

---

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

---

## End IMF System, Or Live Through a New Dark Age

*These are Lyndon LaRouche's opening remarks to the seminar "Mexico-Brazil-Argentina: Hour of Integration; March Toward a New Bretton Woods," held in Guadalajara, Mexico on Aug. 22-23.*

To understand the situation in the world today, go back, in one sense, to 20 years ago, when the great crisis, the first great crisis in the relations between the United States and the other states of the Americas erupted with the Malvinas War, and the subsequent crushing of Mexico, in the period beginning August of that year.

Now, to understand the situation, then and now, to understand the significance of what happened 20 years ago, look at the relationships between the United States and the other states of the Americas, especially Mexico, over the previous two centuries, approximately: The United States was the first republic, of a modern form, established in Europe following the great period of religious wars, from 1511 to 1648. The United States was not founded by indigenous people, in a sense. It was founded by leaders from Europe, who saw in the North Americans, and especially in English-speaking North America, the opportunity—a unique opportunity—to establish a true republic, based on the principles of *agapē*, as it's called in Greek, or the principles of the "common good."

We were successful in the United States. But then, the troubles began: With the Bastille affair in France on July 14, 1789, the hope that the great power of France would, itself, conduct a reform, consistent with the principles of the American Revolution, was lost. The defeat of the great Bailly and Lafayette, in their effort at a constitutional reform, led to the opening of a period of chaos in France, which led to the first modern fascist dictatorship: that of Napoleon Bonaparte—first as First Consul, and later as Emperor.



*The Guadalajara Mexico-Brazil-Argentina conference marked the 20th anniversary of circulation of Lyndon LaRouche's famous memo to Mexico and the continent, Operation Juárez, written after meeting with then-President José López Portillo. It was the high point of a fight for debt moratorium and infrastructure development; then lost; now revived as the fight for a New Bretton Woods. (Shown is the destruction of the British destroyer HMS Sheffield during the Malvinas War.)*

## The United States and the Americas

At the conclusion of the Napoleonic Wars, the aspirations of Europeans, such as the German reformers, the Prussian reformers, for establishing republics in Europe, were lost. All of Europe was dominated by a pair of rival, but allied powers: the British monarchy and the Hapsburgs. They both hated each other; they both used each other. And both were determined to destroy the United States, and prevent the eruption of anything in the Americas, or even in Europe, itself, which would reflect the success of the American republic.

Over the period since that time, the fate of all of the states of the Americas has depended upon their relationship with the big brother in the Americas—the United States—or what became the big brother. Unfortunately, following the Napoleonic Wars, with the British puppet, the Bourbon Restoration monarchy in France, with the Holy Alliance under Metternich's leadership, and with the British monarchy, under the leadership of people like Jeremy Bentham, and later, Lord Palmerston, the United States was isolated in the world, and

threatened with extinction. A similar fate befell the states of Central and South America, in their aspirations for true republics in those parts of the world.

That changed, with the victory of Abraham Lincoln, Abraham Lincoln's government, in the Civil War within the United States. During this period, prior to the Civil War, the European powers, the Spanish monarchy, which was a slave-trading British puppet, the Hapsburgs' interests in general throughout Europe, the British and a fascist ruler, Napoleon III, the Emperor of France, combined forces to invade and crush Mexico, crushing the legitimate President of Mexico, Benito Juárez. At the close of that period, after the fascist tyranny of Maximilian, the Emperor Maximilian, who was essentially a Hapsburg puppet, a British puppet, or abandoned at that time by the British who had given up the cause; the French who were kicked out of the Americas by the United States at the end of the U.S. Civil War; and the Spanish, who were no longer significant, the United States expelled the British, and Juárez, after a series of events, reestablished the Republic of Mexico.

Since that time, the ebb and flow within the United States, has determined U.S. relations with Mexico. They were better under Franklin Roosevelt; terrible under his predecessor, Theodore Roosevelt; in the post-Roosevelt period, immediately, up through the middle of the 1950s, it was better, as the Rio Treaty suggested. But then came 1982: A new monetary system had been put into place, in 1971. Actually, a literally fascist tendency in the United States, of sympathizers of the former Confederacy, around the Nixon Administration, was in power. They were determined to eliminate all traces of, not only the Franklin Roosevelt legacy, but the legacy of Lincoln and all other great founding figures of the United States.

## The Malvinas War and 'Operation Juárez'

Mexico began to feel the pressure. In 1982, at the point that the Brzezinski Administration—the Brzezinski who actually controlled the Carter Administration, who dictated most of his policies, including those toward Mexico—Mexico came under tremendous pressure, as did Argentina, and Brazil, and other states. The determination was, then, to destroy the independence of all of the states of Central and South America. That was the intention; I knew it.

I was involved, at the point, in mobilizing a defense of Argentina, against British imperialism, in the case of the so-called "Malvinas War." Unfortunately, even though many people in the Reagan Administration, who were friendly to me, were sympathetic to my defense of the Rio Treaty, defense of Argentina under the title of the Rio Treaty, Caspar Weinberger and others in the administration managed to push full U.S. support of the British toward the crushing of Argentina in the Malvinas War.

In that period, I met briefly with President López Portillo, in his office, and we discussed the matter. And he asked me:

What is the fate of Mexico, in this situation? And I said, “Well, the intention in Washington and New York, is to crush you, with a blow to come down no later than September of this year.” And from that discussion, and discussion with others in the Americas, there came my determination to set forth a policy, as an economist, which would be adequate to deal with the crisis, which was then, at that time, coming down on all of the states of the Americas: Mexico, Brazil, and Argentina, foremost.

For a brief period of time, my proposal, which was called *Operation Juárez*, seemed to hold the line, for a while. But then, under tremendous pressure from U.S. and other forces, the President of Brazil and the government of Argentina abandoned Mexico and President López Portillo to their own fate. Under these circumstances, Mexico was forced to capitulate, in large degree. However, in the meantime, President López Portillo had taken measures, together with his supporters in Mexico, to try to make reforms, which would have worked. My proposal, *Operation Juárez*, would have provided the framework, in which a united group of the states of Central and South America, would have been able to defend themselves, and also to win the United States government to cooperation with them.

Unfortunately, that did not occur. Henry Kissinger went to Mexico in October, for example; other pressures came down; U.S. State Department officials, from that point on, said, “This guy LaRouche will never be allowed in Mexico, again.” I was considered too dangerous to be turned loose. So, that’s what it was.

Now, look at the situation from that vantage point, today. We are now in the tail-end of a 1966-2002 international monetary system. This started about the period of the U.S. war in Indochina. It was consolidated in the first level, by Nixon’s destruction of the old Bretton Woods system on Aug. 15, 1971, replacing a sound, fixed-exchange-rate system by a floating-exchange-rate system. This particular reform, by Nixon, of the international monetary system, is the principal cause, of all of the economic and financial ruin, which has struck Central and South America, from that time to the present. And, many other parts of the world, as well.

That system is now finished. The present world financial-monetary system is dying, and could not be saved in its present form. The only alternative before us, is the alternative to absolute chaos and uncalculable wars, and riots and revolutions—the only alternative is to return to a kind of system, which is equitable for all nations, and which echoes all the best features of the reforms made by Franklin Roosevelt, and the reforms embodied in the 1946-1964 phase of the International Monetary Fund. That will work.

### **More Than New Financial System Needed**

That will not, however, work by itself. A financial-monetary system is merely a framework, within which actual economic policy operates, politically. Therefore, other things are

needed, as well as simply going back to a gold-reserve-based, fixed-exchange-rate, protectionist system, away from the so-called “wildly free-market system,” that is disintegrating today.

All nations have to face that fact. *There is no possible way, under which the present IMF system, can continue to exist.* The likelihood is, that unless we eliminate that system by a reform, made by an influential group of nation-states, that this planet will be plunged into war and chaos, resembling the condition of Europe, during the 14th Century, following the collapse of the Lombard banking system. So, we *must* make that reform. We must find the political forces, which have the insight and the courage, as representative of nations, *to meet as nations*; and to institute that reform, *immediately*, on an emergency basis.

Now, what I proposed in *Operation Juárez* has several implications, especially when we’re talking about the relationship between the United States and Mexico, and the other states of the Americas. Now, as I said, the problem of both Mexico and the United States, during the early part of the 19th Century—and later on, too; but, during that period, up to Lincoln’s victory—was that European forces, *hateful* of the very idea of a true republic, were determined to destroy the United States. These were the slave-holding interests: the British monarchy and the Spanish monarchy puppet, who were the chief slave-traders, sending slaves into the United States, during this period. The Hapsburg interests in general, who were determined to destroy the United States, and to destroy any similar influence, from a pro-*latifundista* standpoint, in the Americas. And also other forces. So, the Civil War, in the United States, was run with Napoleonic influences—the Napoleonic group, like Barras and so forth, were very influential in the forming of the Confederacy. The slaveholder faction, which was tied to international finance, in New York, in London, and elsewhere, were part of the plan to *destroy* the United States, and to crush the Americas, as filibusters and so forth had attempted to do earlier.

So, the situation in 1859 to 1865 was, that Mexico was crushed, by the intervention of the combined forces of Britain, France, and Spain, and put under the fascist dictatorship of Maximilian and the *latifundista* interest that was rallied to his support, inside Mexico. Mexico, while it fought against this occupation, was in danger of being totally crushed, by the combination, particularly, of French occupying troops and Maximilian’s fascist-like dictatorship—a tradition which still exists, of course; we know it today.

It was at the conclusion of the Civil War, the victory of the United States over the Confederacy, that the United States emerged as the greatest military land power in the world, and an emerging naval power. With that power, the United States *ordered* the French out of Mexico, and they left. Maximilian *refused to leave*, and conducted an evil slaughter. And he died as a result. And Mexico got its freedom back, under Benito Juárez.

## The Monroe Doctrine

Thus, for me, when I labelled my report in 1982, *Operation Juárez*, I was referring, not merely to some memorable event in the past, but a question of policy, of relations among the states of the Americas. As John Quincy Adams defined it, in his draft, issued as the Monroe Doctrine of President Monroe in 1823, the interests and policy of the United States, is to have the states of the Americas, free, free republics, forming together a community of respectively perfectly sovereign nation-states, with a common interest. In the case of the *Operation Juárez* I referred to, that of Lincoln and his successors after his assassination; this is John Quincy Adams' policy; it's *my* policy; it should be the policy of the United States. The United States, as the leading power in the hemisphere, must assume the role of a leading force *to guarantee* the perfect sovereignty of each state of the Americas, as a sovereign state; and, to cooperate in ways which will foster the development of all of these states.

That was my objective with *Operation Juárez*, where I set forth a design, for a regional monetary system, within the Americas—North and South—especially for Central and South America, but with U.S. cooperation, under which we could set up a new monetary arrangement, new financial arrangements, under which the development of these states could continue. And, under which the kind of reforms, which President López Portillo attempted in the period of August through October of 1982, would prosper.

We've now come to a similar situation—a worse situation. I can assure you, that within the coming period, a short time ahead, this present international monetary-financial system *will die*. It will either be replaced, by a reform, in the direction of the old Bretton Woods system; or else, the nations will begin to die.

At this moment, the sovereignty of no state of Central and South America is secure. There's not a single nation, even one as powerful as Brazil or Mexico, which could *resist* the crushing force which is being unleashed by this condition. Only to the extent, that we can mobilize a general monetary reform, away from the present IMF system, to one of the type which I specified in *Operation Juárez*, can that occur. And, for the states of Central and South America, the only hope at the moment, for a rational solution, without a period of great chaos, is that the United States would be induced, in its *own interest*, to support that policy, as I tried to get the Reagan Administration, with whom I had friendly relations on certain strategic matters back in 1982, as it should have done then.

## A Phase-Change in the United States

There is no hope, as we know, for the freedom of the states of the Americas now, from the Rio Grande south, without a change in the policy of the United States. I am working to bring about that policy. I believe we can win. During the past two months, there's been a phase-change, in the thinking of the people of the United States and the institutions of the United States. The possibility of victory exists, as it existed

for Lincoln, in the period of the Civil War in the United States. *Only if we can win that fight*, will we have the correlation of forces, to give the Americas as a whole, the justice which they are presently being denied.

And thus, the tradition of Lincoln's implicit alliance, with Benito Juárez, and the struggle for the development of a true Mexican Republic, is the precedent to which we must turn today. The same is true for our relations with Brazil; for rescuing Argentina from chaos; for rescuing the nations of the Caribbean, generally. Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Paraguay, Uruguay, Chile, are all presently in danger of being crushed. We must defend them. We must mobilize the United States behind that policy: the policy of John Quincy Adams, the policy of President Abraham Lincoln, and the policy of the implicit alliance between Benito Juárez and President Lincoln and his government, at that time.

Thank you.

## Dialogue With Mexico's Constituency Activists

*The open discussion with LaRouche, following his remarks, involved questions posed by active constituency organizers, of great urgency for an entire continent in grave economic breakdown crisis. The dialogue was moderated by Marivilia Carrasco, president of the Ibero-American Solidarity Movement in Mexico.*

### 'The Debt Must Suffer, Not the People'

**Carrasco:** We'd like to take . . . questions.

**Q:** Good afternoon, sir. I am a housewife, and the mother of eight children. My struggle is for my children's patrimony. We have the problem of unpaid debt. What is the solution for me and other families with these problems? What solution would you suggest to put an end to this problem of these interest payments, which are so usurious that they never end, there seems to be solution? What do you advise? This reform which you are proposing, would be the solution to put an end to the majority of these problems? I would like to join this reform effort and continue to struggle for the well-being of many families, which are suffering here in Mexico. Thank you.

**LaRouche:** Well, first of all you have to understand that *the entire, present world monetary-financial system*, as a system, is bankrupt. We must understand that the financial systems of Europe are bankrupt; that the financial systems and leading banks of the United States are bankrupt; that the United States would be bankrupt, if it were not a nation-state with certain, special constitutional authorities, which only a republic has. The Americas are bankrupt. But the world as a whole, with a few, spotty exceptions here or there, is *all, in all parts, financially bankrupt*. Japan is bankrupt. And so forth



*Behind the banner reading "Integration Now!" are some of the speakers (left to right): Oscar Preciado, Jalisco state head of the CROC grouping of the Institutional Revolutionary Party; Adm. Sergio Tasso Vázquez de Aquino (ret.) of Brazil; Argentina's Col. Adrián Romero Mundani; João Pereira de Rosa of Brazil's Association of Superior War College Graduates; and Brazil's MSIA leader Lorenzo Carrasco.*

and so on.

Now therefore, what we have to do in a situation like this: There is no simple, mechanical reform, within the framework of the present monetary-financial system, which will work.

I'll give an example of what I mean by that: In middle period of the 14th Century in Europe, all of Europe had been looted by a financial system, called the Lombard bankers, a syndicate, typified by the House of Bardi and Peruzzi. These bankers had engaged in "loan-sharking" (as we would call it) throughout Europe. At a certain point, the King of England said, "We can no longer pay this debt"; and said the debt was usurious, and therefore, illegal, under Christian law. At that point, the whole system collapsed. Now, during that period, leading up to the collapse, and following it, the option was, either to write off the illegitimate, usurious debt, or to destroy the people of Europe. At that point, the debt-holders prevailed, politically. Europe was forced to submit to the collection of debts they could not pay. As a result of that, *one-third of the population of Europe was destroyed, murdered*, in a period of about less than half a century.

Today, we face a similar situation: We have the choice, now, of trying to collect on the outstanding debts, including the debts held against the nations of Central and South America, or we're going to see, as is clearly seen in the case of Argentina at this moment—and is threatened for Brazil; and is threatened throughout the region—we're going to see a *holocaust of death*, from economic and related causes, matching that that struck Europe in the 14th Century. *No nation-state, presently existing, can survive, if it tries to keep paying this debt!* It can't.

So therefore, under law, which is essentially the law of Christian civilization, the principle of the common good—or called in Greek "*agapē*"; or also called "the general welfare"

principle, which is the distinction of modern European culture, a state based on the principle of the "general welfare," as the U.S. Constitution specifies: In such a condition, when paper debt threatens the lives, and the general welfare, and the common good of people and of their nations, *the debt must suffer, not the people!*

This debt was created artificially, by usury, which technically is morally unlawful, which is therefore, lawfully *a crime*. The present system, established under the floating-exchange-rate system is, under Christian law, *is immoral*. *It's a crime against humanity, like mass murder*, and, if continued, *will result in mass murder*. Therefore, sovereign governments, which consider themselves accountable to the present generations, *and their posterity*, must act to put the debt into bankruptcy reorganization, in the same way, that we put an independent financial firm or corporation into bankruptcy reorganization.

We must save the productive forces. We must protect the people. We must protect the sovereignty of the nation. And therefore, the debt will have to suffer, under those conditions. If we do not have the courage to do that, *there is no hope for civilization, globally*. Under the present conditions, of spreading old and new epidemics, there is no part of this planet, which could survive, under those kinds of conditions, which this bankruptcy requires; unless there's a reorganization of the financial system.

That's what we must do. And that is the thing that tests the nerve of governments: Do they have the courage, to combine with other governments, to force this system to go through bankruptcy reorganization? Or will they sit back and watch the mass murder of their people, and the extinction of their nation, in the most horrible way?

The solution is fairly obvious. And, let me just indicate,

because other questions asked by others will probably follow the same direction, and therefore, in answering this question, I'll cover that area.

There are several things we must do: First of all, the governments or leading governments of the world, or some group of leading governments of the world, must say (as is implicitly being said, in a way, in Italy, Germany, and elsewhere right now): We must put this system through bankruptcy reorganization. We must break the present supranational controls over nation-states, by the financial oligarchy. We must create a *new* monetary system, a new financial system, with many of the best features of the previous monetary system, that of 1946-1964; which, with all its injustices, was nonetheless, a *workable* economic system. That means, that we must take certain practical measures, in addition to a protectionist system—no more free trade; protectionism, but rational protectionism, not chaotic protectionism. It means a fixed-exchange-rate system, without which, you can not make long-term loans at low prices, to rebuild economies. It means we will probably have to resort to a gold-reserve system, with gold prices, perhaps, of \$800 to \$1,000 per ounce right now.

We must then take certain sets of economic measures, as such, physical economic measures: Since we have destroyed much of the agriculture and industry, that many countries, such as Mexico, have suffered this kind of loss, we must now rebuild, starting with the emphasis on basic economic infrastructure: public transportation systems; railway systems; the air-traffic system must be defended, as in the United States, where the rail system and the air-traffic system are both being threatened, *right now*. We must also maintain our ports, part of the transportation system without which we can't function. We must develop more sources of power, electrical power in particular. We must develop large-scale water-development projects, as in the case of Mexico. Mexican development depends upon moving large masses of water from the south, along coastal canals to the northern part of Mexico, such as Sonora, where the potentiality, within a generation, of a large increase in food production, more efficiently, is possible. We must improve public health systems. We must protect the health of the population as a whole, as well as the individual person. We must develop an educational system, designed for progress. We must foster the development of entrepreneurship, in agriculture, small employers in manufacturing and special services. We must foster scientific and technological progress in general.

With these kinds of measures of the type that Franklin Roosevelt did in the United States, over the period 1933 to 1945, we can survive. We can succeed. We can promise future generations the chance they deserve. But we must cooperate in doing it.

So, that's the general nature of the thing. Large-scale infrastructure in the form of public works. Use protectionist measures to foster agricultural development and progress, and to foster the development of entrepreneurs, in manufacturing and other categories. And that way, we build the economy,

using the infrastructure development on a large scale, as the *driver* to stimulate mass employment, to absorb the unemployed, and to lay the basis for prosperity in the internal economy, on which the private sector depends.

Those are the kinds of measures we have to take. If we have the courage to recognize we must put the world through bankruptcy; if we can bring nations together in cooperation around that idea; enforce the bankruptcy in a rational way; establish a new, stable monetary and financial system; let government organize large-scale infrastructure projects, of the type which are urgently needed in Mexico, as elsewhere; and move quickly to try to use the stimulus of investment in infrastructure to build the foundations for investment and success in agriculture, manufacturing, and so forth, of entrepreneurs: That's that we must do.

If we have the courage to cooperate in doing that, we can win, and we can survive.

### What It Means To Be a Nation's President

**Q:** Good afternoon. I would like to ask your point of view regarding President Fox's economic policy, and concretely: What is your forecast, what will be the result at the end of Mr. Fox's six-year term?

**LaRouche:** You have to get him through six years in government!

The problem is, there's no way in which the present policies, which were largely enforced upon Mexico from the United States and others, can succeed. This is not a matter of opinion. This is a plain matter of fact: When an enemy force is invading your country, you must take that into account. And the present policies of the international monetary-financial system, as radiated from the United States, are foolish policies which can destroy Mexico. Therefore, they have to change.

Now, the President of a republic, such as Mexico, is not the embodiment of a contract that he signs, to support certain kinds of policies. He is the President of a republic. He is the chief magistrate of a people; his job is to be the key figure, in the introduction and implementation of the policies which the country requires. He is not wedded necessarily to any earlier contract, on his policy. He is free to *abandon* policies, if conditions require him to do so. And, the reason you need a chief executive of a republic, is for precisely that reason. A parliamentary system, as such, *can not do that*. A parliamentary system can *shape* the environment; can implement the laws, which are needed for the country to function. But the chief executive officer of a republic, has the responsibility *to act as the protector of the nation*. He is not required to commit himself to *any previously adopted policy*. He must act for the interest, the general welfare, of his republic, of the nation. He must take into account the welfare of nations, which are his partners.

So, the question is: Will the influential people in Mexico, working with their President, be able to bring about those modifications of policy-commitments, which are necessary

## 'New America Is Possible'

*Ex-Col. Mohamed Alí Seineldín, a political prisoner in Argentina, addressed the conference by telephone. His remarks have been translated from Spanish.*

My dearest brothers from the great Latin American Fatherland, Marivilia Carrasco, Adm. Sergio Tasso de Aquino, Adauro Rocchetto, Lorenzo Carrasco, and all of my other beloved friends, present at, or absent from, this honorable assembly: Ex-Col. Mohamed Alí Seineldín speaks to you from the Campo de Mayo military prison.

Today, my heart once again beats intensely for this gathering, and for the magnificent possibility [it represents]. Each time you come together to try to uphold our America, hope blossoms for the Possible America, the dream made mission by the Ibero-American Solidarity Movement, guided by the strategic conception of the worthy gentleman and patriarch of humanity, Dr. Lyndon LaRouche. Today [that hope] is a reality, as it forcefully emerges from the ruins of a devastated land.

I suggest [for consideration] . . . the projects of [José de] San Martín and [Simón] Bolívar, regrettably lost during difficult times of the past. There was our failed attempt in 1988 in Panama, to recreate those dreams under the banner of the "Second Amphictyonic Congress"; the subsequent efforts which ended in the failure of Mercosur [Common Market of the South]; and lastly, the current

state of terminal social, economic, financial, political, and cultural devastation of a great nation. And within that chaos, we must face the new threat, of the incorporation of our nations into the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA), which would be the final Anglo-American blow to achieve our total submission and poverty.

In this situation, let us again call upon those spirits so worthy of the American nations. There is no time to wait for other considerations: The predator is already inside our homes. For hundreds of years, we became accustomed to being second-class citizens, [expecting] some great gentleman, somewhere, to do our thinking for us. We were educated to look toward Europe, and more recently to the United States.

This must end. America is of, and for, the Americans, with our ability to think, and our leaders capable of doing what must be done.

Finally, let me remind you that America was built under the banners of the Christian faith. This is our real repository. These values flow through the blood of our Latin American brothers. It is they we must now call upon, and I do so now with absolute confidence. Remember that each good hour will be multiplied by the Lord. This great and urgent undertaking is now in your hands. Five hundred years of history are watching.

America is possible.

I pray to God and to Our Lady of Guadalupe to protect you and your families, and the achievements of our marvelous objective: the United States of South America.

I warmly embrace you and I love all of you very much.

to defend the republic? And that's going to determine it.

If we can do that. If we can build what I'm trying to do, for example, if we can build a stronger alliance *within* the Western Hemisphere, not just among governments, but among influential institutions within nations, which influence governments; if we can build a solidarity of purpose, among leading forces *within* those countries, then we could bring about the kinds of political processes, which are necessary not only for individual governments to make the changes *in their policies*, to change away from policies, which proved *mistaken*, to policies which are better; and find among various other governments, a *solidarity*, so that these governments can work in unison around a common perception of common interest—that's what I would hope.

Let me put it this way: Presently, I'm emerging as, again, a leading figure of the United States. The Republican Party is a mess. The Democratic Party, at present, is a worse mess. The Congress is a mess. Politics are a mess. The system is collapsing, it's disintegrating. Therefore, in this period, very recently, in the past two months, I have zoomed back into—shall we say?—reclaiming the influences I used to have, and

gaining new influences as well. For example: We have in motion, in the United States today, a new youth movement. It's relatively small, but it's extremely effective and influential—moving, in motion. It's the *only thing* in the United States, moving in that way. Other, older kinds of groups are collapsing entirely. We're moving! And, I'm moving internationally, as in the Arab world, in the Orient, in the nations of Asia, in Europe, in Africa, and throughout the Americas: I personally am committed to building the kind of coalition—a coalition of ideas, coalition of principle—within and among nations, which is prepared to rally itself, as a force, to strengthen any government which is determined to do the right thing. That's our best chance.

### How Mexico Can Rebuild Its Economy

**Q:** Good afternoon. Before anything else, Mr. LaRouche, I want to congratulate you, and thank you for participating with us today and answering all of our questions. Thank you very much.

Mr. LaRouche, in Mexico, we are dependent on NAFTA [North American Free Trade Agreement] with regard to agri-



*The faces of these youths eating garbage in Buenos Aires show the tragedy of Argentina today, reduced to misery following IMF and "free-trade" mantras. Colonel Romero Mundani's report of near-starvation conditions gripped the conference, and questions to LaRouche from Mexican constituency leaders reflected the threat of great impoverishment striking that country.*

culture. So we would like to know what your view is: What should a country like Mexico do, which has great agricultural potential, but most of us agricultural producers are dead in the water?

I thank you greatly for your answer. I am from the Committee for Improving Agriculture in the state of Guanajuato.

**LaRouche:** What must be understood in Mexico, clearly, is, that the market represented by the United States is collapsing, it's disintegrating. The tragedy is, that Mexico, in the recent period, has come to depend greatly upon NAFTA, the NAFTA arrangements, and similar kinds of arrangements. These arrangements are now becoming worse than useless. The internal market of the United States, as a market for employment of Mexicans going into the United States as labor, and a market for Mexico-produced goods, as in the *maquiladoras*: That is dead. Not totally, but largely dead.

So, you look at Mexico over the period since 1982, since our great crisis in Mexico, of the period of August through October of 1982, and you see there's been a great destruction of Mexico's independent national capability, in areas such as petroleum, energy generally, agriculture, and so forth; and increasing dependency upon special arrangements, with North America, under which Mexican labor has become essentially cheap labor, or cheap production, for meeting the internal market of the United States, as many other nations, too—but Mexico, especially.

So, Mexico faces an absolutely desperate situation, economically. So, obviously, several things are required: We require an orientation toward increasing the protection of employment in agriculture and other affairs, in Mexico. This means requirement of infrastructure development in transportation, water management, power, and so forth, which is indis-

pensable for agriculture and other things. This could serve as a stimulus, for the development of entrepreneurship in other kinds of things—manufacturing, and so forth.

So, therefore, the *internal economy* of Mexico, becomes much more important, than it has been in the recent period. The idea of living on the U.S. market, as an importer or exporter of last resort for Mexico: That is finished; not entirely, but for the time being, it's finished.

The U.S. economy is in the process of collapsing. For example: In the area outside Washington, D.C., we are looking at, imminently, a 33% collapse—failure—of mortgage-holders, because of the loss of employment in the so-called "New Economy"—the telecom sector, it's collapsing. We are on the verge of a collapse of the real estate bubble in the United States. The U.S. economy is in the throes of an onrushing *general economic depression*. The U.S. is losing its international credit. Its budget is not balanced. The U.S. government can not balance its own budget. The current-account deficit is squeezing the United States. It can no longer secure [credit]. Money is being pulled out of the dollar, into Europe and elsewhere. The U.S. is on the verge of collapsing and bringing down the entire world system with it.

So therefore, the idea of trying to find solutions within this relationship between Mexico and the United States, which has developed over the period since 1982, especially more recently: That is impossible.

Therefore, the only solution, for a country like Mexico is, first of all—the first line of defense, is to defend and expand internal employment, internal production, develop the internal market. This, of course, requires the creation of national credit, to fund this kind of operation. This, in turn, of course, requires cooperation with other states, in similar programs.



But, the first thing, I think, in a case like this: We have to look at what *ideas* will work, under such circumstances. Then we must look around for partners, collaborators, to make correct ideas possible for implementation. Now, obviously, if we could move water into northern Mexico, along the coastline—with canals, as this had been planned in Mexico for more than a century!—you would transform large areas of Mexico into potentially (or emerging as potentially), *rich* agricultural markets. The world needs food! Mexico can produce food. They don't have to go into the United States, to produce food. Mexicans can do it very well, with one country or another. They need the *conditions* under which to do that. They need the protection, under which to survive. They need the water; they need the power; they need the transportation, infrastructure. They need the education. They need to get the families back together again, a sense of family solidarity, which has been lost in the recent period.

So, I would say, we have to define the ideas, which fit the situation, and then find the means—international cooperation and other, to find the means, by which we can implement those ideas.

## Organize the Forces of the Future

**Carrasco:** We have a list of Mexicans who are interested in this dialogue and exchange of ideas, which is indispensable at this time. And we continue.

**Q:** I am from the El Barzón Mexican Movement. My warm greetings. My question to you is, what can we do throughout America, Latin America, and the Third World, if the media—which are indispensable to convince people and to communicate among ourselves—are controlled by the financial oligarchy? Even in your country, the United States, they managed to convince the Republican Party that the best President of the United States, would be the son of President Bush. So, what strategy are you following to convince people from around the world, that the system is awry, when those who run the system are just a few people who control the whole financial side as well as the communications media? Thank you.

**LaRouche:** Well, let's take the first one. Don't overestimate the power of the mass media. The mass media in the United States and elsewhere today, must be compared to the role of "bread and circuses" in ancient Rome. People who call themselves "citizens" in imperial Rome, were given payment—not wages—but bread, to survive. They were entertained by being sent into arenas, for such edifying sports as watching lions eat Christians. And they cheered, as Augustinus describes this situation, and its effects on people. You look at the United States today, for example, or other countries: You see mass entertainment, in the form of sports, bodily contact sports, football and other sports, which are essentially the same kind of method by which the Roman Empire brainwashed its citizens into submission, and led them into the self-destruction of Rome. We have the same thing, now.

Don't overestimate the media. Don't underestimate the stupidity of people, in submitting to it.

But when a shock comes, you enter what's called a "revolutionary period," because the mass media of that time and form no longer controls the mind. That is happening in the United States right now. So, the people who try to influence the mass media, as a way of dealing with politics, *make a fatal mistake*. This is like asking the enemy, appealing to the enemy, to do something in your favor against him. It doesn't work.

Now, the mass media and the financial institutions that control it, are going bankrupt. Citibank is in danger of bankruptcy. J.P. Morgan Chase is on the verge of bankruptcy. Other major banks, controlling banks, are near bankruptcy. The large syndicates, which control the mass media, are on the verge of bankruptcy inside the United States. The people of the United States are beginning to turn away from these influences *rapidly*, and they're doing so around the world.

So, don't be a slave to the idea of trying to get the emperor, who put you in chains, to let you take off your chains: the chains of illusion; the chains of the mass media.

So, we are moving now, around the world, with mass forces, or mass-led forces. The United States is becoming increasingly isolated. Its present policy, of war against Iraq, and toleration of the fascist slaughter in Palestine, by the present fascist government of Israel—the Sharon government—is not accepted. Resistance is growing, around the world. So, we do not have to submit.

What we have to do is, go through a political process, of educating the people to think for themselves, *not* trying to influence the mass media. The greatest mistake would be to base politics on the mass media. Base politics on the *mass people*; on their interests, on discussion of their interests. Engage in a dialogue, a Socratic dialogue, on the subject of their interests, their concerns. The way we did it in former times: This is the method to do it.

Now, the forces that can be rallied internationally, are tremendous. As you know, recently, I've become a kind of folk hero throughout the Arab world. And, I've spoken in a number of locations, and my writings are all over leading publications—mass media, by the way—in various parts of the Arab world. And, also other parts of the world: in the Orient, in Asia. I've been more active in the Americas: I recently was honored by an honorary citizenship in São Paulo, which is the third largest city in the world, with a special ceremony.

So, this is not an impossible situation, politically. You have a change in the policies of Italy, in the direction I've been fighting for, and working with leading Italian politicians to bring about. They're moving in that direction now. Similar policies are being introduced by the present government—not the same policies, but policies in that direction—are now being pushed by the *government* of Germany. Europe is tending to move in that direction. China is doing a reexamination of its policy, as recently announced by President Jiang

Zemin of China.

So: The world is changing. The world is open. The forces are *real* forces. Always start with the youth: It is the young people, especially between 18 and 25, when they've come out of adolescence—that period of insanity we call adolescence, which is legalized insanity; and they come into a period as university entrants, students. They come into a period when they're more vigorous, they're more open than some older people, who've become somewhat ossified in their politics. And, when they move, politically, in a rational way, around policy ideas, they *stimulate* the older generations. And it's through this mechanism which you generally get great movements in history, for the good. We have such a phenomenon, emerging in the United States, right now. It's explosive: The changes in the United States, in the past two months in the United States in this respect, are enormous. Most of all, the political circles are completely discredited right now. It's a wide-open situation.

So, the point is: Go to the forces of the future, I would suggest. We have just formed, in the United States, we're getting into motion, a youth movement, a national youth movement associated with me. I think that what probably is needed, you should study what we're doing in the United States—it's not perfect. It's typical of youth movements, and what they're like. We're organizing around ideas, like what's the significance of Gauss' Fundamental Theorem of Algebra? Why is that a revolutionary concept, even today? Or things like that. So, we're not talking about silly youth. We're talking about serious, thinking people, who are discussing things, studying things, just talking through things—but youth: 18- to 25-year-old youth.

I think we need, throughout the Americas, we need youth movements of that type. Not like the "Lula," the other thing—this so-called anti-globalization nonsense; not these crazy anarchists. We need a youth movement, which is positive, which is looking for the future; which is trying, not to tear down the present, but to build the future. And, I think such movements are needed to change the character of the political forces, to make them more optimistic, and to give them a greater sense of building and unity, rather than the kind of despair and fear, which dominate today.

### Energy Policy and the General Welfare

**Q:** It's a pleasure to greet you. I would like to make two, very important points. I am the leader of the Catholic youth in the state. The circumstances that you have mentioned already,



*Speakers stand for a national anthem: Col. Adrián Romero Mundani at left; João Pereira and Lorenzo Carrasco of Brazil; Peruvian engineer and trade union leader Carlos Repeto, who asked Lyndon LaRouche for an appreciation of the role of Peru's former President Alberto Fujimori; and Alfonso Luján of the El Barzón Mexican Movement.*

that the Holy Father, the Pope, said that the debts of all the countries need to be forgiven, to reach a solution. The other point that I'm interested in, is the energy system, as it is being handled both in the United States and Mexico, and what are the circumstances that lead the Americans to adhere to the energy system, and why Mexico is going to send energy to other countries?

**LaRouche:** Well, the problem here, in the United States, we have had since Brzezinski. Brzezinski is no supporter of the Pope, by the way! He's on the opposite side: You get a certain aroma around him, and his pointed ears, if you suggest where he might spend his evenings. And his policies, more clearly so. He did great damage to Mexico, among other countries, while he was National Security Adviser, for example.

The energy policies, which have been introduced, since Brzezinski was running President Carter, are destroying civilization in Mexico and elsewhere. We have policies—and when President López Portillo was President of Mexico—with which I was highly in agreement. Now, the policies were twofold: We have the long-term view of Mexico's petroleum development, as both an export item for trade—that is, petroleum exports for capital goods, for developing Mexico's agriculture and industry; but the ideas also were there in Mexico, and many people in Mexico had developed these ideas, of the problem of dealing with the north, which is water-shy, and dealing also with the coastal areas, which are very hot in the summertime. And by using nuclear power, which was the intention of Mexico, back in those days, to develop systems built around complexes of power production and distribution:

integrated power production and distribution, to enable a revolution to be made in technology; to create new cities in Mexico; to create networks of transportation; new industries; a revitalization and expansion of agriculture—things which could have all made Mexico, within two generations, among the first nations in the world in terms of production and economy. These were the ideas. We have to do that, now, as an energy policy.

We have to, as John Paul II has emphasized, we have to approach everything, from the standpoint of the common good. Or, as it's otherwise called, "the general welfare," in the Constitution of the United States. Otherwise known as the Greek *agapē*, as in *I Corinthians* 13 of Paul. This is the policy: We must take care of all of the people, to honor the past, to defend the living, and to provide for the future. We are all mortal; we shall all die. Therefore, the question is, not what we get out of *this life*, as mortal people, but what our lives *mean*, when we have completed our life, our mortal life. What have we done, which is honorable in the eyes of our ancestors? What have we done, which will be blessed by our posterity? And, we have to approach things like this, in that state: We have to have love, for those who went before us, many of whom suffered. We have to have love, for those who come after us. And we must devote our life to what *we* can do, in cooperation and as individuals, to make the transition. And one of the things is energy.

We must provide a large-scale energy system, of high energy-flux density, in which production and distribution are integrated. They are *not* privatized. They are regulated by the state. They are not a method of *looting* the people, but a method of providing the basis upon which organized life depends for its progress.

## The Coup Against Peru's Fujimori

**Q:** Good afternoon. I'm a Peruvian, an engineer, from the trade union, Retired Workers of Peru, and I have a question for you, Mr. LaRouche, perhaps a somewhat controversial one.

With regard to my country, Peru, in my modest view and with the respect that I have of your evaluations, I will take the liberty to tell you my opinion, in response to what you, in one of your articles, said, and I quote: "Peru has no better future, especially after the evil offensive of the U.S. State Department to overthrow the government of Alberto Fujimori."

This view of yours, Mr. LaRouche, with regard to the cause of Peru not having a positive future, because of what you said, as a Peruvian citizen, confuses me and makes me uncertain. Mr. LaRouche, Fujimori, of Japanese nationality, and Montesinos, a Peruvian, for a long ten years wrecked our poor country. They left us destroyed, economically and militarily. For example, people say that they fought and defeated terrorism—which is true, but not with the healthy intention of freeing Peru of this evil, but rather, to monopolize the drug trade, which is a well-known scourge which goes hand in hand with terrorism, as in the case of the FARC in Colombia.

It's also said that they stabilized the economy, which is another great lie. The best example of this are the budget problems created by the Economics Ministers Pedro Pablo Kuczynski, the envoy of Soros, and Silva Ruete, a recent minister in an earlier regime. The envoy of Soros—and what is rarely said is that Pedro Pablo Kuczynski came to Peru to just cover up the Peruvian economy.

I would like you, Mr. LaRouche, to clarify this for me. Thank you very much.

**LaRouche:** Well, your questions are a bit self-contradictory, because I agree with you about Soros and Kuczynski and so forth; I know these creatures very well, and I dislike them very much.

The point is, one has to take a certain view of the social process, the political process, in judging a President of any country, such as Peru. Now, Fujimori capitulated, and adopted in many respects, adopted a pro-liberal view. That does not mean, that was his opinion. That does not mean, that was his instinct. Remember that Peru has lived, as all nations of the Americas, have lived under a quasi-imperial boot. They have been, in a sense, quasi-colonies of the United States since 1982. No country of the Americas has really been independent. It has been dominated by the IMF and the Anglo-Americans, by the English-speaking oligarchical factions, financial oligarchical factions of the world. And, Soros is among the worst. Kuczynski, who represents certain Boston and other interests, is among the worst. And, of course, this Boston crowd, like United Fruit and other things—Grace, and whatnot—have a history in Peru, and the history continues. And when you look at the situation, from that standpoint, you understand it.

But, Fujimori acted as a patriotic President. That does not mean he was a perfect leader, in respect to forming his policy. Look, I'm a political figure of the United States—a Presidential candidate. I'm probably the best-qualified Presidential candidate the United States has seen in the past 30-odd years, or longer: So, I have some ideas about Presidencies, and have some idea about how an American Presidential candidate should treat and regard Presidents of other republics in the Americas.

Now, Fujimori, I consider in a friendly way. Why? Because he's the President of Peru. And he was couped by the United States, and many of the charges against him were manufactured by the United States. And there are problems in Peru, which, to a large degree, were introduced to Peru, by the United States! So, who am I, to criticize Peru, or the people in Peru, as if that were not the case? They were living under a virtual dictatorship of the overreach of an English-speaking alliance, power, and they had no absolute freedom of action. And the President of Peru, and the President of every republic of the Americas, has *to calculate*, what he has to concede to, what he can get by with, under the pressure of the United States, and its English-speaking allies. So, that's the way you have to look at it.

So, I would not take simplistic views about criticizing

things that, I agree, are problems in Peru. I have to say: What created the problem? What is the infectious agent, which caused the problem? How must we deal with it? How must we give Peru the opportunity to free itself? I mean, a coup was made, by the Clinton Administration, overthrowing Fujimori! It was made, because of a speech that Fujimori made in Brazil, which implicitly was consistent with the policy perspectives of the Mercosur; which is in the vital interests of that part of South America, to have such policies.

So that Fujimori was toppled, not because he did something bad: He was toppled, because he did something good!

So, when a man is thrown out; exiled from his own country; lied about internationally, and sitting in refuge in Japan, after being *coupéd illicitly*, by an orchestrated coup d'état—I don't attack him. I don't agree with many of his policies. I and my associates objected to these liberal policies many times. But, I've always understood, that *I do not treat lightly, the problems and importance of a Presidency of a republic*—such as Mexico, for example. I don't have to agree with Fox, to defend the Presidency of Mexico. I do! I *must* defend the Presidency of Mexico! It's a republic: I must defend it. It's a partner-country of mine: I must defend it.

So, simplistic kinds of criticisms, we should not make. We should proceed with understanding, not with populist rhetoric; not with anarcho-sindicalist rhetoric. I saw anarcho-sindicalism in the form of Trotskyism: It doesn't work. We should therefore, abhor it, on those grounds alone!

So, no. I don't feel that strongly about that. I feel that Peru has been abused. It will be destroyed, under the present policies, where it probably could have survived a bit, under Fujimori. What has happened to Peru, *since* the overthrow, the coup d'état against Fujimori, is far worse than anything that happened under him. So how can we cheer for the tribulations of Fujimori? I don't. He's the President of a republic, honestly elected. An honest man, as Presidents go. He may have made mistakes; he may have had bad policies, but I have some understanding of why those policies were made. And I've always worked rather, as much as possible, *positively*, to help Presidents and other institutions of republics, to *improve* their policy. I don't walk in with hand grenades, trying to find ways to destroy them. I respect them; I respect the institution they represent; and I treat them accordingly. I try to *win them*, to a better policy. I try to *assist them*, in finding the means to adopt a better policy. [applause]

## Head-to-Head Against The WSF Jacobins

The worsening economic crisis of the nations of Ibero-America has unleashed Jacobin forces, shouting “anti-globalization” slogans, but actually funded by global speculators and attacking the existence of nation-states just as the IMF does. In the days around the Aug. 22-23 Guadalajara events led by LaRouche's MSIA, national radio coverage of those events on Argentine radio sent the Jacobins of the World Social Forum (WSF) into a public rage. The hysteria surfaced in Argentina following interviews on the Guadalajara seminar given by Marivilia Carrasco, president of the Ibero-American Solidarity Movement (MSIA) in Mexico, to Radio Splendid in Buenos Aires. The WSF is built with the funds of George Soros and fellow mega-speculator Sir Teddy Goldsmith.

Carrasco warned that there are two arms of the oligarchy operating internationally, that of the utopian faction which wants to provoke perpetual war, and that of the WSF, which feeds on popular repudiation of the results of globalization—usury and free trade—but wants to preserve the essence of globalization, which is the destruction of the nation-state. She reported that George Soros, with his fortune earned from globalization and speculation against national currencies, paid the ideologues of the

WSF. Carrasco insisted that while it is true that the national institutions of Ibero-America have been hijacked by any number of corrupt and IMF-compliant leaders, to seek to end this plague by destroying the national institutions themselves, is doing the financial oligarchy's dirty work for them.

In an Aug. 26 interview on Radio Splendid, Carrasco was told by the show's host that spokesmen of the World Social Forum had responded the day before to her charges. A TV journalist asked them what they thought of LaRouche's allegation that George Soros was behind the World Social Forum. The WSF spokesman had responded furiously, not to refute the charge, but to say that such a charge from Lyndon LaRouche could not be accepted. Carrasco then added to the story of George Soros, that of Teddy Goldsmith in the WSF. She exposed Soros as the world's leading source of funds for drug legalization campaigns, and the proliferation of his Open Society Foundations, from which human rights groups are financed as shock-troops against national institutions.

The Ibero-American nations actually face immediate threats of national fragmentation: Argentina, as the Province of Neuquén attempts to split away; Chiapas from Mexico; the near-successful drive by narco-terrorist armies to break up Colombia; all under “anti-globalization” rhetoric. Carrasco said there is no ending globalization without the total replacement of the IMF monetary system, which the MSIA's next major gathering will address in Paraná, Brazil, on Sept. 27-28.

## The Importance of Labor Unions

**Q:** Good evening, Mr. LaRouche. I'm a trade unionist from Jalisco state. I would like to know what you think of the worldwide movement toward so-called "flexibilization of labor?" We view this as a direct attack on our social organizations, and on the advances which labor has won through decades of struggle.

**LaRouche:** I agree, this is a danger. This is a danger. People have to come to an understanding, an intelligent view of what the labor movement represents. And the importance of solidarity within organized labor—the ability to implement things.

For example: A rational discussion between the employer or other institutions, and labor, is a good way of bringing the forces of production into effective operation. The other key thing here is, the human question: We can not continue the policy of cheating labor, for the sake of profit. We have a collapsing economy. The economy is collapsing, *not* because of labor. The economy is collapsing, because of international policies, which are rapacious and stupid. Where is the investment? Where is the technological improvement? Where is the improvement of the schools? Where is the improvement of the health-care systems, and all the other things, which make for the increase of the productive powers of labor? Where's the investment in better technologies? Improved physical technologies? These are the things that are urgent.

When you say, "Labor must work more cheaply"; when you say, that you must do things which mean destroying the already-fragile social structure within the family and community of working people, you're not doing anything right: It's wrong! You must have minimal standards, and they must rise, for the improvement in the conditions of life of labor and their families: in terms of education, health care, and also family and community social relations—extremely important. And, when labor fights for this, and negotiates with employers, to press them to move forward, so that these requirements can be satisfied, through a common effort, then labor can cooperate with its employers, with a sense of common purpose: "We're trying to make things better." And, good labor organizations will help bring that about. But, at the same time, they have to have agreements, with the employers' groups, on the kinds of investment, the kinds of conditions of life, the conditions of work, which make that success possible.

No, it's good to have solid agreements, negotiated periodically, between labor and employers, all kinds of employers, with the idea that a partnership can develop, based on bringing together the sometimes paradoxical relations between labor and employers. And finding, by understanding the paradoxes, to discover solutions, which solve those paradoxes.

I've heard this stuff all over—I don't know what the details are in Mexico—but I know what's going on all over the world, and it's producing nothing but misery and breakdown of the economy.

## How I Would Address President Fox

**Carrasco:** We are receiving one last question, which will bring to a close, at this time, the dialogue, that all of you should know is an open dialogue, is a dialogue that LaRouche constantly seeks to engage in with patriots from Ibero-America and other parts of the world. Fortunately, the Internet favors direct contact, and we invite any and all who wish to participate in this process to join in, with your questions, and the work of building the movement that LaRouche has initiated, which is a worldwide movement, for the creation of a new financial system, a New Bretton Woods.

**Q:** Good evening, Mr. LaRouche. I am a Mexican retailer, and my question is as follows: If you had the opportunity, as you did 20 years ago, to meet with President López Portillo—today with President Fox—what recommendations and guidelines would you offer President Fox, so that the financial system does not crash? And many thanks for your answer.

**LaRouche:** I think I would do the same kind of thing. Of course, President López Portillo is a very distinguished person, of real knowledge and intellectual development. President Fox has, of course, a different background: He comes from a business and related background. Shall we say, that President López Portillo is a man of Classical attributes, typical of many leaders of the Mexican Republic, like himself. And, therefore, when I met with President López Portillo, we were people who are in the European Classical tradition, and it's easy for us to exchange certain ideas, because we've already been through that territory, so to speak.

President Fox has not had the benefit of that. He's the President of Mexico. My message to him, would be essentially, the end-result of any approach to him, would be the same. He's the President of Mexico: I would address him as President, as President. And I would try to be useful, in my communication with him, and to try to persuade him to see things that I know are true, which is important that he see. And to suggest to him, things that we and others might do in common, as ideas, as human beings, in our respective positions, to help bring things into play, which have to be brought into play. I think, he has to change his policies; I think he knows that. I think he *will* know that, very soon. But the fact that he changes his policy, does not mean he vanishes as the President of Mexico. He *remains* the President, even if he changes his policies, because his function is not to be the servant of a contract on policy. His function is to be the servant of the interests of the people of Mexico, and their future. And he has to change—as he must change—to satisfy that *mission*. That mission: It's almost a sacred position, to be a head of state, even for a time. And the mission is the future of one's nation; and respect and honor, for one's predecessors.

So, with him, I would simply do the same thing: to explain to him what I know; to try to answer his questions; and to indicate what I can do, what I think others can do, to make possible the implementation of those suggestions.