etc., who ended up with mortgage debts much bigger than the houses they were encouraged to buy were ever worth. That is forty percent of homeowners of a certain age group in south east England.

Results like this don’t feature too prominently in The Downing Street Years. But what does is an abhorrence of the interrelated concepts on which Western society, in the form of the nation state, has been based since the Golden Renaissance, namely, productive labor and work. What would you expect from a kept Lady?

The abhorrence comes out like this: “public money was poured in, but two problems proved insoluble: over-capacity and union resistance to the closure of uneconomic pits.” This is from her introductory remarks, laying the groundwork for the showdown with the miners’ union in 1984-85, and can be found in the section “Mr. Scargill’s Insurrection” on p. 340. Thatcher can’t separate economy and money, in any context. They still have official unemployment of over three million, more than ten percent of their workforce, as a result of what she did.

She doesn’t know anything about wealth creation. Nor, for the most part, do her countrymen. Although they do specialize in turning wealth created by others into monetized loot.

Think of some of the products most closely identified with the British, what their manufacturing sector produces, or used to produce. They prefer luxury-type goods, made in a relatively labor intensive way, like the “hand-made Rolls Royce,” out of absurdly expensive materials, and aimed at the select few. The Concorde is a good example. A terrific plane, beautiful to see and hear, but completely uneconomic as a proposition, dead before it entered commercial service, because the Boeing 747 could carry three times the passengers at less than half the cost.

Quality products, you see, command a higher price. Higher prices mean greater revenues per unit of output, which translates into greater profits, and greater dividends for shareholders. And, economy of scale? Achieved by applying technology to cheapen the cost of production, and improve quality?

That’s why the Rolls Royce corporation, as a whole, was nationalized and broken up. And why Jaguar is now part of the Ford Motor Company. And why the combination of companies now called British Aerospace, haven’t made a full-size commercial airliner since the Concorde.

The British, you see, make “things”; they don’t understand economy. (Like the wreckage they made of the Channel tunnel, or the crazy “tilt-train.”) Not capital improvements, investments in new technology to upgrade labor skills, and enhance general productivity, but production of “things,” with an eye to the bottom line. Money out against revenue in.

So, in her view, they had to stop wasting “public money” on unviable industries, and force those industries to stand on their own feet. Now, they either don’t have them any more, or if they do, they’re in such attenuated shape, they’re of no use to anyone.

In large measure this book is an account of battles fought on behalf of the deconstruction of Britain. How I smashed the steel industry and the steel workers union, how I smashed the auto industry and the engineering union, how I smashed the miners and the mine workers union.

Thatcher, however, wouldn’t have been possible without her counter-parties in the British Labour Party and Trade Union movement, who, like her, didn’t understand economy either.

What was lost in the wash was the existence of a country, which saw its institutions of government, at all levels, taken apart, its national political life reduced to a joke, and effective political power passed into the hands of the faceless crew called the “market.”

And now she steps forward to say “I did it,” me, Attila the Hen!

—Christopher White

Words of an Anti-Romantic Composer

Mr. Eigeldinger has limited the main text of his book, originally published in French in 1971, to direct quotations from Chopin’s students and contemporaries. Those familiar with Lyndon LaRouche’s breakthroughs in musical science, as elaborated in the Schiller Institute’s Manual on Tuning and Registration, will find tremendous riches in them.

However, Mr. Eideldinger’s greatest weakness is revealed in his typical musicologist’s ideology of a “Romantic Period,” and subsequent “Modern Period.” In fact, there never was a “Romantic Period.” There was instead a battle between those who sought to uphold the Classical tradition of Bach, Mozart, and Beethoven, led by Schumann, Mendelssohn, Chopin, and Brahms; and the “Romantics” who sought to destroy it, led by Liszt, Wagner, and Berlioz.

Thus, the great promise of the book’s cover (a cartoon of Chopin lecturing a student: “That’s the style of playing of Liszt [sic]; one must never play that way when accompanying the voice!”), is never delivered.

Chopin: Pianist and Teacher, As Seen by His Pupils

by Jean-Jacques Eigeldinger

Cambridge University Press, New York, 1986

324 pages, hardbound, $89.95; paperbound, $24.95

Much of the book is devoted to biographies of the students, and their utilization of Chopin’s unorthodox fingerings for his own pieces, that are of great, but specialized interest to pianists. Although the quotations are organized
according to subject matter, we will proceed according to the different levels of ideas presented.

Technique and Musical Ideas as One

People have tried out all kinds of methods of learning to play the piano, methods that are tedious and useless and have nothing to do with the study of the instrument. It’s like learning for example, to walk on one’s hands in order to go for a stroll. . . . It doesn’t teach us how to play the music itself. . . . It’s an abstract difficulty, a new genre of acrobatics.

—Frederic Chopin, Projet de Méthode

Chopin forbade his students to practice more than three hours per day, and even then recommended they stop and read a book if ever they found themselves not thinking. Scales were to be performed slowly, emphasizing production of a beautiful singing tone rather than velocity.

Chopin strove to eliminate all stiffness and tension, to obtain a quality he termed “souplesse” in not only the hand and wrist, but “right to the tips of the toes.”

Chopin himself wrote, in his unfinished Projet de Méthode: “For a long time we have been acting against nature by training our fingers to be all equally powerful. As each finger is differently formed, it’s better not to attempt to destroy the particular charm of each one’s touch but on the contrary to develop it.”

Bel Canto Vocalization of Poetry

Under his fingers each musical phrase sounded like song, and with such clarity that each note took the meaning of a syllable, each bar that of a word, each phrase that of a thought.

—Karol Mikuli, pupil of Chopin

All the theory which Chopin taught to his pupils rested on this analogy between music and language. . . . In a musical phrase of something like eight measures the end of the eighth will generally mark the termination of the thought, that which, in language written or spoken, we should indicate by a full point; here we should make a slight pause and lower the voice. The secondary divisions of this phrase of eight measures . . . after each two or four measures, require shorter pauses . . . commas or semi-colons.

—Jan Kleczynski, pupil of Chopin

Chopin himself shows the same insight into the origin of poetry as Lyndon LaRouche, and the poet Friedrich Schiller: “Thought is expressed through sounds. The indeterminate language of men is sound. Word is born of sound—sound before word.” (from Projet de Méthode)

Chopin’s usually banalized concept of rubato (“robbed time”) as the left hand keeping strict time while the right hand may lengthen or shorten notes is clarified by himself: “The left hand is the conductor, it must not relent or bend.”

Jan Kleczynski reports that Chopin’s ideas on declamation were grounded on rules that guide vocalists, and that he exhorted his students to hear specific bel canto singers singing specific works. He constantly cited the tenor, Rubini, as a model for pianistic declamation and prized his autograph copy of Bellini’s cavatina “Casta Diva.”

Agapê, Not Eros

A higher level of idea exists which is nowhere organized as a conscious object of thought by the author, but can be found in the quotations.

Much is made of Chopin’s supposed “femininity.” Even his student Wilhelm von Lentz fell into this trap, when he claimed that Chopin’s playing of Beethoven’s Sonata, Op. 26 was a total revelation, and beautiful, but “feminine, where Beethoven is always a man.”

While Chopin is not the equal of Beethoven, this supposed dichotomy of feminine-masculine is non-existent (the ludicrous Hollywood movie, “A Song To Remember” went so far as to claim that “manly” Polonaises reflect Chopin the Polish revolutionary, and the “feminine” Nocturnes, the admittedly unfortunate influence of Georges Sands). It simply doesn’t work that way, and the book’s treatment of Chopin’s patriotism as something incidental, rather than essential, betrays the Romantic prejudice of locating eros as the wellspring of creativity.

Scientific breakthroughs in intelligible musical ideas are the source of the true agapic emotion, not the summoning of soap-opera style “deep feelings” by the performer or composer. On this score, Chopin is in a different universe than Liszt.

—Fred Haight