

Lyndon LaRouche: Educating Children For the Future

The following excerpts are from the Dec. 29, 2015 Town Hall Meeting with Lyndon LaRouche in New York City.

Question: Long story short: In my evaluating things from over the last 50 years in travel, seeing different cultures, measuring what I've learned from their interactions, the only basic thing that I see to achieve anything directly, to have an impact on the BRICS, which I was told existed from your development in concept, was to get an agenda to nationalize education. To me that is the core problem of economics and class. So, I think, my mentality, as it has been over the years, is to pursue that channel. Voting for whomever doesn't change anything because these people have their own networks, their own concepts, and this situation is creating a catastrophe throughout the world.

So to spend energy to remove an individual, to me,

EIR January 15, 2016

is not really the best strategy; the best thing is to find an agenda where nobody can say “no.” And nobody can say “no” to a balanced education that’s nationalized and makes everybody equal, and taste the same thing.

If you want to deviate, you can do that in addition to the core, but we’re falling behind because we do not have the quality of mentality to be able to run a country without people playing the ping pong game with politics.

LaRouche: That’s true, but I would question what your appreciation is of the problem. Because the point of fact is, you don’t want to have a standard educational program. And we’re talking about an educational program because the educational program is the thing that defines what people are able to understand. That is, really understand, and understand in principle.

Now, what has happened, in the course of the Twentieth Century and beyond: Remember we’re now beyond the Twentieth Century; we’re in the Twentieth Century-plus, and the Twentieth Century-plus is characterized by idiocy. So we don’t want to get into the idiocy department. But no, mankind does not understand mankind himself. There is a higher standard which must be applied.

The higher standard is defined by the fact that mankind,—people believe that their body talks for them, and it’s the mere use of the voice, of that body that defines them. Well that ain’t true. Because mankind is not something on Earth. Mankind is not intrinsically an earthling.

Now we live biologically, conveniently, in that kind of medium. But! the secret of mankind’s progress—and this is what the question is—is what are the changes in behavior that must be introduced, to enable mankind to reach the levels of achievement which mankind urgently requires? And therefore, we need to take the whole school system down, in its present form, because the school system as I experienced it, even as a child, was rot and nonsense! And the only reason I had some intelligence, was because I didn’t believe any of that garbage that I was taught to speak.

And therefore, the question is, mankind is not an earthling. Mankind’s destiny belongs to the galaxies, it belongs to the astronomical realm, away from Earth as such. And it’s the ability of mankind to see what that future of mankind is, in terms of higher systems. And therefore, what you have to do, is develop the creative

powers of humanity, not how to imitate some kind of jazz.

... OK, you’ve got a couple of cases here. You’ve got, first of all, Brunelleschi. Now, Brunelleschi’s work is probably the foundation of all modern Classical art. Now, that leads into other things. It leads into the work of Kepler. It goes beyond Kepler, and at the same time it goes into Shakespeare. Shakespeare’s greatest work was actually a humanistic view. It was not a playwright view, not a drama as such. It was much deeper. And, if you look at the whole work of Shakespeare, you find you’re reaching into something, which is much broader than any simple playwright design. This is an insight into the nature of mankind.

And you have other cases, and these cases are steps of progress, of scientific progress. And that progress is what we should actually be teaching people in schools. To become acquainted with modern history. And you start where? With Brunelleschi. Because Brunelleschi was the greatest scientist of that time.

See, you start with that. Then you go with other higher levels of people who followed him. You go on into Shakespeare, and Shakespeare very soon plays a very important role. And it’s not just as a playwright: It’s a conception of the study of the nature of man, and man’s future and destiny. Then, we go from there into the other aspects of the struggle, which must always try to go beyond what mankind has achieved so far.

But we depend largely on that, and that’s what education of children, education of students, is,—to give them an understanding of a process of history. And to be able to explain what that is, and to get people to respond, and to have insight into what these achievements really meant. And, what you’re talking about is, I think, that question. And, that question is a very important one.

We must go deeply into at least modern history, beginning with the case of Brunelleschi, who is really the first systemic scientist in modern history. And so you start with him, and what was the great period of the Renaissance. And you go into the following period of evil. And Shakespeare was living against a period of evil, in his century. And then explain that, and then you say, “What’s the lesson we, as students, or children, have to learn, to begin to understand what all of this means?”

What you’re doing is in that direction, and I think that’s precious for that reason.