

Why Parliaments and Popular Opinion Can't Solve the Global Crisis

Lyndon LaRouche's opening remarks to the cadre school of the International LaRouche Youth Movement, meeting in Copenhagen on Nov. 30, and a selection from the questions and answers.

Let's talk about two issues: one, primarily the one I addressed in my Thanksgiving Presidential address, which was published in the briefing on Friday morning,¹ that is, the parliamentary problem; and the other being the relationship of Europe and the United States to what is happening in Eurasia, especially the Eurasian Triangle developments among Russia, China, India, and the countries associated with them, in these ventures.

The End of a Cycle of History

First of all, the crucial thing for anyone to understand, right now, is that, we have come to the end of a long, ideological cycle. And I'm referring to a particular cycle—we're in many cycles; we have the post-war cycle; we have other cycles, in terms of history. But, in particular terms, about 1964, about the time the United States launched its commitment to a war in Indochina, officially, until the present, is one cycle, which has taken over Europe, . . . world relations, and so forth.

Now, this was, essentially, with a very crucial point of inflection in 1989-1991, when the Soviet power collapsed: With the collapse of the Soviet power, a new phase-change within the cycle came into existence, which now we're looking at, right away. This situation has resulted in a general breakdown of elementary human mental behavior, among the parliaments of most of the world, especially of the Americas, the U.S. Congress, and the parliaments of Europe. This is a crucial problem.

This is also a reflection of a vast mental problem, a mental breakdown, in the top 20% of income brackets, of the leading circles of Europe and the Americas. The point is, if the person next to you is in the upper 20% of income bracket (I don't think any of you are suspected of being so tainted), then you'll have a mental problem. Or, if you are otherwise not a member of the upper 20% of income brackets, but are emotionally attached to something which is part of that layer, then you are probably suffering a *very severe mental problem*: a mental

problem, which is manifest in the absolute breakdown of mental life, among the parliaments of Europe, generally speaking, and the Americas. This is also a breakdown in the leading, or most politically influential layer of the population in general. This is a breakdown in what is called "popular opinion." If your neighbor shares popular opinion, get them to the nearest psychiatrist, immediately—we have an emergency on our hands. Because of the nature of this cycle.

As I've said before, what happened was, over 1964 approximately, the post-war tendency of the so-called "Utopian tendency" of Bertrand Russell and H.G. Wells, and their followers—the so-called "world government through nuclear warfare" tendency—this took over, increasingly, with the death of Franklin Roosevelt and the inauguration of President Harry Truman. This was not, however, predominant. Two things remained: We were, in the post-war period, especially up to the middle of the 1960s, committed to economic reconstruction of the world, especially Europe, the Americas, and a few other locations. We also had a strong resistance, to going to the Roman imperial, Waffen-SS style in politics, which was coming out of a group called the Utopians, which essentially were the people who were the implementers of the policies set into motion by Russell and his type.

So, in the 1960s, a phase-shift occurred, in which we abandoned—in the United States and under Harold Wilson in Britain—abandoned the idea of being *producer* societies, whose values were based on increasing our productive powers of labor, and ameliorating life through that method; to becoming a *post-industrial, consumer* society. This was marked among the university-age youth of the '60s, of the so-called "rock-drug-sex youth counterculture."

The result is, that the people who are in top positions of power today, were people who entered adolescence or post-adolescence, during the period following the two events: That is, the combination of the missile crisis of 1962, the launching of the Indochina War, *and* widespread introduction of the rock-drug-sex youth counterculture, called the environmentalism, post-industrialism, consumerism, ecologism, and whatnot.

So, this was the culture shift. These people who came out into adolescence or adulthood, during this period, *have no rational experience, of operating as responsible persons, in a producer society*. They are essentially parasitical in their

1. "A Presidential Thanksgiving Message," *EIR*, Dec. 6, 2002.



Lyndon LaRouche told the youth audience: "In order to succeed, you have to be clear. You've got to be uncompromising, when it comes to dealing with clinical insanity of the type very prevalent today."

outlook, and think in terms of credit-card debt-management, consumption, standards of consumption, lifestyle, "how I feel," "how my neighbor feels," "what my neighbor's sex-change was," these were the dominant things that go on in that circle.

So, this is popular opinion. This is also the characteristic of the political parties of parliamentary systems, even down to little nut groups, like the Trotskyist cults. They all share this same kind of moral decadence, this intellectual decadence. And this is what the problem is with parliaments: They can not make consistent decisions, which have any competence, because the world of consumer society—that is, of imperial post-industrial society—has collapsed.

The other feature was, that with the collapse of the Soviet power system, the English-speaking imperial powers saw themselves as in a position to set up a one-world empire: This is called "globalization." This is called "free trade" in a radical form. This is typified by the introduction of NAFTA, in relations among Canada, the United States, and Mexico. This is typified by the attempt to bring the British in on an English-American system, like the NAFTA free-trade system, and so forth. This is the euro; this is the Maastricht agreements. These are all efforts to destroy the residue of the sovereign nation-state economy, a producers' form of society, in order to go to something, which is a caricature of what happened in Rome, during and following the Second Punic War: when

Rome shifted, and Italy shifted, from being largely, still, a producer society, dependent upon the production at home, such as that of the farmers, the Gracchian reforms. Then, the failure of the Gracchian reforms, the defeat of the Gracchi and the earlier successes of the Flaminian reforms, typify what this change was.

So, Rome became a parasite, with extensive use of slavery, ruling the rest of the world, and fighting wars of perpetual genocide along its borders, called the "limes" policy. What has happened, we now have that kind of policy: The collapse of the Soviet system—these lunatics decided that they can have a one-world empire, Bertrand Russell- or H.G. Wells-style, forever. And they're determined to use the supremacy in nuclear weapons, on the ground, on the sea, and in the air, to compel the entire world to submit to a world government, run by them.

The Oligarchical Faction

Now, who is "them"? This gets interesting, when you get to Denmark, because it becomes a very sensitive subject, among names like Baring. In this process, of the attempt to destroy the Renaissance's effect on Europe, Europe was divided into two general groupings, which were induced to engage in war against one another. This is typified between 1511 and 1648, by a series of religious wars, out of which emerged two major factions, which came to a rather crucial point in the 18th Century. On the one side, you have the Hapsburgs. The Hapsburgs represented the idea of a one-world empire. (They called themselves Catholics: They weren't even human, so there's a little different problem there.) On the other side, there developed a Venetian model in the North: This was the Anglo-Dutch liberal model. Now, Anglo-Dutch liberalism is nothing but a copy of ancient Venice, but a copy in different territory, and with somewhat different cultural antecedents.

But, Venice had emerged, from the fall of Charlemagne—actually from the accession to power of Otto III, as Emperor—Venice emerged as the dominant imperial, maritime power of the Mediterranean region and most of Europe, a power held by a financier-oligarchy, of the Venetian financier families. As Venice's power waned, as a state, after the Treaty of Westphalia—particularly in the last quarter of the 17th Century—power shifted significantly, with a dwindling Hapsburg power—toward an Anglo-Dutch liberalism, based upon the sea trade, the maritime trade, first from the Netherlands, and then from England, as England grew as a maritime power.

In due course, through that parent, William of Orange, and the India Companies, which he led, and the takeover of England, which consolidated this power, you had the emergence in the 18th Century, of the Anglo-Dutch liberal model, which included Copenhagen and other places in the North Sea, and so forth, which were all part of this former Hansa League, which had been taken over from the Netherlands. And this was then spread to England.



The founding meeting of the Scandinavian chapter of the International LaRouche Youth Movement on Nov. 30-Dec. 1, 2002 in Copenhagen.

England is, by nature, as attested by the existence of what is called “central banking” systems. Now, central banking systems are nothing but a consortium of private power, of financier interests—not necessarily “banking interests,” but “financier interests.” These financier interests control an institution, of central banking, which is relatively independent of government, and which is even able to dictate terms, to governments. Now, that is the liberal system. That is the Anglo-Dutch liberal system, which is what the United States was founded to avoid; even though they get an infestation of this kind of nonsense, from time to time, as we have now.

So, the result of that is, . . . European governments never really worked. Because European governments were never truly sovereign, with very rare exceptions, momentary exceptions. Because they were always conditioned, as they had been under the Lombard bankers, they had been conditioned into submission of political authority to conditionalities, imposed by what we call today “central banking” systems: financier blocs, which were able to dictate terms, including political terms, to governments. And therefore, European parliamentary systems, which had been more or less consistently based on so-called “central banking” systems, or “independent central banking” systems, are not truly sovereign governments, but are rather, a kind of peculiar partnership, in which the government is often the junior partner, and the financier interest controlling the central banking system, are the senior partners. They dictate issue of money; they dictate exchange rates; they dictate collection policies, bankruptcy

policies, so forth and so on; and investment policies. So, actually, governments in Europe, at present, are essentially toys, playthings of central banking systems, of those financier interests, which are based on the Venetian model of *imperial, maritime power by financier-oligarchical interests*.

Now, the power of Europe, the economic power of Europe: Europe’s domination of the world—and its domination by leadership, not domination by conquest—has been based on the Renaissance, on the emergence of truly sovereign nation-states, based on the principle of *truthfulness*, the Platonic principle of truthfulness, which is called “*agapē*”; it is known in English usage, as “general welfare” or “common good.” So, therefore, governments are obliged to rule, in the interest of the general welfare, the common good; and that includes their *rule over* financier and banking systems, in order to keep these systems functioning within the bounds of the interest of the general welfare and the common good.

What happened during the post-war period, with the oligarchical system rising again, after the death of Roosevelt: In the middle of the 1960s, a drive was made to rid the world of the influence of Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s Presidency. The result was, the post-industrial society, or the shift toward a consumer society, an imperial thrust, which was played out between the Soviet system and the Anglo-American system, until 1989-1991, when the Soviet system died, effectively.

At that point, the Anglo-American *Utopian* system saw itself emerging, spreading its wings—its wet wings, which

like vultures, were hanging out in the Sun to dry, before flying—and these vultures were determined to set up their Bertrand Russell-style, nuclear weapons-dominated, dominant world empire; regulating world population; conducting perpetual wars against Islamic and other populations, and so forth and so on.

So, that's the situation we face.

The System Is Collapsing

Now, we come to the point, that . . . this system, the liberal system, the Anglo-Dutch liberal system, *inherently does not work*: Because the failure to increase the *physical* productive powers, the labor per capita, results in a collapse of society. What is seen as a result of the change, especially in 1964, is that, increasingly, especially after 1971, the rate of monetary value attached to physical objects has increased; whereas the physical value produced per capita, has decreased. This system of speculation has reached the point, that it's no longer possible to maintain the system.

However, all *social* values and ordinary "success" and "lifestyle" values, within the populations, are based on the assumption, that the post-industrial, ecologist, liberal system, that is defined recently, is the way things work! Their credit-card lifestyle is based on the assumption—which is really more extensive in the United States, than in Europe—but this kind of mentality has so corrupted the population, that *neither* the parliamentary parties, *nor* the population in general—especially the upper 20% of income brackets (or those who define themselves, ideologically, as part of the upper 20%) are capable of rational thoughts, about the crises which confront us now. They're in a state of quasi-schizophrenic denial, as a mass-psychotic phenomenon of denial, which is based on the attempt to maintain *a system, that does not work*.

It's like the fellow, who's trying to—you know, he's down in the *Titanic*, and sinking. And he's sitting down there, under the bulkheads, sticking oars out in the water, to try to paddle the *Titanic* to safety. That is the spectacle, of your typical so-called "upper middle-class" mentality, through Europe and much of the United States today.

And it's for that reason that parliaments and similar institutions *tend not to work*. Because, neither popular opinion, as merely popular opinion, nor the system, works. But, they're trying *desperately*, to find solutions *within the framework* of the system. They're trying to say, "Let's cut, cut, cut! Austerity will save us! We must have more austerity. We must have more austerity! We must have more austerity!! We must have more austerity!!!" Meanwhile, the system gets worse and worse, with each dose of this poison, for some strange reason.

The Strategic Triangle

Okay. On the other hand, you have a program of survival, which began to emerge largely at my suggestion, out of the Summer and early Fall of 1998, with the collapse of the GKO bond speculation in Russia. At that point, I proposed, that



Copenhagen Schiller Institute leader Poul Rasmussen gives a class on Gauss's fundamental theorem of algebra, to the youth cadre school.

we had to put up a counterbalance, to the collapsing of the economies of Western Europe and the Americas, by building up the economies of the Eastern Eurasia. And this buildup must occur, based on a strategic agreement, among Russia, China, and India, which are quite dissimilar cultures, but, if they could agree on a common principle of cooperation, this would be a framework, within which our nations—with still different cultural antecedents—could join and work.

What you're seeing now, is that. You're seeing, as recently restated again and again from Russia, and elsewhere; you're seeing the emergence of, what I called, backed in 1998, the "Strategic Triangle." The Strategic Triangle can not work by itself. It is a component, it is a phase-space, of the global system which is *essential* for a global system which works. The immediate implication for Europe, is that—Europe is dying, Western Europe. The economies of Western Europe are dying: Germany is dying; all of Western Europe is dying, economically. The only way you can save it, is an increase in its return to conventional European export trade: which means, essentially, producing for high-technology capital-goods export, primarily. This would save Germany, which already depends upon China, as its only significant growth customer. This is essential for Italy. It's essential for all of

Europe.

Only a stable Strategic Triangle system, as a *partner* of Europe, represents a normal baseline, sufficient for a revival, of an otherwise doomed world economy. And, one would assume that the United States would—with the Americas as a whole—would cooperate and would participate in that kind of *new, international monetary system, financial system, economic system*.

So, the point is, the resistance to that, is what the problem is. But, the resistance comes, not only from the *opposition* by the parliamentary parties; *opposition* by the upper 20% of the populations, who are clinically insane, in Europe and the Americas; but also, the pure inertia of popular opinion. You have the Classical case of a true tragedy on a global scale: You have a society, which is *morally incapable of surviving*, as long as it clings to what it considers its presently adopted *values*; its presently adopted *assumptions*, axiomatic assumptions. This is tragedy: Tragedies are never caused by leaders of society. They're caused by the *lack of leadership* in society, leadership for change, for necessary change—which is what I'm doing: providing the leadership for necessary change, because, around the world, there *is* no other such leadership. Other people who are echoing what we are doing, as you see in the spread of the Strategic Triangle, which I proposed in 1998, is now a hegemonic tendency, among the leading nations of that part of Eurasia. Well, that's not exactly the lack of influence, and we're doing some good. We have influence in other parts of the world.

But, those who *resist* what I represent, represent policies of governments, and nations, which are doomed, if they continue with their present policies.

This is often the case in history. This is the true case of the fall of empires. This is the true meaning of all Classical tragedy. Don't believe any other interpretation of any Classical tragedy than the one I just gave you: They're all incompetent. And they're the babbling of fools.

These are the true elements to consider, from Europe. We must have the policies I've proposed, which are the only existing, feasible alternative, to the suicidal destruction, which is inhering in the present parliamentary systems, and in popular opinion. Especially popular opinion, deeply embedded, in those ideologically self-identified with the upper 20% of family-income brackets, in Europe, the Americas, and so forth.

These people are insane. Therefore, we have to *change* them. Now, even a few among us would say, "You have to go and *influence* them, by appealing to their existing values." That's like trying to give advice to a guy, who absolutely refuses to discuss getting out of the *Titanic*, when it's sinking. What you may have to do, is clobber the guy, put an arm-lock on him, take him up to the bridge, and throw him overboard! Otherwise, he will not possibly survive. And even that's precarious. But, that's your problem.

And, my problem is, I have to do that, despite the reluc-

tance among many of you, among us, to do what I say what must be done. Despite the fact the evidence is all in: I've been right; those who have opposed me on this, have been wrong. But, they're still clinging, out of fear, to popular opinion, and trying to ingratiate themselves with leading institutions, which are themselves morally and intellectually bankrupt. And, thus, as many cultures in the past, plunge into a tragic demise, which is what faces us unless we change things.

So, that's where we stand. So, you're in a very interesting period in history. Times have existed like this before: The empires, like Mesopotamia, have collapsed repeatedly; other empires have collapsed. We're now at the point, that the present *world* system is on the verge of an early, rapid collapse, into a generalized Dark Age of the planet—*unless we succeed*.

In order to succeed, you have to be clear. You've got to be uncompromising, when it comes to dealing with clinical insanity of the type very prevalent today. You have to recognize the problem of governments, is not that this party is not that good; or this party is not that good. The problem is, *all* the parties stink. They *all* stink! They stink for one reason: because popular opinion stinks! And the stink is elected to parliament. And the parliament spreads the stink—which is what it's elected to do! And, if the stink doesn't work, therefore the governments don't work, and the *people* find that, they too, don't work!

So, that's a very interesting situation. To me, as a person of an historical bent, it is extremely interesting. I sit back, and I'm very sad about what's happening to the human race; but I'm very happy, that, in this best of all possible worlds, as Leibniz defined it, stupidity will not prevail.

Have fun!

Dialogue

Franklin Roosevelt and The American System

Q: First I wanted to remind you about Plato, saying in a dialogue, that the worst destiny you can have, is having a leader who's less capable than yourself; and that you have to enforce the people who are more capable than yourself, to become leaders. And that's what I think we should do with you!

So, you've been devoted to the Roosevelt solution, or program. And, my question is—because after he was in office, things were corrupted again. My question is, what measures do we need to make, to ensure that this wouldn't happen again? Is there anything we can do?



President Franklin D. Roosevelt with a young lieutenant in Sicily, Italy, in December 1943. Roosevelt was indispensable, in getting the United States out of the Depression and through the war. But after the Allied breakthrough at Normandy in June 1944, his enemies moved swiftly to impose the Anglo-Dutch liberal/oligarchical model on the United States.

LaRouche: Well, that's what I keep worrying about. There's not much understanding of Roosevelt among Europeans, in general—and even Americans—because you get these things: “But, what was Roosevelt's position on this?” “What was Roosevelt's position on this?” And so forth. That's all nonsense. History is not a sequence of votes on positions. History is a process, in which certain characteristic development is morally positive, and the lack of that development is morally negative.

Now, Roosevelt inherited a destruction of the United States, which occurred under the Presidencies of Theodore Roosevelt, a very, very distant cousin—distant morally, intellectually, as well as biologically; Woodrow Wilson, who was the co-founder of the revival of the Ku Klux Klan in the United States; Calvin Coolidge, who was a complete wretch. And, so you have, from 1901, with the successful assassination of President McKinley, who was a human President, as opposed to Teddy Roosevelt, Wilson, or Coolidge. You had in 1929, a collapse of the international monetary system, in something between a cyclical and systemic collapse—it had the qualities of both: It was cyclical in form, but it was systemic in the sense, that what had happened leading into World War I and its aftermath, essentially Versailles, had introduced a *systemic* feature of doom, into the international monetary-financial economic system.

So, Roosevelt came to power, in 1932-33, in the election of 1932, on the basis of a Hoover, who had refused, like many of today's politicians, to face—. Hoover knew what the reality was. But Hoover refused to face it, and tried to adapt to pre-

vailing opinion of his party and institutions. It wasn't because he was stupid; it was because he was *morally weak*, and didn't have the ability to step over his predecessors.

Roosevelt did.

Failure of the Anglo-Dutch Model

Now, Roosevelt was a man, who had deeply embedded in him, the legacy of the American Revolution, which is distinctly American, and it's not European. The ideas were European. But there's nothing in the American Revolution, which was a copy or reflection of European political government institutions, and many Europeans don't understand that. They don't understand that the European model—put aside the Hapsburg model, which is obviously garbage; the Spanish and Austrian Hapsburgs: Forget them. But, look at the model which came to the fore in Europe, over successive periods, the Anglo-Dutch liberal model, which emerged successfully, triumphantly, in the aftermath of the Treaty of Westphalia.

This was inherently a failure, from the beginning, for reasons which I gave in my presentation, just shortly before, here. The United States was founded on a rejection of the Anglo-Dutch liberal model. Now, the *idea* of the American Revolution came from Leibniz, or came through Leibniz, and reflected the 15th-Century Renaissance. It did reflect the influence of Mazarin, the influence in forming the Treaty of Westphalia, in 1648; these things were reflected. But the governmental model of Europe, the disintegration of the Hapsburg system, over the century or so, emerged as triumphant, as the Anglo-Dutch liberal model—which Denmark and Swe-

den know very well. That's what you've been subjected to—your grandparents' and great-grandparents' lives, and so forth—ever since Baring.

So, we were distinct. And we were distinct in the sense, that we did not believe, did not accept the idea of a financier-oligarchical rule. And, we were opposed to setting up what we would call today, the equivalent of an independent central banking system. We believed that the government had to have the authority, the power, and responsibility, to shape financial, monetary, and economic policy, to conform to the requirements of the principle of the general welfare. And, we believed that we had to *promote* the creative impulses of the individual, the cognitive impulses of the individual, to that end. We had to provide the basic economic infrastructure; we had to promote the individual and his freedom, to make the innovations, which would make the system work. That was our system.

So, Europeans *do not* know that system. Some don't as a matter of information, as a matter of education. But, in terms of the parties, in terms of the policies, *they don't know it*. And therefore, they're very confused about this kind of thing. And therefore, their judgment on Roosevelt is often mistaken, because their conception of history is completely absurd. It's contrary to actual reality: because they try to impose an arbitrary model, of opinions, and do's and don't's, and of specific issues, on history, rather than understanding history as a process of development.

FDR's Fight for the General Welfare

Roosevelt did understand it as a process of development. And he unleashed a series of revolutionary changes, to *save* the U.S. economy, under the guidance of principles which would restore it, to its original intention, original Constitutional intention: the principle of the general welfare. All of the fights, that Roosevelt had, *in* the United States, against his *internal* opponents, and his fights with Churchill up to the last moment of his life, were based on that single issue: the general welfare. His opponents *inside* the United States, which are the so-called "free traders"—or we used to call them the "free traitors"; not "traders," "traitors"—always expressed that.

Now, Roosevelt's power was based partly upon the support he got. But, also, was conditional, because the population in general was still rotten. Generations of the population in the 20th Century, prior to his Presidency, had been corrupted, turned rotten, by what had happened inside the United States. And therefore, the reason for Roosevelt's power, in part lay in the fact that *he was saving the nation*, from a catastrophe, which was the experience of the people; that the opposition to him was there: in the people, in popular opinion, as well as in certain financier circles.

Now, Roosevelt was indispensable, in getting the United States out of the Depression, and getting it through the war. But, after June 1944, when the Anglo-American breakthrough, in Normandy, indicated the final defeat of Nazi Ger-

many was now inevitable; at that point, in the Summer of 1944, Roosevelt's enemies moved to install a pig as the Vice Presidential nominee, in the hope that Roosevelt would die soon, and their pig would become President. That pig was Harry Truman. And, that is the essential pivot in the history of the United States after Roosevelt.

So therefore, to understand Roosevelt, you have to understand him as representing a certain body of *principle*, not a set of issues, but a principle: The principle was to restore the American System, and to free the world from the grip of the imperial maritime power of Anglo-Dutch liberalism. So, if you look at the thing as a process, in those terms, and realize that Roosevelt did *not* have a population which was intellectually developed to the point that it heeded commitment to its own best interest; but that the American population was a *fickle* population, which loved Roosevelt when he saved them from poverty and defeat; and when he saved the world from Hitler: They loved him for that. But the minute Hitler was doomed, they said, "Get rid of this guy!" And, that's what happened.

And, it took a generation, to get that legacy of Roosevelt out of the system, and the American people. Until Kennedy's assassination, the missile crisis, and the launching of the Indochina War, the American people were still enough committed to the Roosevelt legacy, they would not tolerate fascism. But, *with* the missile crisis, *with* the assassination of Kennedy, *with* the launching of the war, the American people became pigs, opportunist pigs. And, their children were educated to be pigs. And the rock-drug-sex youth counterculture, as it was reflected, for example, by environmentalism, is a reflection of the moral degeneracy, which spread around the world, over the past 35 years.

And that's the way to understand Roosevelt.

Going Beyond Roosevelt's Idea

So, what am I doing? Today, I know this—what I just said to you. Okay. Am I going to fail, as Roosevelt, in one sense, failed? That's my concern, that I shall not fail. I can not pre-determine what the result will be. But I can pre-determine what *I will do* about shaping the result. And therefore, you will see, in all my writings, I do something that Roosevelt never did: Roosevelt expressed ideas, but he was not a *man of ideas*. He was a man who acted on ideas, who had ideas, who developed his understanding to *use* them, with good executive power, with leadership capability. But, he was not a *creator of ideas*. He was not a scientific discoverer, as I am.

So, I know everything Roosevelt knew, in terms of how to govern and how to lead. But, I, also, am a creative personality, a scientific discoverer. And recognize, that you must have, as Plato emphasized, with the idea of the philosopher-king, that a world in crisis needs the leadership of a philosopher-king, not merely a good President, under the present circumstances. And my job is to provide that necessary quality of leadership, of a philosopher-king.