

TALK GIVEN BY LeGRAND BAKER BEFORE BYU YOUNG REPUBLICANS, 25  
Oct. 1985

(Typed from recording)

We live in a time where everything is called a crisis and consequently when someone says I want to talk about the "crisis" everybody immediately turns their ears off and stops listening because it has to be one of the things you hear about on the radio all the time; or that you listen to on TV all the time and yet that is not the one I want to talk about tonight.

There is something that is happening in America in the last, I can't do this, you're too far away. Come up here where I can see your eyes. Come on. Something has happened since the turn of the century that was invented initially by Louis XIV, the sun king, in an attempt to consolidate and bring power to bear in France. It has happened in America very slowly and very carefully with a brilliant, from high-sighted, it would appear almost a guiding hand that's been passed from generation to generation. That has moved America from a situation where it was what the founding fathers called a democratic republic to a situation where it is an oligarchy with a kind of veneer of democracy over the top of it. An oligarchy that constitutes what is now the real power of government. I'd like to describe to you very briefly how that happened. I won't pretend to tell you what the consequences are. And I won't pretend to tell you what can be done about it. Much greater men than I have tackled it and they are left hopeless, helpless. The best way to consider what I am talking about is to try to visualize it. The Founding Father's thought in terms of structures, they believed that the best way to describe the perfectness of the universe was in the mechanical operations of something like a clock, which

was a near perfect as mechanics could come up with. And it is not unlikely then that they thought of the Constitution that they developed also as a kind of a mechanism, a clock. An attempt to put into operation the kind of covenant government that they had had in their initial relationship with England. And I suppose if I'm going to tell you about how the development of these little pockets of efficiency that are altering our system so incredibly, how they developed, you have to go back to the very beginning with our relationship with England.

First of all, I hope you realize if you don't something so that you will, that the Liberals at the time of the American Revolution were in England. And the Conservatives were in America. The Revolutionaries in America were not revolutionaries in any sense of the word except that they were concedingly conservative, constitutional conservatives, who wanted to alter this structure of government in order to get back to the form. If one wishes to call someone who wants to alter the structure in order to get back a liberal then there were liberals. If one is content by calling those kinds of people conservatives as I am then you have to call the revolutionaries in America conservatives and this is the reason. Up until the end of the war, the French and Indian War, the Americans were essentially left alone. The arrangement that they had with England that there was a great empire and that they were a part of that empire and that the citizens were virtually citizens of this part of the empire and it was the responsibility of the government in England to look after the general welfare. It wasn't until after the war when the government in England discovered that they were broke. They were really broke. They had succeeded in destroying the French Empire, essentially. They had comandered tremendous quantities of French land. But in the expansion of the Empire, and the acquisition of the land they had made themselves bankrupt. And so they turned to whatever source they could find for money and one of those sources was the empire itself. And one of those parts was these thirteen colonies. While

they constituted about one-third of the empire, they constituted in terms of wealth probably closer to 80 or 90 percent. And so they began to do what governments always do when they need money. They proceeded to try to tax only the taxes were as governments usually try to arrange it, disguised in such a form that they didn't appear to be taxes at all. Rather what they appeared to be was regulations. Regulations for the most part in the economy. The people in America were quite content to let the English regulate the economy for regulation purposes. But when it came time to regulate it for acquiring money purposes that was quite a different thing and they weren't going to have any part of it. So they got upset. The upsetness resulted in their realization that the only way they were going to maintain their rights as Englishmen would be to get out of the Empire. And so they got out of the Empire.

The Declaration of Independence states almost as a part of its preface, the problem that then would become after the evidence that the war presented that they really could get out of the Empire, whether or not it was legal was a question that the war decided. The Declaration of Independence presupposed the problem that they were going to have. When it suggested that they must structure, that they must build their new government on such principles, but structure its power in such a way that it would protect their liberty and their freedom. Initially their reaction was, as you know, to get rid of the centralized government. That was easy. The assumption was, that if we can simply get rid of that government then we don't have to worry a whole lot about any such government invading our lives. Well that worked fine during the war when the colonies had to fight this thing, and once it was fought they just simply sort of drew a line between England and them and so there is no more such thing. But that left a void and it was a void that they were very concerned about because there was not enough cohesive power in the government that was left, in the Articles of Confederation congress that it would hold the

states together under stress. I mean without stress. The war had provided sufficient stress to hold it together then, but now that the war was over and the economy was straightening out it looked at and staged rebellion. It looked as though everything was going to fall apart. And so they were confronted again with the same problem. How do you create a government that is going to be cohesive enough to protect the citizens rights and yet not powerful enough that it can get at their private lives. This was the delimma that they faced. That they met that delimma head on and actually succeeded in answering that impossible question is my thinking the greatest miracle of human history. I really truly believe that.

In their view, government had four legitmate responsibilities. The first was to protect. That means police power and military power. The second was to order society in such a way that the people would be more free. There are not very many examples of that that I can think of right off. The easiest is a communication system, roads. You are more free because you don't have to walk to Salt Lake than you would be if you did. The fact that there's a road there and it's not too bumpy a road makes you freer. The postal system does the same thing. A reasonable tarrif does somewhat the same thing. Fewer Food and Drug Act actually is an extension of this same kind of idea though it was not one of theirs. The third function of government is to use the law in such a way that everyone is equal before the law, but not in such a way that the law can be used to oppress, because the power of the law is also the power to oppress. Let me say something else in that regard. If one wishes to define government very carefully, you come up with any definition you want to but it all boils down to this. Government is the power to oppress. That's all it is. If you look at a governing body, what you see is individuals who exercise that power and the things that's different between those individuals and other individuals is the fact that they exercise the power. There easy access, or difficult access to that ability to

oppress is what makes them governors. It doesn't matter whether you're talking about a dictatorship, where the power to oppress is threat of violence, or whether you're talking about the home of a doting grandparent where the power to oppress is breaking into tears, it all remains the same. If the power to oppress in some way is not there, there is no government. So, the fourth function of government that is legitimate is to leave people alone and let them be best they can. That is a positive, not a negative. You see government functions like an umbrella. It's objective is to keep out any kind of disconcerting, oppressive pressure that would alter ones life. But, like an umbrella not dictate where one goes. That was their view of government.

Now, the problem was. How do you create a central government, now change this, now this become the federal government and this becomes the states, okay? How do you create a central government that is large enough to do what government ought to do, that is protect the citizens; and yet so very very small that it cannot possibly touch their private lives. The answer that they chose was like the clock, the perfect mechanism, a structure that was so well balanced and counter-balanced that notwithstanding the fact as Madison pointed out in his tenth federalist that all sorts of factions would get in the way and everybody....you see government is power, and so people who seek power will be gravitated to government. And so the problem now is, if you're going to have a reasonable government, Madison pointed out that we're not angles. If we were angles it wouldn't be a problem. But if you're going to have a government that functions well you're going to have to have in it people who like power and who know how to exercise it. But if you have that kind of people they're going to want more power than they ought to have and so the problem is how do you structure the government in such a way, the mechanics of it, that they can't get any more than they ought to have. There were two ways that the founding father's did that. I'm talking about the structural mechanism. One is, they created the

government with three branches, the legislative, the executive and the courts and provided that nobody could be in any one of them at more than one time. And then they gave them each powers that were different from the other, powers that balanced each other and counter-balanced so that it was assumed that if anybody really wanted to get a whole lot of power here those two guys would keep him from it and vice-versa. The other way was in the relationship that they established between here and here. The ultimate power to oppress is the military. And so this one got the military. The greatest danger in society is the power to invade your private lives, and this one and the local governments got that. So this government, the state government, has sufficient police power that it is able to enforce local regulations and laws, that's about all. And yet it has responsibility for everything that has to do with your personal life. Your contractual relationships with your family. Your contractual relationships in your business. All of what you do with your private property, all of these things are down here where the power to oppress is not nearly so great, as a matter of fact, not nearly sufficient to get all that involved, but the power that has all the great power, the military power, is up here without the prerogative of reaching down to touch your private lives. If you look in the constitution you'll discover that there is not one instances where the federal government can take an initiative to invade your private life or your business. Now there are instances where you can put yourself under their jurisdiction, if you become involved in business and you wish to go from state to state in your business, interstate commerce, then you put yourself under federal jurisdiction and your business, but you have done that, they have not. If you become involved in international business you put yourself under federal jurisdiction but you have done it, they have not. There's nothing in the Constitution that gives them the power to get down to where you are. Okay? So between this and this they had devised a structure that was so perfectly balanced that the government did have

the capacity to protect but it didn't have the power to touch your private lives. With the Bill of Rights, the Bill of Rights has three functions. One is to protect the citizens from all government, that's the bulk of it. Part of it is to protect the citizens and the states from the federal government. The Tenth Amendment is to protect the citizens and the states from the federal government. Thus codifying effectively the relationship of the people who wrote the Constitution only assumed. Now, what has happened since then is there has developed a....catalyst is not the right word. If you think of it in terms of an electrical system, a short between here and here that gives this power access to your lives. And what I would like to do in the next few minutes is show you how that short in the system was developed. The system remained essentially unchanged until the Civil War. The Civil War established the fact that the state governments were not all that independent and therefore eliminated a good deal of the sense of citizenship that the Americans felt toward the states. However, even after the Civil War the Supreme Court talked about the difference between being a citizen of the state and being a citizen of the United States. That distinction was then made, it is not so much made now. The beginnings of the erosion came with the 13th and 14th amendments. The amendments were dubious in their constitutional origins in the first place. And corrosive in their approach to the constitutional principle in the second. Both amendments conclude with the words congress shall have power to enforce. Heretofore, all the enforcement powers were here, with the president, and the legislator had the power to legislate but none of the power to enforce. But after the Civil War the radicals didn't trust the president to enforce and so they were going to make jolley sure things happened their way in the South, and so they structured these amendments to say that after they were ratified it was going to be they, congress, that would do the enforcing. [question from the floor]

Oh ratification process was very simple. All of the states who had come from the south

who would come back into the nation were thrown out, and they were told that they could come back in after they ratified these amendments.

[statement from audience] Yes, congress told them that they couldn't come back in until after they had ratified. [Congress threw them out. {statement from floor}] And congress threw them out. So it is reasonable to say that the 13th and 14th amendments to the constitution are unconstitutional. One would have to clarify what you meant, but it's still reasonable to say. Okay? So these amendments came into being and congress immediately set about enforcing the terms of the amendment. Now heretofore the presidency had devised the structure of enforcement and it was relatively a new thing for congress, but they found a way. The way was the creation of the Freeman's Bureau. Do you remember what the Freeman's Bureau was? It was a simple little bureauracracy who went into the South, the southerners called them scallywags and carpet-baggers. They went into the South and created an artificial government and started dictating about how things would happen there. The result way that all of the advances that had been made under the Johnson administration to pull the south back into the fold under reasonable terms, were eradicated. And it was not until the beginning of the 19th century that the south, I mean the 20th century, that the south began to be what it had been before the war. The only real relevant thing about all of that to this, is this. In order to do their enforcing, congress created an extra constitution, not extra legal because they, well it wasn't even quite extra, well yes it was, an extra-constituional body, a little, a committee, a bureau within the governmental system but outside the federal government and outside the state government something to sort of sit in between that would serve as a catalyst so that the powers exercised here could be transfered there. With the end of the aftermath of the Civil War the Freedom's Bureau ceased to be and the bureau itself, the ideas of the bureau sort of colapse, temporarily,



only temporarily. Let me say this before I pass on to something else though. If one looks at the rest of the amendments that have followed, you discover that the 15th amendment gave congress the power to enforce. The 16th amendment gave congress the power to lay and collect taxes, income tax amendment. The 17th amendment talks about changing the constituency of the senate and so that one didn't require the congressional power to enforce, except that the constitution already said that the senatorial elections could be judged by the senate. Prohibition didn't give anybody the power to enforce that, nobody needed it they just started drinking again. But the initial prohibition act gave both congress and the states the power to enforce. In order to achieve that, congress who didn't have the power to enforce any such thing as prohibition, had to come up with a new kind of bureau, this was the beginnings of FBI. Which introduced a police system to the federal government something that was quite unique and heretofore unheard of. Women's suffrage, the 19th amendment, gave congress the power to enforce. The 20th amendment was about the succession of the presidency and that was not necessary. The 21st amendment, as I've mentioned, which repealed the 18th nobody had to enforce that one. The 22nd amendment which said only, what does the 22nd amendment say? I can't remember what it says, anyway, well never mind. The 23rd amendment which talks about the elections in D.C., that is gives the people in Washington, D.C. the right to vote for president, gives congress the power to enforce. The 24th amendment which says there won't be any poll tax in either the federal or the state elections, gives congress the power to enforce. The 26th amendment that said the 18th, that changed voter age to 18, gives congress the power to enforce. And ERA would have given congress the power to enforce. Which all put together one must admit is a rather remarkable departure from the original concept here. In addition to that change there was some other things that were beginning to happen in America that the founders had not quite anticipated

and therefore had not built into the system, as matter of fact, the things that the founders had done began to work too well. Among the things that happened was an incredibly quick movement from the East to the West. So that within 50 years after the Civil War was over most of the western territory, I guess all of it, had been become states. That altered substantially the physical structure of the nation. Another thing that had happened was the urbanization of America and with the urbanization came the trauma of those being urbanized. There was some communications changes that altered America incredibly so that it was now possible for people to talk from one side of the nation to the other, either by telegraph or by telephone and then to have it printed the next day in the newspaper, and that altered the basic structure of the government. And then there was one more thing, and this one was something that no one quite knew how to handle. That was the railroad. The railroad constituted two things; in addition to the fact that it moved people. One is that it was a power all by itself, a tremendous economic power. The best way to describe what I'm talking about is to mention what happened in Wisconsin. In Wisconsin the farmers didn't have anybody to sell their grain to except other farms and other farmers don't buy grain very well. It was obvious that the only way the farmers in Wisconsin were ever going to get rich was to have some market for their grain and so they sold themselves, and I use that term not at all loosely, to the railroad. Farmers all over Wisconsin mortgaged their property and turned the money that they got from the mortgage over to the railroad to build a railroad. Some of them lost their property in consequence of that. The result is that the railroad came in, the economic power of Wisconsin, and before a decade was over the railroad owned the state legislature. The farmers who use to own the state legislature didn't own it any more. Now the farmers owned neither the railroad nor the state legislature. And they were at the mercy of the railroad. This happened all over. The other thing was, the railroad was a

creature, unlike anything America had ever seen before. Something that began at one side of the country and went to the other and paid no attention whatever to the arbitrary state lines that were drawn. The railroad seemed to supercede that. If a state legislature made some attempt to control the railroads, the railroad simply obeyed the local law and went to the next state to do whatever they chose and it became obvious as two things happened, one is the states refused to cooperate and the other as they became increasingly aware that they had something here that was bigger than they could handle, which means essentially that the states pretty much advocated. Everyone turned to the federal government to control the railroads. This was the only power big enough to do it. And so the federal government went back to the principles that it had learned during or immediately after the Civil War. They passed a law about the regulation of the railroad under the Interstate Commerce clause. But you see, they had no intragal structural power to do any regulation. The founding fathers had created a system so that we were governed by tentative makers of temporary laws. There's something very comforting about that. The fact that any law maker who was there is temporary and that any law he makes is absolutely tentative. The arms sale yesterday is an example to that, or rather the refusal to sell arms. We absolutely will not sell arms to Jordan now. Isn't that what it is? But this is the way the whole system is. If you don't like the way things are, everyone of those law makers know that in two years there will be a little revolution, using the word the way the founding fathers did it, and they may be booted. And so they are tentative, and that is the system, and that is one of the genuises of the system. Well there was something about the awesomeness of the railroad that implies that it ought not to be too tentative, that is the rules and regulations that control it. And so the legislators created something that would handle two things very well. Oh, one more comment. The government [end of side one]

So we have this little pocket of efficiency that is absolutely insulated in its necessary response to the people. There can be no little revolutions here. Every two years the bureaucrats don't have to go back to the masses, and get reappointed to their power, that power is theirs and it is theirs perpetually. The next thing that happened was the American people elected a Democrat, with a very capital D, ideologue to be president of the United States. I'm talking about Woodrow Wilson, who did some things that no president had ever quite done before. Wilson was the very first president in the history of the United States to talk about America as a democracy. Heretofore, America had been a Republic, but now it changed. It changed from the status of a Republic to the status of a Democracy. And it really did change. Initially the congress was divided into two parts, with the Senate and the House. The House was elected by the masses, the Senate elected by the State Legislatures. The House then had as its constituency the poor people, everybody. The Senate had as its constituency the people who made up the State Legislature, who were essentially the rich people. But it also had another constituency too, that is entirely forgotten in our time. It had as a constituency the state government. Well, that was changed under Wilson. The Constitution was rewritten and it now read that the constituency of the Senate and the constituency of the House should be exactly the same. That meant that the state government as a government had no more legitimate way of inputting into the federal system. It also meant that these people had precisely the same constituency as those people. Now, I'll come back and say something about that in a minute, because some other things happened under Wilson that are very important. I've got to get rid of my notes, they're a nuisance. The federal government by virtue of the war, you know if one has a war one always can do things that one cannot do without a war. Wars are exceedingly important to people who control. That is why the war on poverty was a war, because that meant that with a war on

poverty then extraordinary measures could be taken that otherwise would have been looked at with a rather jaundiced eye. Well there was a war now for Wilson, it was World War I, and even though he demonstrated an utter incapacity at diplomacy, in America he did some things that were rather significant. One of the things that he did was nationalize the railroads. So that the private owners of the railroad no longer had any control whatever about their operation. It was an inefficient, bungling system and by the time that the war was over it was almost working well. But throughout the whole of the war, those people who had been established in this new little pocket of efficiency whose responsibility it had been to control the railroad, by the time the war was over they had learned how, and even though they lost their power, the knowing how hadn't been lost. There was another thing that he did that was probably the most, most is too big a word. Certainly one of the most innovative things that any president had ever done. He mobilized the powers of the federal government to restructure the thinking of the American citizens. And that was a good trick. I'll tell you how he did it. The war began without American's really knowing where they were going. You're aware of that I presume, you've had that much history. There was at least as much chance, if the bet makers had been making bets before the war, that we would have entered on the side of Germany, as it was that we would have entered on the side of the allies. As it turned out we entered on the side against Germany, but the feeling in America was still, "What are we doing here?" We got in the war for the only legitimate reason and that was wholly ideological. We certainly had no economic interest, we had no political interest. But we were making the world safe for democracy after all and that was sufficient reason to get into the war. But that posed a problem, because American's weren't really quite sure who the good guys were. They'd never really been sure, at least before the war hadn't been sure who the good guys were. And so the federal government began to educate them

about the nature of goodness and badness in guys. They employed history professors, sociologists and those kinds of people, I have in my library at home a little book that was created by the professors at the University of Wisconsin, which is some of the neatest bit of propaganda you've seen. The object was to create pamphlets, literature, brainwashing system, if I can use any phrase as crude as that one, that would convince America that the Hun's were evil in their nature. And by the time the war was over, one couldn't play Bach. One couldn't eat sauerkraut it was freedom cabbage. There was something fundamentally evil about anything that was Hun. The war passed and American's stopped thinking the German's were such bad people. I mean, as soon as a war is over one can stop thinking the other guy is such a bad person. But the people who had created the illusion of badness hadn't forgotten. They went in two directions after that, one was advertising. American advertising begins with this thing. The people who had done it so successfully against the German's began to sell it, and so American advertising changed for all time. And the other is that government learned how to do it too. The greatest propaganda effort in the whole history of the world, I suspect. Certainly in the history of the Free World, was the multi-day TV that happened shortly after the Watergate thing. A president who was elected by a tremendous landslide was soon discovered to be the greatest villan in American history. Using essentially the same tactics except in a much more sophisticated way than Wilson had used. There were a number of other things that happened during the Wilson administration that were significant, women got to vote. The constituency of the Senate was changed, as I mentioned to you, and the president began to talk about himself as being the people's president. Heretofore, presidents had always been elected by electors. Electoral College. But somehow or other, he succeeded in erasing the reality of the Electoral College from the American conscious opinion, and he declared himself, that is the office of the presidency, the most democratic of all the offices

in any of the geographic United States. The reason was because this was the only office that was elected by all of the people. And so the American national government came more and more to look like a democracy, but at the same time it was becoming more and more to look very unlike a confederacy. At the same time America was getting more nationalistic, I mean it was getting more democratic, it was getting more nationalistic. And if one thinks very carefully, one has to realize that the two are absolutely at the opposite ends of any kind of spectrum. And yet that was what was happening. The illusion of democracy was coming full blown and at the same time all sorts of little pockets of efficiency were being created. Lots of bureaus to do lots of things. And then the master stroke, that was the income tax. There's nothing more oppressive to one who wishes to wield power than not having the money to finance his wieldings. And that had frustrated the federal government for a very long time. They had discovered something during the Civil War but they had failed to maintain it and that was the income tax and so it was suggested that the government should have an income tax in order to do the minimum things that government should have to do. If you go back and read the, propaganda is the wrong word but it will have to do, about the income tax you'll discover that people absolutely guaranteed, now mind you the people who did the guaranteeing were these tentative temporaries, they absolutely guaranteed that the income tax would probably not get above 2 1/2 percent and certainly under no circumstances would it ever rise above 3 percent. And with that guarantee the American public signed a blank check. Leaving to Congress the power to decide how much of their income they were going to absorb into the federal coffers and leaving to Congress the capacity to enforce. You see the income tax is enforced, not by the president, but by Congress in precisely the way that Congress always enforces, a bureaucracy. And so the new bureaucracy was invented for the income tax, which had the power to make rules that had the capacity to function

as law, that had the power to exercise those rules, to enforce them. Even our own judiciary. Have you ever been to Washington, D.C. and walked around the mall and observed that the Court building for the tax commission is about three times as large as the Supreme Court building, have you noticed that? There's more reason than rhetoric in that one. And then a tragedy hit America that seemed to be all out of proportion to anything that America had deserved. The Republican's got elected. And the Republican's proposed and began to propert a system that was *laisser-faire*, *laisser-faire* means, and all you have to do is go look at any good,...I saw something the other day, one of these bureaus that had created by [ ] is to, one of these bureaus that had been by the federal government came up with a report, the report was, this is only two or three weeks ago, the report was that social science texts tend to praise people on the left and their policies more than they do people on the right and their policies. I wondered how much it cost for the government to come up with a conclusion like that? Anyway the Republicans invented something called *laisser-faire* which means you keep your hands off, and of course, there was only one group that government wanted to keep their hands off and that was big business. *Laisser-faire* became equated with teapot dole, and was a no-no, much the same way Watergate became a no-no. What was really happening is the Republicans had been repulsed by this incredible growth, almost like bacteria dividing to multiply, of these pockets of efficiency and were trying to back down. *Laisser-faire* means keep your hands off, and they were trying to keep their hands off. And the democrats thought that was a dreadful thing to have happen. And then they were saved by an act of providence that couldn't have been predicted, I don't think, and that was a combination of three things, the Depression, World War II, and FDR. FDR was anything but an [ ] his wife was, but he wasn't. FDR was a pragmatist, he did whatever worked and his wife and her fabian socialist friends had lots of ideas of things that



would work and so they came up with a whole lot of things all of which required a whole new system of bureaus, of government agencies with the capacity to get right down into the neighborhood and fix things. FDR came up with a list of freedoms, do you recall what they were? They weren't the same ones as in the Bill of Rights. They were freedom from want. Remember? What does freedom from want mean? Careful now. Freedom from want means....what the problem? I only learned this a week ago, it was one of the most delightful things I've learned for a long time because I was troubled by it. If you go look at a dictionary that was published before 20 years ago and look up the word welfare, your apt to come up with all sorts of different things. It means that people are well off. Now days, if you get a present day dictionary, something that was published within the last ten years, five years is better, you discover that welfare means the governments need to take poor relief. I discovered last week that the reason that poor relief on a national level was called welfare was because that word was used twice in the Constitution and therefore, if you called it welfare it certainly was constitutional. I know that, but you have to admit it was brilliant and it worked. And so Social Security, but not just Social Security, but lots and lots of other things as the federal government became more and more aware of your personal needs and became desperately involved in securing your welfare, almost imposing it upon you. FDR had two pieces of clout that nobody else had ever had before him, Wilson had come close but Wilson after all was only purporting an ideological war, we had real bad guys. Between the Depression and the II World War, FDR was able to mobilize the federal government in a way that it had never been mobilized before. He'd create a bureau that would get involved in virtually everything that the states and local government had any interest in. And then the war was over and Truman came along who was much more interested in defense than he was in local affairs and then Eisenhower, the

Republican, who was a do nothing president. You know that Eisenhower...all the text books say that Eisenhower...you know that Eisenhower was a do nothing president, don't you? You know what he did nothing? He did not increase these marvelous bureaucracies. They as a matter of fact began to wither just a trifle, except the ones that had to do with roads, and that is doing nothing, and that is a no-no. But there was some things that provided some salvation for the country and that is that Eisenhower had a wholly Democratic Congress and they were able to enforce this way and that. Eisenhower was followed by one of the most brilliant presidents we have ever had. John Kennedy did two things that no president that ever had preceeded him had done and that no president that ever followed him will be able to ignore. The first thing he did was hire Lou Harris, you see we have now developed the thing that Wilson started about imposing its government upon people's thinking to a point that one can discover people's thinking and then match it. Very much like you'd put a gig-saw puzzle together. Kennedy hired Lou Harris to discover, he paid no attention to places that wouldn't vote Democratic in any case. But he went to those places that would vote for a Democrat and those places that looked like they would be swing states, and Harris discovered what those people wanted in a president. Whenever Kennedy gave a national talk it was very generic, motherhood and apple pie. But he was presented to the people locally as the person that Lou Harris said they wanted to elect. And so the people in the North were electing quite a differnt person than the people in the South were, and they were both electing Kennedy. After he did that so successfully it has never been changed, that is the way one runs politics now. You're aware of that. Someone said to me the other day, that the most powerful Mormon in the United States is the fellow who operates Reagan's pollster organization. And there's probably a good deal of truth to that. The other thing that Kennedy did that, oh it didn't work quite, he had to serve donuts and coffee in Chicago and

in Texas in order to get elected, but he did get elected. The other thing that Kennedy did that no one will ever be able to undo was realize the power of federal money. The time has long since past, hasn't it? Can I keep talking for just a little while, am I boring you? Do you want to go home? If you want to go home, you can go home, it's after 8:30. Let me give you some examples. Let's go back away; in Rome, Rome was a democracy, earliest republic. The aristocracy decided that they wanted to get control of the citizens of Rome and they used a very simple approach. They used public money for the private good, which means that they could be very generous with the public funds. And bought power in Rome. Initially they did it simply by, Rome was, well they just bribed people and the guy that could bribe the best would always get in power. But after awhile some of the Romans discovered that it would be a whole lot better to do their bribing without using private funds, much more economical. And so they came to the Romans with this approach, you are special. That's the beginning, that's always the beginning. That's the beginning of every kind of seduction. Whether you're talking about sexual immorality, whether you're talking about political, or economic seduction the beginning of all seduction is this. You, or the situation, one or the other, is special and in your specialness the normal rules that apply, don't apply. So having gotten rid of the normal rules and their consequences we can go on. Because the citizens of Rome were special they ought not to be as other people were, imposed upon by the responsibilities of feeding and clothing and entertaining themselves. And so the Roman government provided free food, wheat from Egypt, free entertainment, Christians, and free rent, just as long as from Rome, to the Roman citizens. And in the process they divested from the Roman citizens the power to feed themselves, provide their own housing and entertain themselves. And so the specialness of the Roman people caused them to be slaves. [ ]how it worked, brilliant strategy. I already referred to them once the inventor of the bureaucracy, at

least for modern times was the Sun King, Louis XIV, for generations the Duke of Burgundy was technically the king, which was what Louis was, had been fighting civil wars with the other aristocracies in France. Burgundy had more land than Paris did and Burgundy always wanted to try to be kind, and they were just fighting each other all the time. But as soon as Louis became of age the war stopped. He announced he simply wasn't going to spend his money fighting anybody anymore. Instead he built Versailles, this gorgeous palace. And Versailles had enough rooms in it, that it could house in elegant, private apartments all of the landed aristocracy of France. And then he said to them, "It is really below your dignity that you should have to administer the affairs of state, therefore the bureaucracy, and it is absolutely below your dignity that you should have to be out there in the netherlands, in the back country of France, and away from all of the elegance that is Versailles, and so you come here as my guests. So the aristocracy left their lands, which was the seated source of their power, and came to Versailles, where they got elegant cuisine, where they got unlimited and unrestricted entertainment, and where they lived in the most elegant new palace on the face of the earth, and within that generation the aristocracy of France was divested of their power to control. Even their own estates almost. If you want a really good example, you look at the American Indians, a vigorous people...What are you grining about? Am I boring you? The American Indians once knew how to take care of themselves. But the government put them on reservations, insisted on giving them their food, on giving them enough beer that they could be properly entertained, and insisted on providing their housing and they destroyed them. They destroyed their culture. They destroyed their initiative, they destroyed them. The first American president, if not the,....I was going to say politician but that's stretching it. The first American president to understand that principle was John Kennedy. And he devised a program that would reach down into the specialness of American citizens, and

provide all of the wants of their happiness. Especially those who felt a little bit disgruntled about not having quite enough. These people he was going to help. When Kennedy came to power American society could be described like this, there were a few rich, there was a great amount of middle class and there were a few poor. By the time Johnson was no longer in power, by definition, the poor was everybody below this group. By the time Jimmy Carter came to power, by definition, I don't know where the poor was when Jimmy Carter came to power. Johnson conducted a war on poverty with all of the elegance that one conducts war. I mean, this was an extra special, a unique situation that needed to mobilize all of the powers of America. It's unlikely that Kennedy could have pulled it off, but Johnson was a politician to do so, and he succeeded. There was one thing that got in his way and that was war. That was a real war. Johnson didn't have time for a real war. He only had time for the pretend one that he had created. And he conducted the real war in a way that is most abominable, he would send soldiers up on hills to be killed and then the next day bring them off of the hill saying that we had slapped the enemies hands, and therefor, we had won. And American's got awfully upset about that kind of war. It was a war without moral basis, it was a war against communists, it was a war against...the communists were ill-defined. They weren't even bad guys. No one really knew what we were doing over there. Someone suggested we ought to end the war and Johnson said this in a public televised news conference. Johnson said, "We can't end the war because if we do it will bring all of those American boys home and we can't let that happen because that will dump them on the American workforce and that will destroy our economy and so we've got to keep them over there where they can be killed and not hurt the economy." Those last words were not his, but the intent was. Yes. [comment from the floor] So Johnson's pretended war was interrupted by his real war, and he was booted and Nixon came into play. Nixon said he was

going to do two things. He says in the first term he was going to get us out of the war without destroying the economy, and the Democrats all said that was impossible. But he did it. He actually succeeded, he got us out of the war, so we weren't slaughtering ourselves any more, and it didn't destroy the economy to do it. He said in his next term he was going to dismantle the great society. And, therefore, Watergate. If you'd like me to talk about that I'll talk about that, but I'm not going to do it tonight. But the therefore should be underlined many, many times. And so Nixon was removed and the great society was kept in tact for Carter. Carter reminds me in a way, I've often wondered how I could describe the utter incompetence of this wholly incompetent man, in a way that is visually acceptable, and the nearest thing that I can come up with is the story of "The Emperor's New Clothes". [laughter] Here was a man who pretended to be a liberal, I mean a conservative, and therefore, got elected. As soon as he got into office he acted as a liberal and he acted [end of tape]