

# Who Fails to Learn the Lessons

Nobody asked but ...

Some time I picked up the notion that some leaders name natural enemies (of one another) as their lieutenants, hoping to gain the benefits of survival of the fittest. Perhaps the notion arose from a review of a Doris Kearns Goodwin book — the notion, combined with my earlier conclusions on statism and *faux* leadership, caused me to pass on Ms. Goodwin's books. I may have formed the opinion, rightly or not, that she was feeding the negative traits of human development rather than exposing them for what they are.

Daniel Webster said, "There are men in all ages who mean to govern well, but they mean to govern. They promise to be good masters, but they mean to be masters." Let me rephrase that: Some leaders mean to be GOOD but more than that, they mean to be FOLLOWED, at all costs. I hope that reaffirms Webster, as well as clarifying and amplifying.

Does anyone dispute that the above is a set of fact? Is not that an important lesson of history? Why don't we, as an intelligent species, escape? Why don't we focus?

— Kilgore Forelle