Catholics, so they were against birth control. That has nothing to do with it.

The fact is, that the scientific discoveries people made, let us change our relationship to nature, and this was attacked. So now, let's compare the attack on the Renaissance, with Kepler.

Take for example, Fludd, Descartes, Galileo, Newton, Bacon, Voltaire—all these people, some of them more than others, were supposedly scientists. Francis Bacon wrote this great big treatise on how science ought to be practiced, although he didn't discover anything himself. These people aren't scientists though; they're political actors. These people get used, just like today.

You know in academia, you go to an economics department—maybe some people there are unaware of it, but I think if you look at people in the know, these departments are political departments, they're not really scientific departments. Economics is a political goal, and then you have to come up with theories after the fact to support it; in large part that is what happens.

So what all these empiricists said is that we come to knowledge through our senses. And unlike Aristotle or Euclid, they said, "Yes, it's possible there might be more to discover, we don't know everything yet. Obviously, the Renaissance has shown us that. But," they say, "hold on. As to *the way* we discover things, we're done! We've figured that all out, so we can tell you how all discoveries are made." Like Bacon, writing a book about discoveries that he didn't make.

And they said that the basic key is induction. They got a breakthrough: Instead of starting from assumptions and hypotheses, and then coming to conclusions, why don't you start by making observations?

Okay, so you make observations, and then you find some way of generalizing them, and making a general statement that would include all of your observations. Now, that general statement is expressed in terms of observations. It's expressed in terms of what will one see, how will this process respond, etc. It never gets at a "why?" It never gets at physics, it never gets at power. It's not creative.

In contrast to that, take Kepler. Now here's something that Kepler wrote—remember the earlier distinction with Aristotle or Euclid, where the mind wasn't part of the discoveries; they existed on their own, and the mind was sort of written out? Here's Kepler in one of the introductions to his *Astronomia Nova*, his *New Astronomy*. He wrote:

"In what follows, the reader should overlook my credulity, since I am judging everything by my own wits. Indeed, the occasions by which people come to understand celestial things seem to me not much less marvelous than the nature of the celestial things themselves. I therefore display these occasions scrupulously, with, no doubt, some attendant difficulty for the reader. Nonetheless, that victory is sweeter that was born in danger, and the Sun emerges from the clouds with redoubled splendor. Therefore, O reader, pay heed to the dangers of our army, and contemplate the clouds, horrifying in their darkness. Contemplate, I say, for beyond these clouds the Sun of truth truly lies hidden, and shortly will emerge."

So, Kepler is saying here that the way we come to understand things is "not less marvelous" than those things themselves. The mind, and how it works, is "not less marvelous" than the planets. And this is from *the* foremost astronomer, ever, in his time. What did Kepler do? He completely threw away this whole empirical model. He, in fact, did it very explicitly with his vicarious hypothesis. He said: "Okay, let's play your game: Let's make a bunch of observations"—and he did a better job than anyone else. "Let's make a model that would include all of these observations." So he makes a model and includes all the observations. And he shows that that model disagrees with itself.

He just says, "Look, we tried this out, we tried the models that everyone else was using. We got circular motion, or at least the equi-angular circular motion. We've got these planets, etc., and the model disagreed with itself." This vicarious hypothesis had an internal contradiction.

Kepler was able to adjust it to get the right results, and a lesser astronomer might have stopped there, might have said: "Look, whatever, we can get the right observations with this model. Who cares if there's some problems on the inside?" Here's what Kepler says—he says, "No!" regarding his adjusted model: "Even considering the longitude alone, the lack of any perceptible


FIGURE 1
Kepler's Harmonies




Johannes Kepler (1571-1630), by insisting on the principle of causality (rejected by the reductionists then and now) gave modern science its first practicable, scientific conception of the astronomical universe. In his Harmony of the World, he extended the question "Why so, and not otherwise?" to the whole planetary system, showing that the conflicting evidence of the senses can only be resolved on a higher plane.

The drawing (left) is from the frontispiece to Kepler's 1627 Rudolphine Tables. It shows the astronomers Copernicus and Tycho Brahe at the center, while Hipparchus and Ptolemy look on. On the base, the panel to the left shows Kepler himself, laboring by candlelight.

The musical scales shown below are illustrations from Kepler's Harmony of the World, showing the "tonalities" of the harmonic orbits of the planets. Above is the major scale, below the minor scale.





difference in effects, between the as yet unknown true hypothesis, and the false one assumed by us, the vicarious hypothesis, does not make the effect identical. For there can be a small discrepancy which the senses do not perceive."

Now, hang onto that: He's saying that even if you make a model that matches the observations perfectly, that matched the data perfectly, that in itself would not be sufficient to say that your model was right. Kepler said, no, you've got to look to causes. If you can't answer "why so, rather than otherwise"—like the method of Socrates: Was it a discovery, Alcibiades? Did it have to be that way, instead of another way? Kepler is saying, unless you can say why it had to be this way instead of some other way, unless you're answering a question, what you're getting couldn't possibly be the real truth.

You think about how he used that, in his *Harmony of the World*: It's similar to looking at a future that doesn't yet exist. He looked at the planets, and he looked at going beyond what he had done in his *New Astronomy*, where he understood the relationship of two planets with the Sun; he only used the Sun, Earth, and Mars in that whole book.


In the *Harmony of the World*, he extends this question, "Why so, and not otherwise?" to the whole planetary system. And the answer that he arrives at, is that a harmonic system is set up, that both the major and the minor modes are required. He goes through the whole thing; but one of the important things, is that the harmonies that determine the system don't exist in the data themselves anywhere; that the harmonies Kepler finds are not in the motions of the planets; they're not in the speeds of the planets; they're not in the distances of the planets. They're in the *perceived speeds of the planets, as the Sun would see them*. And understood, through the sense of hearing. Which is the Sun is seeing.

So, without this whole, without the Sun as "conductor" so to speak, you aren't able to have the harmonies that he discovers in that work.

The Infinitessimal

Just to finish up, I'd say there are a couple aspects on music that are very relevant today. One of them is what

FIGURE 2
Quadrature of the Circle



Nicholas of Cusa (right) showed that Archimedes' (left) attempt at quadrature of the circle—to approximate the value of pi— was ontologically incompetent. The first three drawings show the process of estimating the area of a square approximately equal to that of a given circle, as the average area of two regular polygons. In the last drawing, although the inscribed polygon may seem to closely approximate a circle in area, it actually contains a devastating paradox. The more the polygon looks like a circle, the larger is the number of its sides—i.e., the less it partakes of circularity.

Kepler had done: You've got a certain continuity that underlies all the experiences, you've got the thing that drives all the "nows" that then follow. And you've also got a sense of how you break one of those continuities, one of those wholes, to arrive at a higher one.

You take a look at music today: What Kepler was saying, again, about how a difference that's imperceptible doesn't make things identical—you can have someone who even attempts to imitate, say, a Furtwängler, or somebody who attempts to imitate an actor; they're playing in a play and they're imitating the way another actor acts. Sometimes, even if it's very difficult to tell quite what's different at every node, or every passage or every word, you still know that something just isn't there. And often, just as an aside, with acting this comes up as sort of using a broad brush to paint a scene. So you say, "I don't know what that guy was saying, but I know he was angry." As opposed to letting the words actually speak for themselves.

But this difference, the size of this difference, you really have to say, is infinitely small, because the difference between a new discovery and what was before—in the case of the vicarious hypothesis, it wasn't even perceptible. But take the case of the difference in using a bunch of polygons of increasing an number of sides to make a circle, versus the circle itself (**Figure 2**). If you put enough sides on that polygon, the difference can be as close to zero as you want, spatially; however, the

power of the difference does *not* become infinitely small. Although it's spatially infinitely small, or almost nonexistent, the power that's represented in it doesn't exist in a spatial world; it's in a world of power, it's a dynamic. And if you try to focus on it itself, it might appear to be nothing, although it's actually more powerful than the "somethings" that it's causing to behave the way that they do.

And so, in terms of science now, we have to have this approach that Socrates and Plato had, that Kepler had, that some of the last people who had it recently had—Planck, Einstein, Vernadsky, Furtwängler—that this approach, of what it means to make a discovery, of what it means to have a whole; if we don't bring that back to science, we're not going to get out of the empiricism that's preached by such as that evil, terrible man, Bertrand Russell.

Music's going to be an essential aspect of getting a real idea of what a discovery is, to bring science really forward now.

Science, Music, and the Imagination

LaRouche: Yes. We've reached a certain point in the three weeks of discussion on the subject. The subject is not closed; the subject has merely been demarked for further consideration. But this is extremely important, because we have to understand the function of what most people would consider the imagination. And in this area, people would say, "But that's *only* the imagination." But you have to look at the catastrophes that result from ignoring the imagination! And therefore, it's important that we go into the domain of the imagination, as we do here, because we're dealing with factors which we know, as factors; they're empirical factors. But we don't understand fully the mechanisms by which they operate. And that's precisely the issue. What we've gone into in these three weekly sessions, are some of the foundations of questions, or question-*ing*, which are used by us to expose the frauds which we ordinarily believe.

And therefore, we do not come up with final answers; we come up with conclusions which denounce things that some people think are final answers. And it's the progress of continuing that process, which is essential. And only when you enter the doubt about your sense-certainties, do you actually begin to acquire genuine knowledge. And that's the function I believe we've tried to perform in these three-week sessions.

There's a lot to be said. There's so much of it, which I already have said. But just as you have expressed again, Furtwängler has been expressing this question about the factor of uncertainty in conclusions. The question is, you have to get to *define* the uncertainties. And those then become the missions to perform.

But the important fact here is that what most people believe and rely upon, especially in government and what is often called science, that these things are frauds, because they are assumptions which are made, in defiance of evidence to the contrary. You find there are lacunae in what you know. Somebody then introduces an explanation which is relatively arbitrary and therefore denies the unknown which needed to be explored.

What science can do for us, is to point us in the direction of questions to be answered, and point out to us things that are the wrong answers, to a certain degree. And between the two of these kinds of conditions, we are able to steer ourselves into investigations.

For example, my own case as a forecaster: Most of my forecasts have determined the actual course of history, since the first one I made a long time ago, I should say now, back in the 1950s, that period. And the 1950s forecast I first made stands up today, in terms of method. It's the ability to foresee, as you expressed in your report on this, to foresee the future, as a necessary future, even though it is not demonstrated as deducible from the recent past. This is what we define, really, as creativity: the ability to see the option of the future as distinct from the recent past, or what seem to be the shadows of the recent past.

That's it. If we don't have that, if we don't have that self-critical drive, to get into the future and look back at the present, in this way, as the great forecasters have, you can not forecast competently. That is the reason why every modern forecaster who's publicly accepted by universities and so forth generally, why they're *all incompetent*: because they rely on only deduction, reverse deduction. They do not see the future. They would be embarrassed to mention the future. "That's only speculative!"

Well, it's not speculative. "I proved it's true, again and again, and you guys are still saying it's only speculative? Is it not the case that you're being stupid? Or stubbornly stupid, for trying to seek approval from the past? And you call yourself a person who's going to forecast the future?"

And this is the essential issue, and what I've got here in this piece on *The Universe Beyond*, will indicate some of the things that these questions portend.

Time To 'Wise Up'

Ogden: And this is the urgently necessary political question for people to face.

LaRouche: People have got to realize that many of them have been stupid. They don't like to hear that, but it's true. Stupid in what sense? They don't accept the creation of the future, that the future is a creation of something which has no active precedent as such, no literal precedent. It's the attempt to *see* what's wrong in the present, what's a failure in the present, what's a destructive force in the present, and to *change it*, and to see what you can do to *change it*!

Right now, the United States is threatened with destruction, self-destruction under British influence. We have the worst kind of President you can imagine, as a President. We have creepy characters who are running our government, in other capacities, who are actually destructive forces. They doom humanity by their very presence, let alone their bad breath! Because they have no opening to reality. Reality is always a change from the present to the future, and they can never get to the future.


I've gone through this *again and again* in forecasting. Every time I've raised a major forecast, it worked. The other guys were wrong. The most famous one, of course, was 1971, where I had made this forecast, you know, in 1966, that this is where we were headed, this is the calamity your present policies are going to carry us into, and it was delivered in the Summer of 1971 [with the end of the Bretton Woods System]. And not a single economist in the nation who had piped up earlier, or piped up then, not a single one, had even *after the fact* admitted the fact of what had happened.

And it went on like that, again and again and again, up to the present time.

Ogden: Right. The point is, that the future has to be defined in its own terms. You can't define the future according to the terms of the present.

LaRouche: Well, let's take a case of discovery; like we've had various developments in chemistry, the nuclear and super-nuclear factors; these keep piling on to us. The more we discover, the more that they reveal to us, factors which are determined factors, which were not taken into account. Many of these things, like the discoveries in medicine which have saved lives, were things that did not exist until the actual *discovery*, as an original discovery, was made.

So it is this factor of discovery, in that sense, which



LPAC-TV

Lyndon LaRouche: "Only when you enter the doubt about your sense-certainties, do you actually begin to acquire genuine knowledge. And that's the function I believe we've tried to perform in these three weekly sessions."

defines human intelligence. And people who go by deduction, always going by deduction, "You have to prove this by deduction!" is the hallmark of stupidity. And also calamity.

And that's the point. You have to develop what is called sometimes "the poetic principle," the creative principle. You find, in the great discovery by Furtwängler, this discovery was earthshaking, literally. Here it was, a musical discovery, it has an effect, of the foretone and after-tone, but *exactly* that, the idea of the foretone and the after-tone, *exactly*, defines the very principle of musical composition. And the very scientific principle of that subject.

And here, this guy emerges with a concept which corresponds to the creative powers of the *universe*, in this music. And you realize that the music is not just music per se. The music is a message! It's a message to man's destiny, a message to man's opportunity for the future. And here's a man, who's considered "merely" a conductor, merely an imaginative conductor, and he actually produces the *greatest scientific discovery* in the current history of mankind.

And that's the lesson to be taken from this table. And we should enjoy it, and participate in it, and ambulate this kind of discovery.

Ogden: Well said!

THE SYRIA FLASHPOINT

Putin Draws the Line Against Empire's Nuclear War Drive

by Nancy Spannaus

June 12—From the moment the British, Obama, and Sarkozy murdered Libyan leader Muammar Qaddafi last October, the Putin leadership of Russia has been on to the British Empire's game: a confrontation to break Russia's and China's defense of national sovereignty, with the threat of launching thermonuclear war. That imperial strategy is continuing, with an almost daily escalation against Syria, with the aim of forcing Russian (and Chinese) capitulation to the Empire's drive for global dictatorship.

Fortunately for humanity, the Russian leadership has drawn the line, and refused to back down. It has received crucial support from the highest levels of the U.S. military, in an ongoing battle against the British-controlled grouping in the Obama Administration, led by Obama himself. But the Empire, desperate to hang onto power under threat of its own bankrupty-disintegration, cannot, by its very nature, give up. Mankind continues to live on the edge of thermonuclear war.

With this reality in mind, Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov, over the past week, has announced new strategic initiatives against the British drive to overthrow Syrian President Bashar al-Assad, including a proposal for an international conference including all Syria's neighbors, and, most importantly, exposing the fact that it is the Washington-, London-, and Saudi-supported "opposition" that is behind the massacres which are being used to justify a "humanitarian" war of aggression against Syria.

Lavrov Delivers a Message

Lavrov held a televised press conference in Moscow on June 9 to reiterate an unambiguous message: It is those who want UN and Arab League envoy Kofi Annan's ceasefire plan to fail who are behind the escalating violence in Syria, but it will not work. Russia will never accede to demands for UN-sanctioned armed intervention against Syria, he said.

Russia is "concerned with the reaction on behalf of outside players that openly support armed groups in Syria, but on the other hand, demand decisive steps by the international community to change the regime," Lavrov said. He added that the turmoil in Syria is happening because "players from outside the region are pushing the opposition to defy efforts at compromise." He reiterated the Putin government's steadfast position that Russia "shall not sanction in the UN Security Council the use of force. The consequences for the Middle East would be dire."

Noting the calls to blame every act of violence on the regime, Lavrov said, "The problem is not just the regime." The Houla and Qubeir massacres, terrorist attacks, and other acts of violence "are the result of confrontation fueled by outside forces."

On the Annan plan, Lavrov said that there is "no alternative to implementation for a peaceful settlement." The Western policy of regime change, he said, means more violence. "The Annan plan makes peace possible," but it doesn't "fit into the logic of the West, which



Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov (right) with UN and Arab League envoy for the Syrian crisis Kofi Annan, in Cairo on March 10, 2012. Lavrov is reiterating at every possible forum that Russian will not tolerate foreign military intervention in Syria.

wants the international community to sanction intervention."

To implement the Annan plan, as well as relevant UN Security Council resolutions, Lavrov put forward the Russian proposal, first mooted June 8, for an international conference on Syria, to include the five permanent members of the UN Security Council (the U.S., Russia, China, the U.K., and France), Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan, Iran, and Iraq, as well as the Arab League in general and Saudi Arabia in particular, and also the European Union. "We want this conference to be a venue for frank and open dialogue that would make it clear whether it's realistic to find agreement on coordinated, targeted actions between the government and all groups of opposition, and the sooner the better," he said.

While there have been squawks about Russia wanting to include Iran, a close ally of Syria, in the talks, the concept has not been rejected.

Broader War Avoidance

Lavrov's high-profile intervention should be seen in the context of a larger swath of war avoidance efforts by the Russians, which has been ongoing since last Fall, and was punctuated in a May 17 speech by Prime Minister Dmitri Medvedev at the St. Petersburg International Legal Forum, where he reiterated Russia's unmovable commitment to the principles of international law, the central role of the United Nations, and the inviolability of national sovereignty. The alternative, he said, to the shock of many, was nuclear war:

"Such actions, which undermine state sovereignty, can easily lead to full-scale regional wars even—I am not trying to scare anyone here—with the use of nuclear weapons."

Under pressure on numerous fronts in addition to Syria—including the NATO anti-missile defense system in Europe, and the threats of a bombing campaign against Iran—the Putin-Medvedev government has taken a series of military preparatory actions. One of those was the deployment of the Russian Navy in the eastern Mediterranean, off the coast of Syria—a deployment Ria Novosti said would be permanent. Another measure is the build-up of military facilities for possible counterstrikes against the NATO ballistic-missile defense systems (BMDS) to be deployed in Romania and Poland.

At the same time, Russia has taken extraordinary diplomatic initiatives to try to ensure war avoidance, including hosting talks with the Syrian opposition, and offering Moscow as a venue for the next round of talks between the UN Permanent Five plus Germany (P5+1) and Iran (June 23). On June 13, Lavrov will travel to Tehran to hold preparatory talks with the Iranian government, prior to those crucial discussions.

The Truth Behind the Massacres

One of the major tools of the Empire faction's push for war against Syria is the series of massacres being touted as the work of the Assad regime. Yet, as Russian media has consistently reported—and is now being picked up by others as well—these stories are *lies*, concocted, as Lavrov has charged, in order to justify foreign intervention.

EIR exposed the lies behind the Houla massacre in our last issue. On June 7, the German daily *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* (*FAZ*) ran its own story, based on eyewitness reports, which established that those killed

in Houla were slaughtered in cold blood by Syrian rebels, who then video-recorded the results, and falsely portrayed the victims as victims of pro-Assad militias.

Author Rainer Hermann wrote that the Houla massacre occurred after Friday prayers on May 25, when Sunni rebels attacked the three Syrian Army roadblocks around Houla, whose purpose was to protect the Alawite towns near the overwhelmingly Sunni Houla from attack. (President Assad and his family are Alawites, a branch of Shi'a Islam; the Alawites constitute 11-12% of the Syrian population.)

Units of the Syrian Army reinforced the roadblocks that were under attack, and 90 minutes of fighting ensued, killing dozens of soldiers and rebels. During the fighting, Houla was cordoned off from the outside world.



UN Photo/Jenny Rockett

U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Susan Rice is demanding foreign intervention in Syria, even outside the venue of the UN, if Russia and China veto such a move on the Security Council (which they would do).

"According to eyewitness accounts," the *FAZ* report continued, "the massacre occurred during this time. Those killed were almost exclusively families belonging to Houla's Alawi and Shi'a minorities. Over 90% of Houla's population are Sunnis. Several dozen members of a family which had converted from Sunni to Shi'a Islam were slaughtered. Members of the Shomaliya, an Alawite family, were also killed, as was the family of a Sunni member of the Syrian Parliament, because he was regarded as a collaborator. Immediately after the massacre, the perpetrators filmed their victims, and then presented them as Sunni victims in videos posted on the Internet."

This *FAZ* account is the most prominent of several stories that have come out quoting eyewitnesses who are naming the Syrian rebels as the culprits in the attacks. On June 10, the British *Mail* Online published an account reporting that "a group of Western women in Damascus has contacted the *Mail on Sunday* [June 10] to say rebels were firing upon the army with the sole purpose of inciting riot and mayhem.

"They mention a peaceful march in which a rebel pulled out a gun and shot dead an unarmed policeman. The following riot was reported as a police attack on peaceful protesters, they say."

The author, Peter McKay, wrote that he has not been able to verify the report, but this is not the only instance of similar reporting. He also wrote that Britain's "Channel 4's chief correspondent, Alex Thomson, says Syrian rebels tried to have him and his team killed by Assad forces by leading them into a firefight," because " 'Dead journalists are bad for Damascus.' "

A third story about the Houla massacre in a Dutch Internet publication, deredactie.be, by Dutch Middle East expert Martin Janssen, also quotes witnesses to opposition atrocities carried out in Syria.

The Empire Presses On

Meanwhile, the Empire faction—from British Foreign Secretary William Hague, to Obama's Oxford-trained UN Ambassador Susan Rice, and academics such as Ann-Marie Slaughter of Princeton—is loudly demanding foreign intervention, even outside the venue of the United Nations. Rice delivered this threat at the UN on May 31; on June 10, she was echoed by Slaughter in an op-ed in the *Washington Post*, invoking former British Prime Minister Tony Blair's doctrine of "humanitarian intervention." She said that "the world will act—with force if necessary and with the approval only of a regional organization and a majority of the members of the UN Security Council."

The lesson of those statements is clear: Americans must utilize the political space given them by the Russian resistance, to remove Obama from office. Otherwise, the threat of imminent war remains.

Putin in Beijing: Russia, China Ally To Thwart Obama's War Policy

by William Jones

June 9—The state visit of Russian President Vladimir Putin to Beijing June 4-7, which concluded with a summit meeting of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) on June 7, was a most significant development in preventing the outbreak of general war as a result of the policies of the Obama Administration.

The imminent danger is from the drumbeat for military intervention against Syria, led by Obama hatchetperson Susan Rice, the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. It is solely the obstacles placed by Russia and China in the way of such military action that have prevented that war from occurring. But also in the Asia-Pacific region, Obama's "Asia pivot" has helped to fuel tensions between China and some of its neighbors, especially the Philippines, where wildman President Benigno Aquino is eager to give China its "comeuppance," with the backing of the United States.

Panetta's Shangri-La Monologue

The U.S. "Asian pivot," now euphemistically renamed "rebalancing toward Asia" so as to appear less threatening, was carried a step further with the visit of Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta to Asia. Speaking on July 2 to the Shangri-La Dialogue in Singapore, Panetta announced that the U.S. plans to deploy 60% of its fleet to the Asia-Pacific region, instead of the usual 50-50 division between the Atlantic and the Pacific fleets—a significant upgrading of the U.S. military presence in the region.

The Shangri-La Dialogue, which brings together defense officials from the nations of East and Southeast Asia as well as from the United States, was attended by China's defense minister last year. This year, evidently fearing that the disputes in the South China Sea would be made into the primary focus of attention, in which China would be lambasted from all sides, Beijing downgraded the level of its delegation. As the Chinese suspected, the South China Sea dispute did play an inordinate role in this year's "dialogue."

Panetta further announced that the U.S. was strengthening its traditional alliances in the region, with Japan, South Korea, and Australia, and reaching out to others. After Singapore, he visited Vietnam, India, and Afghanistan, with Vietnam and India on his target list of new possible "strategic partners." While both of these have land or maritime border disputes with China and are eager to have a good relationship with the United States, both would be loath to become too close to Washington militarily. Vietnam still gets flak for being a "communist" country, and is often the target of the U.S.-based human rights lobby. India has a stubbornly independent streak and has always been intent on maintaining good working relations with its great neighbor to the north. But the direction in which U.S. policy is tending is clear: creating a ring around China.

Russia-China Partnership

President Putin's choice of Beijing for his first state visit after his election was a clear signal of the importance of the relationship. Coinciding with the beginning of the SCO summit, it provided an opportunity for the heads of state of the two countries to enhance the role of the SCO in the region. Putin underlined its importance in an article for China's *People's Daily* published on June 5. The closer collaboration between the two countries can help propel the SCO toward a more influential global role.

Speaking at the press conference at the conclusion of his meeting with President Hu Jintao on June 4, Putin said: "China is the strategic partner of the Russian Federation. In all spheres, our relationship is based on mutual benefit and with the highest level of trust and openness. In the political sphere, we operate on the highest level of mutual trust, showing each other firm



Russian Presidential Press Service

President Vladimir Putin and President Hu Jintao at a concert during the summit of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, in Beijing on June 5.

support on key issues affecting the vital interests of the two countries and the two peoples."

That "firm support" was clearly evident in their efforts to prevent military intervention in Syria.

Both leaders stressed that they were taking their relationship to a higher level, and that they would be working within the international organizations to support each other's interests and to maintain world peace and stability. "Taking into account the complex and rapidly changing international and regional situation," President Hu told reporters, "our two countries will pay special attention to cooperation within the UN, SCO, BRICS [Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa], and G20, and will uphold the objectives and principles stated in the UN Charter, and basic norms governing international relations, to promote solidarity and cooperation between countries with emerging economies and developing countries in order to promote a more equitable and rational development of the international political and economic order."

The two leaders also committed to enhancing military cooperation. This Spring saw the first joint China-Russia maneuvers to be conducted outside the auspices of the SCO, in the region of the Yellow Sea. While Obama's "ring around Asia" is aimed at recruiting China's neighbors, the close Russian-China military cooperation assures China that it is not alone in the region.

The Joint Statement signed by the two leaders on June 5 delineates the new thrust of the relationship. There is an extensive expansion of trade and investment, with the intention of bringing bilateral trade up to $100 billion in 2015, and $200 billion in 2020, from the present $80 billion. Seventeen agreements were signed in key areas such as energy, industry, banking, aviation, and innovation technology. The two great powers are intent on increasing the export of high-technology products from Russia, whereas the present exports are largely confined to energy. Russia will increase its involvement in the development of the Chinese nuclear industry, and the two sides will continue their close cooperation in space.

President Putin also welcomed Chinese investment in the development program of Russia's Far East, indicating that it would be more closely intertwined with China's development of its northeastern region, bordering on Russia. This will include a significant upgrading of railroad links on both sides of the border. Russia's Minister of Railroads, Vladimir Yakunin, was a member of Putin's delegation.

The Joint Statement also underlined the need for enhancing the SCO as a force for peace and stability in the region. The two leaders called for regular consultations of SCO members on important regional issues, in particular, Afghanistan after the draw-down of U.S. troops there. They urged a diplomatic solution to the dispute with Iran, and reiterated their opposition to military intervention in Syria, and they called for a revival of the six-party talks over the North Korean nuclear program.

The statement called for creating a new "architecture of defense and stable development" in the region, and urged the SCO to begin a dialogue with other regional organizations, such as the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum (APEC) and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN).

The SCO Summit

All the leaders of the SCO member states attended the summit: China, Russia, Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan, plus high-level representatives from the observer nations: Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, Pakistani President Asif Ali Zardari, and Indian Minister of External Affairs S.M. Krishna. Afghan President Hamid Karzai was there as a special guest.

The situation in Afghanistan received a lot of attention, with the SCO vowing to play a major role in the reconstruction of that country. There is also a great deal of concern about Afghanistan falling into into anarchy with the draw-down of U.S. troops. While the SCO has not been prepared so far to play any role in maintaining security in Afghanistan, it does have a certain capability that might be brought to bear if need be.

There was a great focus at the summit on the global economic situation, and a commitment to increase the economic role of the SCO. For that purpose, the establishment of an SCO development bank was again proposed and is expected to move forward. President Hu promised a loan of $10 billion for the purpose of enhancing SCO cooperation.

In a "Declaration on Building a Region with Lasting Peace and Common Prosperity," the leaders stated their opposition to all acts of violence inside Syria, and called for a "broad-based dialogue that respects Syria's sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity." It rejected any use of force against SCO observer nation Iran, and underscored the willingness of the SCO countries to aid Afghanistan in its reconstruction efforts, pledging to consider giving Afghanistan observer status in the organization. The statement also opposed "unilateral" missile-defense projects.

Although the Western media is focusing solely on the military aspects of the SCO, in an attempt to beat the drums about creation of an "Asian NATO," the SCO is becoming a major force in foiling the war plans of President Obama and his British controllers. But as the U.S. prepares this month to conduct major military maneuvers in the Pacific, involving, for the first time, almost every maritime Asian-Pacific country except China, it is clear that more provocations are on the way.


New from *EIR*

The British Empire's Global Showdown, And How To Overcome It

In the face of a potential thermonuclear World War III, a confrontation being engineered from London by a desperate British-centered financial oligarchy operating through the vast—yet often underestimated—powers of the British monarchy, EIR has produced a 104-page Special Report, documenting both the drive for war, and the war-avoidance efforts of patriotic military/intelligence circles in the U.S., and the Russian and Chinese leaderships. The British hand behind the warmongers, and the concrete economic and strategic programs which can defuse the threat, are elaborated in depth. These include the Russian proposal for collaboration on the Strategic Defense of Earth (SDE), based on Lyndon LaRouche's original Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI).

The Global Showdown report is available in hard copy for $250, and in pdf form for $150, from the EIR store.

Call **1-800-278-3135** for more information.



IN BRIEF HERE:

The End of Britain's 'Bail-Out'

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Thursday, June 7, 2012

As it must come to all nations of the present "trans-Atlantic community," the present British world system is now hopelessly doomed to pass, as did the Roman Empire, in one way or another. Either the sovereign nations of the Americas and Europe, most emphatically, return immediately to the equivalent of U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt's fixed-exchange-rate system, as had been intended by the decision to defeat John Maynard Keynes' own intended swindle at "Bretton Woods"; or else, without that reform which I have just indicated for immediate action now, the present trans-Atlantic monetary system collapses into an irredeemable general collapse of the entirety of the trans-Atlantic system, and, quite likely, much beyond.

Stating the same point otherwise, without an immediate installation, by political force of leading nations, of a trans-Atlantic equivalent of President Franklin Roosevelt's original "Glass-Steagall" law, the nations of western and central Europe (and others) will become virtually "far worse than merely financially extinct" during the presently onrushing collapse already under way, especially in the combination of the British system and its captives of the already terminal crisis of the so-called "Euro system."

I had lately presented a three-point reform for the United States' economy, a reform composed essentially of three constitutional measures of immediately required leading components. Without such a reform, the United States itself would collapse into a hopeless, and largely homicidal condition, within the short term immediately ahead. My indicated three-point measure of reform is premised on the same principles employed to establish the U.S. Constitutional system of national banking under U.S. President George Washington and his Secretary of the Treasury Alexander Hamilton. That same reform was also the basis for the great reform which saved the existence of the United States under President Franklin Roosevelt, before the ruin of the U.S. economy in great part, under President Harry S Truman's obedience to the indications by Britain's Winston Churchill and Britain's traditional, more or less treasonous, "bail-out" crony, Wall Street.

Three Key Measures for Action

The three, actually elementary measures of constitutional reform which are urgently required now, are, summarily, the following:

1. The immediate re-installation of a fixed-exchange-rate U.S. system, by means of a re-enactment of President Franklin Roosevelt's Glass-Steagall law's initiation.

2. The establishment of a national banking system based on the precedent of the national-banking law which had been established under President George Washington's Secretary of the Treasury Alexander Hamilton, contrary to the terrible national economic crisis which had been unloosed by the combination of the controllers of the unscrupulous President Andrew

Jackson and Jackson's backers and controllers such as the well-known, habitually treasonous Aaron Burr, Marin Van Buren of Panic of 1837 infamy, and associated New York City-based and London-controlled international bankers who used the wrecking of U.S. national banking to install the London-controlled financiers as the subsequently traditional London controllers of Wall Street tyranny over our republic.

3. The need for the launching of the original North American Water and Power Alliance (NAWAPA), as being prepared anew at this time, to prompt a general recovery of the U.S. economy through a fairly estimated four millions high-technology-driven places of long-term modern employment under a refreshed NAWAPA design, plus an estimated addition of two millions of net, capital-intensive, long-term, high-technology employment for categories outside NAWAPA itself: six millions employed in increasingly high-technology, largely capital-intensive productive employment, to rebuild our presently ruined, broken-down, U.S. economy to ensure the rescue of our republic and its cooperating partners from the onrushing and intrinsically mass-murderous, present trends in the recently accelerating ruin of our national economy under current prevailing policies and trends.

There are compelling needs for exactly such a form and quality of a U.S. national economic-recovery program at this time. I indicate some of them here as illustrations of the principled implication of this package of remedial measures for this time.

First: the U.S. economy is presently shattered from the effects of trends of policies of practice since the changes in leading U.S. policies since the assassination of President John F. Kennedy and his brother Robert Kennedy. The collapse of the U.S. economy accelerated throughout the interval from the inauguration of President Richard M. Nixon, until the inauguration of President Ronald Reagan. There was an acceleration of the decline under the disastrous term of President George H.W. Bush, an added stagnation attributable to circumstances created under the attempted impeachment of President Bill Clinton during his second term in office, and accelerated economic disasters under the two terms of President George W. Bush, Jr., and the worst economic disaster of the U.S. economy, by far, under London's particular choice, President Barack Obama, with a pending worsened disaster under presently indicated Republican alternatives.

Second, there has been the trend of ruin which has been brought upon the U.S. economy, especially under the effects of U.S.A. and British policies under the George W. Bush, Jr., and, the most wrteched of all, Obama Administrations. The effect of the George W. Bush, Jr. and Barack Obama Administrations has been a degree of wrecking imposed upon the U.S. economy caused chiefly by post-September 2007 policies which became the opening of the gates of folly to the Wall Street and related "bail-out" practices which have now virtually destroyed the scant remnants of a former productive form of economy and its employment practices.

The result of that indicated pattern has included the lack of any significant investment reserves available for actually rebuilding the economy now. Under that state of affairs, it were not feasible to actually fund the urgently needed capital funding in any presently practiced approach. The needed margins of presently investable funds simply do not exist at this juncture. However, there is a remedy for that. This means U.S. government margins of capital funding for long-term productive investments of an aggregated type represented by NAWAPA's long-term capital improvements and "Detroit types" of largely privately executed, but publicly funded investments. The combined margin of capital investment through the public sector, such as NAWAPA implies, and general investments in agricultural and capital-intensive science-driver and related capital investment, will aggregate, at first, toward four millions annually employed in NAWAPA, and an additional two millions annually in other relatively capital intensive expansion in such other categories.

Under such a program, there will be a serious need to emphasize recreating lost productive skills; but, that problem can be repaired.

The estimated component of the six millions relatively higher technology jobs in "new capital improvements" must be recognized as oriented toward the high-technology category of space-science-oriented technologies, with much emphasis in a direction of thermonuclear-fusion technologies, and beyond. The restoration of NASA and comparable programs previously in use during pre-Obama years, will not be merely opportunities, but increasingly indispensable.

It is time for mankind to do what is necessary for mankind's increasing need of conquering nearby space, and beyond, which will emerge as the characteristic of the new quality of economy for human beings, to which we must turn now, immediately, for the restart of an actually human economy.

Spain Forced To Seek Bailout; Glass-Steagall Push Intensifies

by Nancy Spannaus

June 11—After weeks of being beaten about the ears by the Obama Administration, the IMF, the gathered Eurozone finance ministers, and the London-run international banking community, the Spanish government of Mariano Rajoy on June 9 finally agreed to "request" a bailout package from the European Financial Stability Facility/EFSF (or the soon-to-be-created European Stability Mechanism/ESM), to the tune of some EU100 billion. The money will be lent to Spain's Fund for Orderly Bank Restructuring bailout facility, which in turn will use it to try to stop the massive run on Spain's bankrupt banks.

Desperately trying to avoid the kind of bloody conditionalities which the IMF-EU-ECB Troika has imposed on Greece, Spanish Economy Minister Luis de Guindos told the press, after the Eurogroup meeting of Eurozone finance ministers: "This has nothing to do at all with an absolute bailout. It is financial support aimed and given to the Spanish bailout fund and the Spanish bailout fund will inject this capital to those Spanish institutions that require it as stated by the IMF."

The British-based financier cabal was desperate to get Spain to cave in this weekend. But in fact, the announcement—which is still all in the realm of stated intentions—will do absolutely nothing to resolve the fundamental bankruptcy crisis staring the entire trans-Atlantic financial system in the face. Solving that crisis demands, as Lyndon LaRouche's article above reiterates, taking the bad gambling debts off the books, by implementing Glass-Steagall.

Thus, it is lawful, and good news, that leading financial spokesmen are now stepping forward to campaign for Glass-Steagall. Particularly notable were op-eds published in the June 11 *Wall Street Journal* and *Financial Times*, by former Kansas City Fed chairman Thomas Hoenig and University of Chicago Prof. Luigi Zingales, respectively, both of whom unambiguously promote the return to the Glass-Steagall principle.

The Spanish Bailout

As the *New York Times* put it, the Spanish announcement came "following increasingly desperate calls from world leaders to accept the money before Greek elections next week, that they fear could cause havoc in the markets." Spain's announcement was met with plaudits from the IMF, the EU bureaucracy, and of course, U.S. Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner—no newcomer to hyperinflationary bailouts.

The EU100 billion figure is meaningless in the face of the size of the actual blowout underway. The *Financial Times* earlier this week estimated that the amount required to bail out the Spanish banks was probably closer to EU475 billion. *EIR*'s conservative estimate is in the EU600-700 billion range for the banks—and over a trillion euros for the country as a whole.

In addition, it is not at all clear that there is any fund available that could accomplish such a bailout. By applying for funds, the Spanish government has taken itself off the donors list for the EFSF, the entity first in line to provide the money, thereby reducing the amount available for bailouts to approximately the same amount that Spain is expected to apply for! The ESM does not yet exist.

Even before De Guindos had finished crying "uncle!" the markets escalated the attack on Spain. Moody's rating agency said that the agreement will probably spur further downgrades of Spain's credit rating. And Bloomberg quoted investment banker Nicholas Spiro stating: "Market reaction is unlikely to be favorable, given that the bailout places even more strain on Spain's creditworthiness."

It Didn't Take Long

Surprising even hardened financial "experts," who expected the Spain bank bailout to "work" for as much as several hours, the bailout had actually failed before being formally announced—a new speed record that should, by all reason, be allowed to stand forever. The causes of this lightning collapse should be understood, so that bank bailouts be buried forever.

Spanish government bond yields *rose* this morning, to 6.54% for a ten-year bond, 0.3% higher than the June 8 closing level which helped panic Spain's government



Former Kansas City Fed chief Thomas Hoenig is pushing for a return to Glass-Steagall.

into "requesting" the bailout. Credit default swaps (CDS) on the Spanish government debt zoomed higher in price. And the contagion spread to Italy, where Spanish debt dragged Italian debt to a ten-year yield of 6.04%, up more than a quarter of a point from June 8. One may be sure that the same thing is happening with Eurozone *bank* debt, as with sovereign debt.

The "agreed" bailout was to pile EU100 billion in new debt on top of Spain's sovereign debt, and on top of the bonded and short-term debt of Spain's bad-asset-loaded banks. The mechanism was to be a credit line from some EU bailout fund, which Spain's bank restructuring agency would use to replace the capital of banks, which would have agreed to write off *some* of their bad assets, thus impairing (reducing) their capital. It might have been predicted that the EU100 billion would shortly be used up in this manner, leading to requests for more bailout.

For bad-asset-loaded, undercapitalized, overleveraged banks, this new debt does not improve the situation, as the Greek default and "haircut" proved. The new debt is "senior," being from a supranational bailout agency, and thus immediately subordinates all the other debt of Spain, which guarantees repayment; and of the banks (which already owe EU330 billion to the very-senior ECB, which tolerates no "haircuts" on its loans). So, these loans must be repaid even if other Spanish government and bank debt is defaulted to do so, and all "markets" know this; there is no prospect of economic expansion which would enable Spain or its banks to magically service more debt than the debt they couldn't keep servicing before the bailout.

So the results of this bailout, like Greece's, were pre-fixed: Spain will be further downgraded, Spanish banks will be further downgraded, and by contagion, Italian, French, etc., sovereigns and banks will be downgraded, etc.—while Obama/Geithner, the U.K.'s Cameron/Hague, the IMF's Madame Lagarde, and the EU bureaucrats demand a further, even more gigantic bailout, likewise built to fail.

It might also occur that the Spanish bailout, announced to have no austerity "conditions," because "Spain is in a recessionary situation," will thus strengthen the anti-austerity forces in the June 17 election in Greece, which is in a depressionary situation.

The Demand for Glass-Steagall

While this deadly financial chicken-game continues, the good news is that the drumbeat for Glass-Steagall is growing.

"Why I was won over by Glass-Steagall" is the title of a call published in the *Financial Times* June 11 by Italian Prof. Luigi Zingales, at the University of Chicago Booth School of Business. Zingales admits to having opposed Glass-Steagall before, but he now understands that its elimination led to giving the major financial powers "excessive power." He also argues for the simplicity of Glass-Steagall over the 298-page (yet to be completed) "Volcker Rule," arguing that the more complicated a rule, the "more difficult it is for someone with vested interests to get away with distorting some obscure fact."

Simultaneously, former Fed official Thomas Hoenig, a well-known Glass-Steagall supporter who has remained relatively silent over recent months, also went public again for its reinstatement, this time in the *Wall Street Journal*, which specializes in attacking regulation. Hoenig refutes the two biggest arguments against Glass-Steagall: that it would not have prevented the collapse; and that it is against free-market ideals and would put the U.S. at a disadvantage in the current economy.

Hoenig, now a director of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, can exert a significant influence on national policymakers, especially Republicans, who are still largely in the background of the political fight for Glass-Steagall in Congress, and around the nation, led by LaRouchePAC and its supporters.

Pressure Builds To Throw Obama Out of Office Now!

by an *EIR* Team

June 11—Attorney General Eric Holder, who has flatly denied everything, stonewalled, and refused documents with respect to each and every previous crime of Barack Obama, was finally forced on June 8 to assign two Federal prosecutors to a criminal investigation of Obama Administration national security leaks, telling them to follow the investigation wherever it led in the Executive branch—that is, to the White House.

Holder's abrupt reversal on this, and the process that produced it, exemplify Lyndon LaRouche's contention June 10 that "a new trend has surfaced recently: Obama is on the edge of being finished." There is "not a buildup of Obama support, but a buildup to throw him out of office."

For the first time, the calls for investigation and prosecution come equally from Republican and Democratic leaders of the Senate and the House. Senior Democratic Sen. Dianne Feinstein (Calif.), Chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, took the lead, along with House Intelligence Committee Chairman Mike Rogers (R-Mich.). The two are working closely together in such a way as to scrupulously maintain the non-partisan nature, and thus the effectiveness, of the effort.

As if in a one-two punch, the announcement of the leaks investigation was followed on June 11 by the scheduling of a meeting of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee on the matter of citing Attorney General Holder in contempt of Congress, for having withheld documents in the investigation of the Fast and Furious scandal. The session will occur on June 20.

Although these leaks of classified information, as damaging as they might be, and the coverup of the Fast and Furious gunwalking[1] operation, seem to pale beside Obama's other crimes—such as violating the Constitution by launching a war unauthorized by Congress, and killing American citizens—they could well signal that a group of leading policymakers has finally decided that the narcissist Obama is such a clear and present danger to the Republic that he has to be removed. It is absolutely crucial that this occur *prior* to the November elections, in time to permit a worthy alternative candidate—*not* Mitt Romney—to emerge.

"Obama is on the edge of being finished," LaRouche said. The time to throw him out of office, by impeachment or under Section 4 of the 25th Amendment to the Constitution, is now.


There's the smell of Watergate in the air, but, as LaRouche emphasized in a June 11 discussion, this issue should not be seen as one confined within U.S. national borders. London brought Obama to power, and it will weigh in on what happens to their tool. Thus, the fight to remove Obama, in order to create a future for the U.S. and the nation, has to be seen as a *global* fight

1. "Gunwalking" refers to the allegation that the ATF allowed guns to "walk"—to be bought by suspected arms traffickers on behalf of Mexican drug cartels.

against the British Empire, and waged accordingly.

Deadly Leaks

It is widely mooted in Washington circles, and confirmed by *EIR* sources, that not long ago, in the face of an increasingly desperate situation for his re-election campaign, President Obama adopted a new strategy of bragging about his so-called national security accomplishments. It was in this context that the *New York Times* published two major articles in late May on Obama's security policy, which featured both his personal fixation on supervising a "kill" list, and the alleged U.S. sponsorship of the Stuxnet computer virus, which temporarily crippled Iran's nuclear program. Sources for both of the articles were identified as current and former Administration officials.



DoJ/Lonnie Tague

Attorney General Eric Holder may soon be held in contempt of Congress for his coverup of the Obama Administration's "Fast and Furious" scandal. He is shown here at a press conference, Aug. 20, 2009, on the Justice Department's "coordinated strike against Mexican drug-trafficking organizations." It seems that such "strikes" include "walking" guns to the drug traffickers themselves.

The two leaks most at issue are the one concerning U.S. cyber-warfare against Iran (an Israeli spokesman has now rushed to take credit for Stuxnet), and the leak of the identity of a British-Saudi double-agent within al-Qaeda in Yemen. Interviewed on CBS's Face the Nation June 10, Senator Feinstein said that the two prosecutors' investigative teams had probably divided the work: "one for the Iranian situation and one for the Yemeni situation."

Coordinating with Feinstein on the same program, Representative Rogers said, "I had eight senior case officers from a whole different set of programs in my committee just recently, and … all the men and women at that table said this is devastating to them and makes their jobs so much significantly harder.… I know Senator Feinstein and I really want to get to the bottom of this, … because we know that sources' lives are in danger and operations, importantly, going forward, are in danger. That is a serious blow to national security. So this should be done in a way that is fair and nonpartisan."

On June 11, new accusations about the leak were raised by Patrick Caddell, a prominent pollster politically linked to efforts on behalf of Hillary Clinton. Appearing on breitbart.com's "Victory Sessions," Caddell declared that Obama's National Security Advisor Tom Donilon was definitely the source of the leaks, because of his background as a political operative and known "leaker." Caddell reported that Donilon had been confronted by former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates soon after the killing of Osama bin Laden—which the White House had made the subject of a "brag" campaign—and told that he had a communications strategy for him. According to David Sanger's just-released book, *Confront and Conceal*, Gates's strategy was simple: "Shut your f***in' mouth."

EIR's sources argue that Donilon can't be solely to blame; the onus is on Obama himself. Indeed Caddell noted in his interview that Obama is the person who could have stopped the *New York Times*' publications; his silence speaks volumes.

The Military Angle

It is noteworthy that the issue of the intelligence leaks jeopardizing national security is one which brings together JCS Chairman Gen. Martin Dempsey and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who are in revolt against Obama's drive for thermonuclear war, with both leading Democrats such as Feinstein, and with some Republicans. (Both the Senate and House committees also met June 7 with the Director of National Intelligence James Clapper, who is said to be outraged about the leaks.)

Feinstein has also discussed a joint hearing of the Intelligence and Armed Services Committees with the latter's chairman, Sen. Carl Levin (D-Mich.).

Contempt Decision Looms

The intelligence community is equally outraged by the Obama Administration's handling of the Fast and Furious gunwalking scandal, which resulted in the kill-

ing of at least one Federal agent, in addition to hundreds of Mexicans, with "walked" guns.

On June 11, Rep. Darrell Issa (R-Calif.) released a statement indicating that on June 20, the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, which he chairs, will convene to consider a report holding Attorney General Holder in contempt of Congress for his failure to produce documents specified in the Committee's Oct. 12, 2011 subpoena in regard to Operation Fast and Furious. House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) also released a statement indicating that the House leadership fully supports the vote to hold Holder in contempt, noting that "the Justice Department is out of excuses. Either the Justice Department turns over the information requested, or Congress will have no choice but to move forward with holding the Attorney General in contempt for obstructing an ongoing investigation."

Issa's statement notes that the House Committee, working with Sen. Chuck Grassley (R-Iowa), has been investigating the operation for over a year and a half, and has turned up enough evidence, through whistleblowers and documents released, to reveal fundamental flaws in the operation, which Holder has had to admit. Yet, Issa writes, the Attorney General has balked at turning over documents subpoenaed on Oct. 12, 2011, specifically any documents created after Feb. 4 of that year, the day the Justice Department issued a false denial to Congress.

Issa argues: "The Obama Administration has not asserted Executive Privilege or any other valid privilege over these materials and it is unacceptable that the Department of Justice refuses to produce them. These documents pertain to Operation Fast and Furious, the claims of whistleblowers, and why it took the Department nearly a year to retract false denials of reckless tactics. The Justice Department's actions have obstructed the investigation. Congress has an obligation to investigate unanswered questions about attempts to smear whistleblowers, failures by Justice Department officials to be truthful and candid with the Congressional investigation, and the reasons for the significant delay in acknowledging reckless conduct in Operation Fast and Furious."

A Bipartisan Move?

Approval of a contempt citation takes only a majority vote in committee, and thus, unless the DoJ complies, as it still can, it will almost certainly pass the Republican-dominated Committee. Then it goes to the floor of the House, where, although Democrats have rushed to defend Holder and Obama in all previous hearings, it will intersect concerns about the other egregious behavior by the Administration.

It should also be recalled that, approximately one year ago, 31 Democrats wrote a letter to President Obama, asking him to cooperate with the investigation. In a statement June 11, Representative Issa declared that he expects that 31 Democrats will join the Congressional Republicans in finding Holder in contempt, if it comes to that. He added that he hopes Obama intervenes to get DoJ cooperation, saying, "This is like Iran-Contra, like Watergate, and other embarrassments over the years. The major embarrassment is the delay in being honest and open about it."

While the 31 Democrats who acted in 2011 have since been quiet, it is clear that the "trend" has changed. Obama is on the verge of being finished, and some Democrats, like those acting on the leaks scandal, just might be impelled to act.

William Wertz, Tony Papert, Jeffrey Steinberg, and Nancy Spannaus contributed to this report.





Sam Vaknin, author of *Malignant Self-Love*, is interviewed in a 46-minute LPAC-TV video, on President Obama's narcissistic personality disorder, a condition which Vaknin says is increasingly controlling the President's mental outlook. Agreeing with Lyndon LaRouche, Vaknin believes that Obama poses a grave danger to the United States and the world, unless he is immediately removed from office.

http://larouchepac.com/node/19464

The LaRouche Slate

Glass-Steagall Put Back on the Agenda

by Harley Schlanger

June 10—LaRouche Democrat Kesha Rogers' victory in the Democratic primary for Congress in Texas, and Diane Sare's campaign in New Jersey, combined with the multi-billion-dollar derivatives loss by JPMorgan Chase, and the collapse of the banks of the Eurozone, have put the issue of restoring Glass-Steagall banking regulations back on the front burner for the U.S. Congress. In the last two weeks, at least seven additional Congressional co-sponsors have been added to Rep. Marcy Kaptur's H.R. 1489, bringing the total to 69.

The LaRouche Slate has made the return of Glass-Steagall the entryway to its three-point plan for an abrupt reversal of the continuing downward crash of the U.S. economy, along with a return to a Hamiltonian credit policy, through creating a National Bank, and the North American Water and Power Alliance (NAWAPA), the largest infrastructure program ever considered. The lies of the Obama Administration, that the U.S. economy is doing well, were exposed again in the last week, as a disastrous report on job creation, and another downturn in home sales, demonstrated that there has never been a recovery in the U.S.

Rogers, Sare, and the other three slate members (Rachel Brown in Massachusetts, Bill Roberts in Michigan, and Dave Christie in Washington) have made the immediate implementation of Glass-Steagall the number one issue in the nation. Sare's Democratic opponents, who were defenders of President Obama—a staunch opponent of restoring Glass-Steagall—were left stammering, with nothing to say, when the JPMorgan Chase losses showed that Obama's Dodd-Frank law had done nothing to stop highly risky speculative activity, which is threatening to blow out the whole trans-Atlantic banking system. One of her opponents, who eventually won the primary, refused to even discuss Glass-Steagall during a debate, dismissing it as "a LaRouche issue."

In a sense, he was right: This *is* a LaRouche issue, as Lyndon LaRouche has insisted that the return of Glass-Steagall is the only way to end the bailouts of bankrupt banks, and clean the toxic debt off their balance sheets, so a real credit-based, production-driven recovery can occur. Though Sare received only 10% of the vote in the three-way primary on June 5, she won widespread support for Glass-Steagall in the district, as well as the support of a national campaign by former supporters of Hillary Clinton, who are calling for Obama's removal, and have made Glass-Steagall one of their leading issues.

This "LaRouche issue" was also a central focus of Democratic Party state conventions over the last two weeks, as Democrats meeting in Massachusetts, Virginia, Washington State, Texas, and West Virginia were overwhelmingly in favor of a return to Glass-Steagall. More than 350 delegates in Massachusetts signed Rachel Brown's petition calling for Glass-Steagall, and the Democratic candidate for Senate, Elizabeth Warren, has made its restoration her leading concern.

In West Virginia, 111 of the 800 delegates signed a LaRouchePAC resolution for Glass-Steagall, although it was not put on the agenda. And in Washington State, the loudest applause came when Sen. Maria Cantwell announced her continuing support for Glass-Steagall. Cantwell was the Democratic co-sponsor (with Republican John McCain) of a bill to restore Glass-Steagall in 2010, which was killed directly by Obama, to keep it out of the Dodd-Frank bill.



LPAC-TV

The strategic focus of the five Congressional candidates of the LaRouche Slate, on bringing back Glass-Steagall, is reinvigorating the political fight for the FDR-era recovery measure. Shown: Diane Sare, meeting with constituents in Teaneck, N.J., April 28, 2012.

Simmering Revolt Against Obama

The other leading development at these state conventions has been the emergence of a still-below-the-surface revolt against Obama. Instead of the conventions serving as pep rallies for the incumbent, Obama's name was rarely mentioned in Massachusetts, Virginia, and Washington.

Perhaps as a result, Obama-connected party leaders demanded a "loyalty oath" in Texas and West Virginia. This was a particularly hot issue in West Virginia, a coal state, where not only the base of the party (which went for Hillary in 2008) is hostile to Obama, but even newly elected Democratic Sen. Joe Manchin has publicly declared that he "hasn't decided" if he will give Obama his vote. A threatened demonstration against Manchin's speech at the convention did not occur, but the loyalty oath did pass.

In Texas, where LaRouche Democrat Kesha Rogers had won her second Democratic Primary in the 22nd District, making her the party's candidate in November against incumbent Republican Pete Olson, the corrupt party leadership went so far as to claim that Rogers is "not a Democrat," and passed a resolution to that effect. They unsuccessfully tried to exclude her from participating in the sparsely attended convention.

Despite the official exclusion line, Rogers did address the Veterans and Progressive caucuses, and was greeted by many delegates who expressed their verbal support—and then scurried away, so as not to be seen talking with her. They represent the kind of support for Obama which could vanish in an instant—if top policy circles move to dump him, in order to save the nation.

Diane Sare

'I Am Proud To Have Stood for Truth'

June 6—*Diane Sare, the LaRouche Democrat running as the National Slate candidate in New Jersey's 5th Congresstional District, issued this statement following the closing of the polls after yesterday's election. She was joined at her victory party by Tea Party activist Mark Quick, who had withdrawn his Reform Party candidacy, and endorsed Sare for Congress.*

A video of their remarks can be found on Sare's campaign website (http://dianesare.com/).

The Diane Sare for Congress campaign has transformed the 5th Congressional District and the nation forever. While officially being given only 10% of the vote, all those of you who joined with my efforts know that our effect was spectacular. Fellow LaRouche Democrat Kesha Rogers' victory in Texas demonstrates what all of us found in the streets of northern New Jersey: The American people have had it with this treasonous British agent Barack Obama.

Furthermore, we now have a phenomenal coalition of patriots who agree on the core principles of the U.S. Constitution, and who will stand up for that.

My request to all of you is that you not walk away from the fight just as it is getting interesting! Lyndon LaRouche, at the age of nearly 90, like Founding Father Benjamin Franklin, has given the better part of his adult years to creating a future for those who will be born centuries from now. Each of us can do no less.

The euro is going to blow out momentarily, and unless Glass-Steagall is reinstated now, most people will lose everything. Obama's Ambassador to the UN, Susan Rice, is threatening unilateral military action against the nation of Syria, once again without consent of the U.S. Congress. As Kesha Rogers stated, a lot is going to change between now and November, and we cannot allow a little aberration like an election to stop us from taking action to save the republic and the world.

Obviously, it would have been easier to convince some pessimists of our power had I been allowed to win the primary—but frankly, the vote is not significant. Adam Gussen may have been delivered the Democratic Party nomination, but that does not stop the euro from crashing, or thermonuclear war from beginning.

The truth of the matter is, that as long as we stick to true principles, we have the upper hand. The primary elections of the remaining members of the LaRouche National Slate[1] are approaching, and we may have more victories at the polls; but more importantly, we have been proven right over and over again, and those who oppose us have been proven wrong. I am proud to have stood for truth with Lyndon LaRouche and the rest of the slate, and I expect to see all of you out there with us tomorrow morning as we win the war for the nation and for mankind.

1. The three members of the Slate whose primaries are upcoming are: Bill Roberts, Michigan, 11th C.D., Aug. 7; Dave Christie, Washington State, 9th C.D.; Aug. 7; and Rachel Brown, Massachusetts, 4th C.D., Sept. 6.

Editorial

Dump the Euro! Get on with Development!

The instant failure of the June 9 attempted "step-by-step" bailout of Spain's banks has triggered a Europe-wide debt panic in which only one policy has a chance of working: Helga Zepp-LaRouche's Mediterranean development plan, beginning with immediate national exits from the fatally doomed euro, and imposition of the Glass-Steagall principle on the banking systems. *EIR* rushed that program into production last week because of the breaking crisis: As of this week, the full-scale emergency makes it even more urgent.

With the failure and backfire of the Spanish bank bailout, "The crisis is deteriorating at an ever-increasing pace," said one "senior banking strategist" quoted by the *Financial Times* June 12. "It's … full eurozone break-up or fiscal union." The suddenly looming demand for simultaneous bailouts of Spain and Italy has raised the specter of all-out, hyperinflationary printing of doomed euro "money," while capital hectically flies out of Europe, and bank lending is frozen.

In her introduction to the "Mediterranean Economic Miracle" report, Zepp-LaRouche provided the diagnosis and the solution:

"Twenty years after the signing of the Maastricht Treaty, a monster has been created; and 11 years after the introduction of the euro, many Eurozone nations are in danger of descending into African-level conditions—social collapse, rising death rates, infrastructure no longer maintained, … one in two or three young persons unemployed, and skilled workers fleeing their homelands.… The alleged boom in the Eurozone's so-called catch-up nations was in fact a bubble—and now that bubble has popped."

The once-sovereign nations of Europe must exit the euro now, she emphasized, and implement Glass-Steagall banking reorganizations based on re-establishing their own currencies.

"The current specter of gargantuan, failed, hyperinflationary bailout attempts makes this the only way to survive. National sovereignty over monetary and economic policy must be re-established. Competent feasibility studies for a 'Plan B,' comprising technical preparations for, and execution of an exit from the euro, have already been worked out by such experts as Prof. Dirk Meyer at the Federal Military College in Hamburg. An extended weekend could be utilized as a bank holiday to prepare the currency conversion, and to deal with account balances in checking and savings banks.…


"The exit from the euro must be followed by a transfer of the monetary sovereignty that was handed over to the EU, back to the respective national states.… A new national currency law could then legislate the adoption of the New Deutschemark, and likewise for other respective national currencies." The euro would become merely "a unit of accounting among national banks."

This makes imposition of the Glass-Steagall principle work in the current extreme European bank crisis. The Inter-Alpha banks, the Swiss supergiants, and the city of London derivatives banks, have been playing in the "Eurodollar" and euro casinos for so long, a Glass-Steagall reorganization will virtually eliminate them all as banks. They've eliminated themselves as real banks as it is. The re-establishment of national currencies, and establishment of national banking, will make it possible to create a credit system and protect commercial banking, and organize investment into the great projects of a "Mediterranean economic miracle."

It's a life-or-death issue for Europe, *and* the U.S. Let's get it done.

SUBSCRIBE TO

EIR Executive Intelligence Review
EIR Online



EIR Online gives subscribers one of the most valuable publications for policymakers—the weekly journal that has established Lyndon LaRouche as the most authoritative economic forecaster in the world today. Through this publication and the sharp interventions of the LaRouche Movement, we are changing politics worldwide, day by day.

EIR Online

EIR Online includes the entire magazine in PDF form, plus up-to-the-minute world news.

I would like to subscribe to **EIR Online**

(e-mail address must be provided.)

- ☐ **$360** for one year
- ☐ **$180** for six months
- ☐ **$120** for four months
- ☐ **$90** for three months
- ☐ **$60** for two months

☐ Send information on receiving **EIR** by mail.

—EIR Online can be reached at:

www.larouchepub.com/eiw

e-mail: **fulfillment@larouchepub.com**

Call **1-800-278-3135** (toll-free)

Name _____

Company _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____ Country _____

Phone (_____) _____

E-mail address _____

I enclose $ _____ check or money order

Make checks payable to

EIR News Service Inc.

P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390

Please charge my ☐ MasterCard ☐ Visa

Card Number _____

Signature _____

Expiration Date _____