

Who Are They? The Shadows Behind the Screen

Recently, there appeared in the London Sunday Telegraph (6/27/93) a lengthy article about Britain's secret education establishment. It was revealed that since 1941 this shadowy group, known as the All-Souls Group and representing some of the most powerful people in the world of British education, have been meeting three times a year in an oak-panelled room at Oxford University. The article states:

Many believe it is here, rather than at the Department of Education, that crucial questions about schools are raised. One member, who did not want to be named, said that the group had caused frustration to successive Education Secretaries.

"One of the reasons why Margaret Thatcher got so infuriated with the educational establishment was that it seemed to have a private core which she couldn't get her teeth into, and half her civil servants seems to be involved," he said.

Anyone who discloses details of who was present or what was said risks being black-balled. No minutes are kept, no papers or public statements ever emerge, and the membership list has never before been published. . . . Over Saturday evening sherry in the gardens of Rhodes House, Oxford, and later over dinner, the great and the good speak frankly together about government policy -- and they rarely have anything complimentary to say.

They are protected by Chatham House Rules, which dictate proceedings are off the record. Those who do not share the group's Left-wing views are occasionally invited to speak, but rarely receive a sympathetic hearing.

Each member is free to bring a guest, and the result is a volatile mixture of the most powerful and the most radical in today's educational world. . . .

Membership is by invitation and the criteria are shrouded in mystery. Names are put forward by members, and after they have attended a meeting a decision is made on whether they have anything to contribute. . . . There are about 50 active members and, once in, few leave.

Does such an exclusive, secretive education establishment exist in the United States? Undoubtedly. That's the reason why President Reagan could not abolish the Department of Education, and why conservatives in the department were pressured out of their positions the moment they started to do anything threatening to the establishment. Who are they in that top controlling group? The top foundation heads like Ernest Boyer, top professors of education like John Goodlad, Bill Spady, and TedSizer, and top educational operatives in the state and federal governments. They are the ones who decide on policy and coordinate its implementation throughout the United States and provide the funding for it.

Otherwise, how explain the implementation of Outcome-Based Education in state after

state as if orchestrated by a central control? How explain the widespread use of whole language in teaching reading when we know that it produces crippled readers? How explain this orchestrated hostility against intensive phonics among educators?

As for the actual formation of an education establishment in the U.S., it seems to have started with a confidential meeting called the Cleveland Conference organized in 1915 by Prof. Charles Judd, head of the University of Chicago School of Education. Judd, who got his Ph.D at Leipzig under Prof. Wilhelm Wundt, was spearheading the movement to reform education in the psycho-progressive mold. David Tyack writes in his book *Managers of Virtue* (p. 132):

[Judd] had a vision that both the structure of the schools and the curriculum needed radical revision, but that change would take place "in the haphazard fashion that has characterized our school history unless some group gets together and undertakes, in a cooperative way, to coordinate reforms."

Judd urged the members of the Cleveland Conference to jump into the breach and undertake "the positive and aggressive task of . . . a detailed reorganization of the materials of instruction in schools of all grades." One of the most important reforms promoted by Judd was in the teaching of reading. It was his protégé William Scott Gray who produced the Dick and Jane look-say reading program that began America's downward slide into illiteracy.

Among the 19 members who attended the first Cleveland Conference were James R. Angell, a Leipzig alumnus who became president of the University of Chicago and later president of Yale; Leonard Ayres, director of the Russell Sage Foundation; Abraham Flexner of the Rockefeller Foundation; Paul Hanus, director of the Harvard Graduate School of Education; Paul Monroe, founder of the World Federation of Education Associations; Edward L. Thorndike, father of educational psychology at Teachers College, Columbia University; and Ellwood P. Cubberly of Stanford University's School of Education.

Among others who joined in later years were Lyman Bryson of CBS, John Gardner of the Carnegie Corporation, James Bryant Conant of Harvard, and Ralph Tyler of Stanford whose pioneering work in psychological testing helped Benjamin Bloom design Outcome-Based Education. David Tyack writes (p. 132):

Having no constitution, no minutes, no officers save a "factotum," no bylaws, no "public life," the conference was described in 1949 as a club whose "sole object is to make it possible for forty or fifty men to meet once a year and talk about whatever they are interested in for ten or a dozen hours in session and an unpredictable number of hours in lobbies or bedrooms." Members had a chance to "learn about the news behind the news," to get to know leaders in a variety of fields, to share information about new educational programs or jobs or foundation grants or new government programs or regulations. When the Commonwealth Fund decided to give large sums for educational research, for example, its officer Max Farrand outlined the funding program to conference members first.

And now you know why the education establishment is so unresponsive to parental wishes and why the only educational alternatives for parents is to get their children out of the government schools and into homeschooling or a decent private school.

Incidentally, the Chatham House Rules mentioned in the *Sunday Telegraph*, which means that all conference proceedings are off the record, refers to Chatham House,

the home of the Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA), the British counterpart of our Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). And Oxford, where the All Souls Group meets, is also where Bill Clinton studied on his Rhodes Scholarship. The scholarships were founded by Cecil Rhodes, who made his fortune in gold and diamond mining in South Africa in the 1880s and formed a secret society in 1891 with an elite membership to promote the interests of the British Empire.

Professor Carol Quigley, Bill Clinton's mentor at Georgetown University, wrote a book about the secret society entitled *The Anglo-American Establishment*. Quigley wrote:

The Rhodes Scholarships, established by the terms of Cecil Rhodes's seventh will, are known to everyone. What is not so widely known is that Rhodes in five previous wills left his fortune to form a secret society, which was to devote itself to the preservation and expansion of the British Empire. And what does not seem to be known to anyone is that this secret society was created by Rhodes and his principal trustee, Lord Milner, and continues to this day. . . .

This society has been known at various times as Milner's Kindergarten, as the Round Table Group, as the Rhodes crowd, as *The Times* crowd, as the All Souls group, and as the Cliveden set. (p. ix)

The scholarships were merely a facade to conceal the secret society, or, more accurately, they were to be one of the instruments by which the members of the secret society could carry out his purpose. (p. 33)

The group obviously failed in its mission to preserve the British Empire, but the Rhodes Scholarships continue to be awarded. Rhodes died in 1902, and the country of Rhodesia, which was named after him, has become Zimbabwe. Are the Rhodes Scholarships now being used to recruit the future leaders of the New World Order? It seems that way, doesn't it.

4.
An article about Cecil Rhodes in the *Boston Globe* of Feb. 14, 1993 remarked:

Cecil John Rhodes would have been delighted at the news that Bill Clinton is president of the United States, for Rhodes specifically intended his scholarships for young men "who have shown during school days that they have instincts to lead [and] esteem the performance of public duties as their highest aim." Moreover . . . he would have been particularly pleased that a Rhodes Scholar was in charge of an administration that included a sizable contingent of his "boys."

In the first years of the scholarships few Americans applied because you had to know Latin and Greek. But these prerequisites were eventually dropped. Today the selection process is conducted by committees of past Rhodes Scholars in different states and regions. According to the *Globe*:

These review the applications and interview the most promising applicants. Prospective scholars describe the interviews as hard but fair; questions can range from fields of study . . . to more personal challenges. . . . At the regional level, applicants are gathered together for an interview process that includes a cocktail party, ostensibly for socialization and hospitality; dark rumors circulate that the party is an occasion for covert assessment of dress, deportment and mastery of the social graces.

What kind of careers do Rhodes Scholars choose when they return to the U.S.? A survey of the first 25 years of scholars found that 33 percent become educators, 24 percent lawyers, 13 percent businessmen, 8 percent doctors, and only 6 percent went into government service. Nowadays, twice as many Rhodes Scholars are entering government service or foundation work.

Some of the Rhodes Scholars who have achieved a modicum of notoriety are J. William Fulbright (1925) U.S. Senator from Arkansas; Daniel J. Boorstin (1934) Librarian of Congress; Walt W. Rostow (1936) national security adviser; Byron R. White (1938) Supreme Court Justice; Nicholas Katzenbach (1947) U.S. attorney general; Stansfield Turner (1947) director of the CIA; Guido Calabresi (1953) dean of Yale Law School; Neil Rudenstine (19056) president of Harvard; Jonathan Kozol (1958) left-wing author and admirer of Fidel Castro whose book on illiteracy says nothing about the cause of our illiteracy problem: the discarding of phonics in favor of look-say; Lester Thurow (1960) liberal economist, dean of Sloan School at MIT; David Souter (1961) U.S. Supreme Court Justice; David Boren (1963) U.S. Senator; Richard Lugar (1954) U.S. Senator; Paul Sarbannes (1954) U.S. Senator; Bill Bradley (1965) U.S. Senator; Robert Reich (1968) U.S. Secretary of Labor; George Sephanopoulos (1984) Clinton's White House spokesman; and Thomas F. Birmingham (1972) Massachusetts state senator who sponsored and promoted the state's new OBE reform bill.

As you will notice, there isn't a true conservative among them. All of them to some degree or another are promoting the agenda of the New World Order. According to Malachi Martin, the pagan, free-market New World Order is merely one of three forces vying for hegemony over the human race. He writes in his book, *The Keys of This Blood* (p. 15):

Willing or not, ready or not, we are all involved in an all-out, no-holds-barred, three-way global competition. Most of us are not competitors, however. We are the stakes. For the competition is about who will

establish the first one-world system of government that has ever existed in the society of nations. . . . The competition is all-out because, now that it has started, there is no way it can be reversed or called off. No holds are barred because, once the competition has been decided, the world and all that's in it -- our way of life as individuals and as citizens of the nations; our families and our jobs, our trade and commerce and money; our educational systems and our religions and our cultures, even the badges of our national identity, which most of us have always taken for granted -- all will have been powerfully and radically altered forever. No one can be exempted from its effects. No sector of our lives will remain untouched. The competition began and continues as a three-way affair because that is the number of rivals with sufficient resources to establish and maintain a new world order. . . . Indeed, the three rivals themselves . . . speak about this new world order not as something around a distant corner of time, but as something that is imminent. As a system that will be introduced and installed in our midst by the end of this final decade of the second millennium.

Who are the three contenders? Martin sees the first as Christian civilization based on Biblical morality and values. He sees the Catholic church as the last remaining world-wide stronghold of those values. Its opposition to abortion in the face of fierce secular humanist pressure indicates that it has not abandoned moral absolutism.

The second contender is communism which is by no means dead. In fact, recent events in Russia attest to the enduring power of the communist establishment which is about to put a stop to the free-market, privatization process. In addition, Gorbachev has become head of a new world organization called the Green Cross which has as its aim an "ecologically safe future" for mankind. In an interview in *Parade Magazine* of January 23, 1994, Gorbachev said:

The Green Cross is in its infancy but is already drawing strong support. . . . We need a global focus. . . . We have to change our values. We have to educate people. . . . Educational systems all over the world must take up this task, international codes of law must be developed, and the practical work of environmental cleanup must be undertaken. . . . Leaders in religion, politics and science must speak out and point us in new directions, toward a new paradigm for our civilization. . . . If we're going to protect the planet's ecology, we're going to need to find alternatives to the consumerist dream that is attracting the world. . . . We recognize the gradualness of change, as we recognize the urgency of change. . . . We recognize that we will learn as we go. There is no clear answer, except that the old ideologies in our civilization must give way to the new challenges to our civilization. The growing environmental movement in the world must be the vehicle for that.

Note the use of a green cross as an ecological symbol. A good deal of careful thinking and marketing knowhow must have gone into the choice of a cross to symbolize a movement led by Gorbachev.

Concerning the third contender, Martin writes:

The final contender in the competition for the new world order is not a single individual leader of a single institution or territory. It is a group of men who are united as one in power, mind and will for the purpose of achieving a single common goal: to be victorious in the competition for the new global hegemony. While the acknowledged public leader and spokesman for this group is the current American president, the contenders who compose this assemblage of individuals are Americans and Europeans who, taken together, represent every nation in the Western democratic alliance. Unremittingly globalist in their vision and their activities, these individuals operate from two principal power bases. The first is the power base of finance, industry and technology. Entrepreneurial in their occupations, the men in this phalanx qualify themselves, and are often referred to by others, as

Transnationalist in their outlook. . . .

Members of the second phalanx of this group of globalist contenders -- Internationalists, as they are frequently called -- bring with them invaluable experience in government, intergovernmental relationships, and in the rarefied art of international politics. . . . Transnationalists and Internationalists can be said for all practical purposes to act as one: to constitute one main contender. . . . Both are so closely intertwined in their membership that individuals move easily and with great effect from an Internationalist to a Transnationalist role and back again. And not the least important in the all-encompassing confrontation that is under way, both groups share the same philosophy about human life and its ultimate meaning -- a philosophy that appears, in the surprised view of some observers, to be closer to Mikhail Gorbachev's than to Pope John Paul's.

It's important to understand that what is taking place in American public education today is a direct result of decisions being made at the top by those planning to lead us into a world government. That is why whole language and Outcome Based Education is being imposed on our schools in the orchestrated manner in which it is being done.

If you doubt that such an organized group of planners exists, let me quote to you several passages from Carroll Quigley's monumental history of the world in our time, *Tragedy and Hope*, published in 1966 when Bill Clinton was one of his students at Georgetown University in Washington, D.C. Clinton, incidentally, got his Rhodes Scholarship in 1968. Quigley writes (p. 950):

There does exist, and has existed for a generation, an international Anglophile network which operates, to some extent, in the way the radical Right believes the Communists act. In fact, this network, which we may identify as the Round Table Groups, has no aversion to cooperating with the Communists, or any other groups, and frequently does so. I know of the operations of this network because I have studied it for twenty years and was permitted for two years, in the early 1960's, to examine its papers and secret records. I have no aversion to it and to many of its instruments. I have objected, both in the past and recently, to a few of its policies . . . but in general my chief difference of opinion is that it wishes to remain unknown, and I believe its role in history is significant enough to be known. . . .

It was this group of people, whose wealth and influence so exceeded their experience and understanding, who provided much of the framework of influence which the Communist sympathizers and fellow travelers took over in the United States in the 1930's. It must be recognized that the power that these energetic Left-wingers exercised was never their own power or Communist power but was ultimately the power of the international financial coterie, and, once the anger and suspicions of the American people were aroused, as they were by 1950, it was a fairly simple matter to get rid of the Red sympathizers. Before this could be done, however, a congressional committee, following backward to their source the threads which led from admitted Communists like Whittaker Chambers, through Alger Hiss, and the Carnegie Endowment to Thomas Lamont and the Morgan Bank, fell into the whole complicated network of the interlocking tax-exempt foundations. The Eighty-third Congress in July 1953 set up a Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations with Representative B. Carroll Reece, of Tennessee, as chairman. It soon became clear that people of immense wealth would be unhappy if the investigation went too far and that the "most respected" newspapers in the country, closely allied with these men of wealth, would not get excited enough about any revelations to make the publicity worth while, in terms of votes or campaign contributions. An interesting report showing the Left-wing associations of the interlocking nexus of tax-exempt foundations was issued in 1954 rather quietly. Four years later, the Reece committee's general counsel, Rene A. Wormser, wrote a shocked, but not shocking, book on the subject called *Foundations: Their Power and Influence*. (p. 955)

e All of which brings us to the real source of control of American education: the big tax-exempt foundations. While a good deal of the money lubricating educational

restructuring today comes from federal and state governments, the private foundations were a crucial source of funding for progressive education in the early days. For example in the Reese Committee Staff Report on Relations Between Foundations and Education, we read:

According to our compilations, the Carnegie Corp. has contributed to all educational purposes from 1911 to 1950, approximately \$25,300,000. . . . The Carnegie Corporation of New York had contributed a total of \$1,237,711 to the National Education Association, the Progressive Education Association, the American Council of Education, perhaps the major part of their sustenance in the early years.

In the area of curriculum reform and textbook revision, the Carnegie Corporation provided the American Historical Society with the funds to produce a new set of social studies textbooks with a clear pro-socialist bias.

Norman Dodd, a former banker who had been appointed research director of the Reese Committee was asked to investigate the tax-exempt foundations. He found that only 12 of the 7,000 foundations in the country represented 80 percent of the capital endowments of all of them. He and his staff decided to concentrate on those 12. He writes (*Freeman Digest*, June 1984):

This brings me to two experiences which I will describe to you. The first was my response to an invitation during November 1953, from President Roman Gaither of the Ford Foundation, to meet in his office in New York. Upon arriving there, I was greeted with the following:

"Mr. Dodd, we invited you to come because we thought that perhaps, off the record, you would be kind enough to tell us why the Congress is interested in the operations of foundations such as ourselves." Before I could think of how best to reply, he volunteered this: "Mr. Dodd, we operate here under directives . . . which emanate from the White House. Would you like to know what the substance of their directives is?"

My answer was, "Yes, Mr. Gaither, I would like very much to know."

Whereupon he said: "The substance of the directives under which we operate is that we shall use our grant-making power to alter life in the United States so that we can be comfortably merged with the Soviet Union."

Needless to say, I nearly fell off the chair. . . .

I said, "Mr. Gaither, legally you are entitled to use your grant-making power for this purpose but I do not think you are entitled to withhold this information from the American people to whom you are beholden for your tax exemption. So why do you not tell the American people what you have just told me?"

His answer was: "Mr. Dodd, we would not think of doing that."

The next experience Dodd had was with the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace which had worked hard to get the U.S. Senate to ratify the United Nations treaty. The president of the foundation, Dr. Joseph Johnson, who had succeeded Alger Hiss in that position, was extremely cooperative and offered Dodd's staff access to the corporation's minute books from its inception. Dodd writes:

My first reaction is that he had lost his mind. I had some suspicion what these minute books might well contain, but there was no objection from their counsel and there seemed to be no disagreement on the part of the vice presidents.

All of them were relatively young. My guess was that none of them had ever read the minutes themselves. As a result, I accepted the invitation and sent a member of my staff to New York. She later brought back to me on Dictaphone belts what she had dictated from the minutes of the board. This information came as a

shock to all of us.

In 1908 the trustees had raised this question, "Is there any way known to man more effective than war, assuming that you wish to alter the life of an entire people?" They discussed this question academically and in a scholarly fashion for almost a year and came up with the conclusion that war is the most effective means known to man, assuming that you want to begin concentrating power in government and abandon the dispersion of authority contemplated by the Constitution.

They then raised Question No. 2: "How do we involve the United States in such a war?" This was in 1909. . . . The trustees answered the question this way: "We must control the diplomatic machinery of the United States."

That brings up Question No. 3, which is: "How do we secure control of the diplomatic machinery of the United States?" And the answer comes up, "We must get control of the State Department."

That tied in with prior information our committee had uncovered indicating that the hand of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace had already become a powerful policy-making force inside the State Department.

Finally, in 1917, we did get in a war -- World War I. These trustees then had the brashness to congratulate themselves on the wisdom and validity of their original decision. The impact of our participation in World War I immediately indicated its capacity to alter our national life. The trustees even went so far as to dispatch a telegram to President Woodrow Wilson, pressuring him to see to it that the war did not end too quickly. v

Finally the war was over. The trustees then took up the problem of preventing -- as they put it -- a reversion of life in the United States to what it was prior to 1914. They came to the conclusion that to gain that end they must somehow get control of education in the United States. They realized this was a prodigious piece of work, so they tried to obtain the assistance of the Rockefeller Foundation.

It should be noted that prominent educators were among the earliest trustees of the various foundations. For example, Nicholas Murray Butler (1862-1947), who was president of Columbia University from 1901 to 1945, was an original trustee of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, a trustee of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, and president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He was also president of the National Education Association in 1895.

Frank E. Spaulding (1866-1960), a Wundtian PhD who organized Yale's department of education and wrote numerous textbooks, was a member of the Rockefeller funded General Education Board from 1917 to 1920. It was a half-million dollar grant from the General Education Board in 1920 which financed the establishment of the Harvard Graduate School of Education. Walter A. Jessup (1877-1944), who got his PhD at Teachers College, Columbia University, and became president of the University of Iowa in 1916, became president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in 1934 and president of the Carnegie Corporation in 1941.

In short, top educators have been part and parcel of the secret elitist network promoting a humanist world government from the very beginning, and they have used the great foundations to finance their plans. In 1985 an American-Soviet education agreement was negotiated by the Carnegie Corporation for the purpose of developing curricula and teaching materials for American schools.

Also in 1985, the Carnegie Corporation of New York established the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. In May 1985 the Forum's advisory Council created the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. The result of the Task Force's work was a report entitled "A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century." In it is the rationale

for all of the insanity that now passes for educational restructuring. As the report said, "We do not believe the educational system needs repairing; we believe it must be rebuilt to match the drastic change needed in our economy if we are to prepare our children for productive lives in the 21st century."

What were the solutions offered by the Carnegie Forum? A National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (to control who may or may not teach), an "integrated" curriculum, team teaching, school-based management, life-long learning, critical thinking, higher order thinking skills, etc. And the way for implementation has been well lubricated by grants to the Education Commission of the States, the National Governors Association, the Council of Chief State School Officers, and the National Association of State Boards of Education.

At the same time, the U.S. Department of Education is pumping billions of dollars into educational "research" through its own grant-giving powers. But the Department of Education apparently takes its orders from the Carnegie Foundation, for most, if not all, of its grants support the educational aims and goals of the Carnegie group.

One of the things I've learned over the past ten years is that in this business you have to know who's who. You have to know who you can trust and who you can't. For example, one of the biggest mistake made by the first Reagan administration was the appointment of Terrel H. Bell as Secretary of Education. Reagan wanted to abolish the Department of Education, but Bell wanted to preserve it, for he was an establishment educator and no one in the Reagan administration had any idea that that would create a problem. The next four years proved to be an endless struggle between Bell and the conservatives, and in the end, the conservatives lost a crucial cultural battle, even though Bill Bennett replaced Bell in the second term.

To give you an idea of how much of an insider Bell was, let me read to you a short letter sent to him by G. Leland Burningham, State Superintendent of Public Instruction in Utah, dated July 27, 1984. Burningham writes:

Dear Ted:

I am forwarding this letter to accompany the proposal which you recommended Bill Spady and I prepare in connection with Outcome-Based Education.

This proposal centers around the detailed process by which we will work together to implement Outcome-Based Education using research verified programs. This will make it possible to put outcome-based education in place, not only in Utah but in all the schools of the nation. For those who desire, we will stand ready for regional and national dissemination of the Outcome-Based Education program.

We are beginning to see positive, preliminary results from some of the isolated schools in Utah which have implemented Outcome-Based Education. These positive indicators are really exciting!

We sincerely urge your support for funding the proposal as presented.

Warmest regards, Lee.

What good is it to elect conservatives to office if they don't know what to do with the power they've been given? By the way, it was Jim Baker on the White House staff who proved to be Bell's most valuable ally in the war against the conservatives. But what

that letter reveals is that 10 years ago Terrel Bell, Leland Burningham, and Bill Spady were planning to put OBE in all of the schools of America. Whom can you trust among these establishment educationists? Not a one.

There is one other federal education program I'd like to talk to you about. It's been in the works since 1974, but you didn't hear about it until Bev Eakman exposed it in her book, *Educating for the 'New World Order,'* published in 1991. It's about the monster computerized National Data System of Elementary and Secondary Education which will collect personal information about every child in the public system to be used by the government for its own purposes.

All of this is tied in with Vice President Al Gore's drive to build an information superhighway across the nation. This will mean the complete loss of privacy for the American citizen and the ability of government to control everyone through the education system. If you add to that the information the government has about you in the files of the IRS, and the information the government will have about you in Clinton's socialized healthcare program, our rulers will have a complete, detailed dossier on every American citizen. Our lives will be more controlled than in any other society in history. It will be the end of individual freedom in America. And if you don't think the government means business, let me refer you to what happened last year in Waco.

How can we fight this billion-dollar educational juggernaut determined to destroy our freedom? It's not easy, but it can be done with patience, persistence, and a strategy that finds the weak links in the totalitarian system.

In a way, we are much better prepared today than we were ten years ago. We have much more information than we had then, and we are much more aware of the wily ways of the enemy. I think our next step is to hold conferences on strategy. This conference is informational, and you should take this information and get it to as many potential allies as possible. There cannot be an awakened public until the information is read, absorbed and understood. That is the job that must be done in the months ahead.

But let us not repeat the mistakes of the past. Let us not appoint Terrel Bells to fight for our freedom. If the Republican party is not controlled by conservatives but by New World Order so-called moderates, it will not help us regain our freedoms. We know what happens when conservatives and moderates coexist in the same Republican administration. The moderates do everything in their power to thwart conservative aims.

Conservatives must learn how to use power when they get it, even though political power is something they don't like. That is why conservatives must fight to gain control of their local Republican organizations and run for office. Only the state legislatures and the Congress can put a stop to this totalitarian drive. Only when our own people are in the state legislatures and the Congress will our words be heard.