



CHRISTIAN CRUSADE FOR TRUTH

Intelligence Newsletter

"And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." John 8:32.

May - June, 1999

The Judicial Branch And The Cultural War

In the [January-February issue](#) we presented the ongoing cultural war from the secular viewpoint. In that issue we showed some of the examples, space permitting, of the efforts and results of the attempt to retain our Western European Christian culture. There are many fine, dedicated patriots literally consuming themselves in this fight to the death. Their state of mind is, "For God and Country." They continue with the mind set, or soul and spirit, comparable to that of John Paul Jones. We should review John Paul's efforts to show the magnitude of the undertaking.



John Paul Jones

John Paul migrated to America from Scotland at which time he added the name *Jones*. It was John Paul Jones, who alone of all the naval heroes of the Revolutionary War, has left a permanent name in history. The book *History of the United States of America* by Henry W. Elson tells of his exploits. "With a squadron of three ships led by the *Bonhomme Richard* he met Captain Pearson with the *Serapis* and *Scarborough* convoying a fleet of merchant vessels off the coast of Famborough Head, England, and at once the two flagships engaged in a desperate conflict. It was the evening of September 23, 1779, when the battle opened, and during the long hours of the night the boom of cannon rolled across the waters. In the midst of the battle Jones intentionally ran his vessel into her antagonist and ceased firing for the moment. Captain Pearson called out, 'Have you struck your colors?' **'I have not yet begun to fight,'** was the now famous answer of Jones. A hand grenade from the *Richard* was thrown into the hatchway of the *Serapis*, where it ignited a row of cartridges, and in the explosion that followed twenty men were blown to pieces. Still the two commanders doggedly continued the battle until both ships were on fire, and half their crews were dead or wounded, when at last the *Serapis* surrendered. Jones towed his prize to Holland. The news of the victory made a profound sensation on the continent, as it was told and retold in every language in Europe. Nothing before, except the surrender of Burgoyne, had called the world's attention to the rising nation in the west as did this signal victory in sight of the British coast."

How dare those who presently are attempting to destroy our Christian culture take the history of men like John Paul Jones as **theirs!** They are traitors of the worst type. They are openly and flagrantly forcing upon us a one world government, a one world people and a one world religion which is simply a new culture. That culture is to be totally different from our time honored Western European Christian culture. They are intentionally doing this evil thing and all the while waving the flag and praising the Constitution.

In the [January-February issue](#) we could cover only the concept of the secular part of this great conflict. In the [March-April issue](#) we showed the cultural war from some of the Christian Church aspects. We could see how the Christian Church changed into the Judeo-

Christian Church. That issue, too, was only the highlights of this ongoing battle. The purpose of these history lessons is to create and maintain a vital interest and a participation of all of us. We simply cannot, and must not, sit idly by and let the modern leaders for freedom (and there are many) do it by themselves.

The modern Judeo-Christian Church is solely an emotional trip with an attempt to declare it to be in the name of Jesus Christ. The clergy refuses to discuss the reasons why our society has fallen from the teachings of Jesus. Real men have left the churches leaving the direction of the movement to the women. The deacons are now deaconesses! As a nation, we deserve what we are getting.

The intent of these newsletters describing the various aspects of a cultural war is for one specific purpose. That purpose is to show that our Western Christian culture is in a death struggle and if the situation doesn't change, it will be extinct before another century has passed. Already, there are many who believe that our culture has changed into what is called the American Culture. The Christian Culture of our history is gone, according to them. They could be right. In that event, can we retrieve it. With God's help, we believe we can.

As the author Leon Podles in his book *The Church Impotent* describes, "Life (our culture) is a football game, with the men fighting it out on the gridiron, while the minister is up in the grandstand, explaining it to the ladies." His book proves that the current preoccupation with the role of women in the church obscures the more serious problem of the perennial absence of men. His book argues that Western churches have become "womens clubs," and that the emasculation of Christianity is dangerous for the church and society (our culture), and that a masculine presence can and must be restored. He also proves that other religions and cultures are not feminized. He shows that Islam and Judaism are predominantly masculine. These two cultures, along with China, are the primary threats to the Western Christian culture (*The Church Impotent*, Spence Publishing Co., Dallas TX, ISBN 1-890626-07-4).

We have discussed the argument that the United States is now a Talmudic nation ([Sept.-Oct., 1996 issue](#)). In reality, all of the Western Christian nations are now under the Talmudic concept for their governments. Every Christian in the West should feel some shame for this to have happened. It is important that we know the history of this phenomon. But we don't need to feel totally alone! Our ancestors were the start of it. Must we allow it to continue or can it be reversed?

"The Lord is longsuffering, and of great mercy, forgiving iniquity and transgression, and by no means clearing the guilty, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation. Pardon, I beseech thee, the iniquity of this people according unto the greatness of thy mercy, and as thou hast forgiven this people, from Egypt even until now."

"And the Lord said, I have pardoned according to thy work: But as truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled with glory of the Lord. Because all those men which have seen my glory, and my miracles, which I did in Egypt and in the wilderness, and have tempted me now these ten times, and have not hearkened to my voice; Surely they shall not see the land which I swear unto their fathers, neither shall any of them that provoked me see it:" ([Num 14:18-23](#))

We can't imagine just how long-suffering God actually is. This cultural war has actually been going on since the time when Jesus conducted His ministry. God has simply continued forgiving iniquity and transgressions by just adding on another three and four generations to the long list! God, in all of His omnipotence simply lets us destroy ourselves if we choose!

The Talmudic influence in the destruction of the Christian culture cannot be refuted. The proof of it is without question. When a group, any group, openly and ostentatiously writes about what they have done and will do it is proof enough. Then, when one reads history, current events, and predictions of the future, the proof cannot be questioned.

There are many well known and knowledgeable individuals who understand that our culture is being destroyed. They have written about it and made presentations about it repeatedly. Perhaps understandably they are consistently mute regarding the Talmudic influence on this phenomenon. They want to protect their families and themselves just as we all do! But what if Nathan Hale, Paul Revere, John Paul Jones and all of those men at Valley Forge had felt that way?

So, first, we will again repeat some passages out of the book *The Wisdom of the Talmud* by Rabbi Ben Zion Bokser, Philosophical Library, New York, 1951. We have on more than one occasion printed this portion of Bokser's book. We must continue to repeat it until all of our people fully understand that this is truly a Talmudic nation.

"The growth of Talmudic Law, in all its aspects, was for the most part, the work of judicial interpretation rather than of formal legislation. The Rabbis who were called upon to administer the old law reckoned with the conditions under which it was to be applied. And if they thought the mechanical application of precedent in conflict with the demands of equity, they resorted to reinterpretations which withdrew the new case from the old category into which it seemed, by the rules of formal logic, to fall. The case so decided then became precedent for parallel situations.

"The judge served in effect as a creator of law and not only as its interpreter, a phenomenon which has been duplicated in every system of jurisprudence. (That is especially true with respect to the Western European Christian culture.-ed.)

"The social process frequently brings individuals into a position where they exercise power over the lives of others. In the social theory of Talmudic Judaism, it then becomes the task of the community to develop such instruments of social control as will rationalize that power with moderation and justice. The Talmudists declared individual property rights as subject to their consistency with the public welfare. When it is to serve the public interest, these rights may be modified or suspended altogether. Basing its action on this principle, Talmudic legislation regulated wages and hours of labor, commodity prices and rates of profit. They held it was similarly the task of the community to provide other facilities for promoting the public welfare, such as public baths, competent medical services, and adequate educational facilities for all, at least on an elementary level.

"Indigent townsmen were given a weekly allowance for food and clothing. Transients received their allowance daily. Ready food was also kept available to cope with immediate needs. For the poor traveler and the homeless, public inns were frequently built on the high roads. All these facilities were maintained from the proceeds of a general tax to which all residents of a community contributed.

"Perhaps the most interesting form of poor relief, from a modern standpoint, is a public works project for the assistance of the unemployed, the details of which have been preserved by Josephus but which was instituted in Talmudic law.

"The Talmud gives evidence of a continuously growing program of welfare legislation, in which ever wider sectors of social life were brought under the control of a law, whose motivating impulse was the welfare of the common man. Thus the law empowered the community to assume responsibility for elementary education and poor relief. It authorized

the supervision of weights and measures, and of fair wages and prices to prevent unethical business practices.

"The pressure of a higher moral standard inspired the Talmudic liberalization of the Jewish criminal code. Capital punishment is provided in the Bible for a variety of crimes. But the Rabbis found capital punishment reprehensible, and they rendered it almost inoperative by hedging it with conditions that made of the old law a dead letter. Thus they insisted that the commission of a culpable act must be preceded by a warning and by an expression of defiance on the part of the criminal in the face of that warning." End of quotes from *The Wisdom of the Talmud*.

The [Constitution](#) of the United States was based on Common Law, which is based on the Laws of God as revealed in the Bible. As long as the American culture remained with that Constitution, along with the Bill of Rights, we were able to retain our culture. With the inclusion of the Amendments after the first ten, our culture began its long spiral into destruction. That started immediately following the intentionally contrived and manipulated Civil War. As Franklin Roosevelt said, "Nothing happens in politics by accident. If it happens it was intended to happen." Every bit of legislation, and enforcement of that legislation since the Civil War, has been Talmudic in nature.

One can readily see Socialism in those words of Rabbi Boxser. One can see Communism. One can see the modern political mentality of "Tax and Spend." It has become the "Constitutional" way by throwing money at all of our problems. The Republicans and Democrats alike fall all over each other passing more and more legislation which requires more and more money.

An article in *The American Hebrew* dated September 10, 1920 stated this: "The Bolshevik revolution in Russia was the work of Jewish brains, of Jewish dissatisfaction, of Jewish planning, whose goal is to create a new order in the world. What was performed in so excellent a way in Russia, thanks to Jewish brains, and because of Jewish dissatisfaction and by Jewish planning, shall also, through the same Jewish mental and physical forces, become a reality all over the world."

All of this has not gone unnoticed by leaders even though they may not understand the Talmudic influence. These "intellectuals" (that is not a derogatory word!) have repeatedly gathered in conferences and debates on this most pressing subject of the destruction of our Western heritage. Their concerns and their thoughts on solutions will be reflected in the remainder of this issue. Read these comments with Christian concern. The title of the book (and debate), is, *The End Of Democracy?, The Judicial Usurpation Of Politics*; edited by Richard John Neuhaus, Spence Publishing Co. Dallas, Texas 75202.

They all show concern for the future of our country and our Christian culture. However, they seem to have the same problem that was discussed in the last issue. That problem was the total acceptance of universalism and assimilation by our Christian Churches. We showed in the last issue that the problem of universalism and assimilation has been with us since the days of Eusebius and some of the other early church leaders. They simply could not comprehend the ethnic messages of Jesus and "The Way."

Also, they could not, or would not, observe and report on the fact that the Judicial system in the United States has become totally Talmudic in nature. If they could only have related our present judicial system to what Rabbi Ben Zion Boxser described in his book *The Wisdom of the Talmud*, their solutions would then have become obvious to them.

The Preface of the book itself describes the problem that we as Christians must address and we will quote some of it. "As the editors said in that November, 1996 issue of the

magazine *First Things*, discussion about 'judicial activism' and 'the imperial judiciary' is hardly new. Such discussion has been a staple in our public discourse for some decades, usually under the auspices of thinkers who are viewed as conservatives. Why then did the symposium spark such intense debate? The simple answer and, I believe, the accurate answer is that we took the Supreme Court up on the challenge that it has issued in a number of decisions, including several remarkable decisions of the 1996 term. We did not raise the question of the 'legitimacy' of the judicial regime by which we are governed. The Court itself did. A majority of the Court has pronounced the doctrine that the legitimacy of the Court, and indeed the survival of the rule of law, depends upon the American people's submitting to its edicts...The current debate is about the American constitutional order and the procedural rules by which law is made. Beyond the procedural, it is also a substantive debate about the connection between laws and higher law--whether the latter be understood as rationally determined moral truth, natural law, or as the Declaration of Independence proposes, 'the laws of nature and of nature's God.'"

With that statement the real and underlying debate should have been whose God are we going to discuss with respect to our laws in this country? Are they to be God's Laws as the Declaration states or man's laws as the Talmudic case law system dictates? Jesus is describing the Talmudic Pharisees when He says:

"The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not. For they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders; but they themselves will not move them with one of their fingers."

"But all their works they do for to be seen of men: they make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of their garments, And love the uppermost rooms at the feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues...Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel." (Mat 23:2-6,24)

One of the participants, Robert H. Bork stated this: "Most members of the Court seem to be gnostics, firmly believing they have access to wisdom denied the rest of us. 'What secret knowledge, one must wonder, is breathed into lawyers when they become Justices of this Court?' (Antonin) Scalia has asked. 'Day by day, case by case, the Court is busy designing a Constitution for a country I do not recognize.'

"The last term was unusually rich in examples. The Court moved a long way toward making homosexual conduct a constitutional right, adopted the radical feminist view that men and women are essentially identical, continued to view the First Amendment as a protection of self-gratification rather than of the free articulation of ideas, and overturned two hundred years of history to hold that political patronage is unconstitutional....The First Amendment speech clause has been made a guarantor of moral chaos, while its religion clauses have been reshaped to banish religious symbolism from public life. The court invented a right of privacy and used it to create a wholly specious right to abortion. The list of such incursions into the legitimate sphere of democratic control goes on and on."

It is significantly an example of their lack of understanding of the Talmudic influence when he stated, "while its religion clauses have been reshaped to banish religious symbolism from public life." That is not exactly true. the Mennorah is prominently displayed in many U.S. Post Offices and in many public places throughout the country. It is only Christian symbols that were intended to be abolished.

As we shall shortly see, the Judicial Branch has also gotten into the euthanasia question. The Ninth Circuit Federal District Court made the decision favoring doctor-assisted suicide. This could be fatal to all elderly people if it can be found to be "Constitutional." Was that

decision Talmudic in concept? From the **Encyclopedia Judaica**, page 1191, we find this under the title "Noachide Laws and Pre-Sinaitic Laws" and under a sub-heading titled "Liability for Violation of the Laws" we read this:

"While committed to the principle that 'There is nothing permitted to an Israelite yet forbidden to a heathen' (Sanh. 59a), the seven Noachide Laws were not as extensive as the parallel prohibitions applicable to Jews, and **there are indeed situations in which a non-Jew would be liable for committing an act for which a Jew would not be liable**. As to the latter point, as a general rule, the Noachide is criminally liable for violation of any of his seven laws even though technical definitional limitations would prevent liability for blasphemy--even if only with one of the divine attributes; murder--even of a **foetus (see Embryo)**; robbery--even of less than a perutah; and the eating of flesh torn from a living animal--even of a quantity less than the size of an olive. **In these cases a Jew would not be liable (Sanh. 56a-59b; Yad, Melakhim, ch.9, 10)**. One additional element of greater severity is that violation of any one of the seven laws subjects the Noachide to capital punishment by decapitation (Sanh. 57a)."

Those statements made in the Talmudic book *Sanhedrin* show the authority for making such rulings regarding abortion. Also, it can now be understood why the President had the authority to veto the recent bill outlawing "partial birth abortions." Whether their thought processes are towards the abortion of a fetus or that of infanticide is a mute point.

Charles W. Colson, in his contribution to the debates entitled "Kingdoms in Conflict" (Cultural War), wrote a strong condemnation of our Judicial Branch: "In America today we have very nearly reached the completion of a long process I can only describe as the systematic usurpation of ultimate political power by the American judiciary--a usurpation that compels evangelical Christians and, indeed, all believers to ask sobering questions about the moral legitimacy of the current political order and our allegiance to it. This is an inquiry undertaken reluctantly and, I hope, with due caution, for the stakes are very high. Among the questions we must address is whether millions of Americans are still part of the 'We the People' from which democratic authority is presumably derived.

"A little more than two hundred years into the American experiment, cultural conservatives stand convicted of unspeakable crimes in the eyes of most of America's media commentators. The opponents of abortion on demand, in particular, have felt the whip. Some columnists charge them with fostering a climate of hatred responsible for the Oklahoma City bombing and the Michigan militia. One claimed that 'the main form of political terrorism in the United States is perpetuated by right wing opponents of abortion,' while another added that 'most anti-abortion activists' are 'religious fanatics who want to impose their version of God's word on the rest of us.'

"Writing the decision for the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in *Compassion in Dying v. Washington*, which overturned a state ban on euthanasia, Judge Reinhardt slammed the door on people 'with strong moral or religious convictions,' as he put it. 'They are not free,' he wrote, 'to force their views, their religious convictions, or their philosophies on all the other members of a democratic society.'

"The Supreme Court itself has expressed similar sentiments. In overturning Colorado's prohibition of local civil rights statutes based on sexual preference, the Court in *Romer v. Evans* effectively branded a bigot any citizen who considers homosexuality immoral. Writing for the majority, Justice Kennedy declared, 'Laws of the kind before us raise the inevitable inference that the disadvantage imposed is born of animosity toward the class of persons affected'

"Kennedy's decision, now the law of the land, forces us to ask a series of critically important questions: Are citizens--whether Protestants, Catholics, Jews, or Mormons--who seek to apply transcendent moral values to public life welcome in political, legal, and cultural debates? Are citizens free to 'impose' such values by referendum of legislative means in their respective states, or are their efforts inherently unconstitutional. Does religion have any role to play in the law?"

Truly, "the tail is wagging the dog." Regardless of who is legally or illegally residing in the United States, the system of law is Constitutional and it is based on God's constitutional system of government. God allows total freedom of actions in His pure republican system (Captains of tens, Captains of fifties, Captains of hundreds). However, one is entirely responsible for his actions. He is not to hurt anyone and if he does, he is held responsible. No victim, no crime. In homosexuality there are victims. In abortion there is a victim. In euthanasia there is a victim. How can we continue to permit a minority to acclaim that the Christian bedrock of the United States' Constitution is no longer the majority position?

Continuing with Mr. Colson's debate: "Writing in the *Baylor Law Review* before the *Romer* decision, David Smolin of Stanford University Law School argues that the present Court--rejecting 'religiously based' claims as inherently particularistic--is increasingly dismissing 'traditional theists' as too absolutist to join in public debate in a pluralistic society. This dismissal of religion helps explain the 'frustrated religious patriotism' that drives much conservative political action. With political prospects increasingly out of reach, Smolin predicts traditional theists with political interests will be forced to abandon their religious beliefs and accommodate themselves to an amoral, libertarian regime. The only alternative seems to be an abandonment of their political interests, becoming what the theologian Stanley Hauerwas has called 'resident aliens' in America--no longer concerned about the fortunes or misfortunes of a flawed republic, no longer considering this land their country."

The writer of those statements is Charles Colson. He is the chairman of *Prison Fellowship* and the recipient of the Templeton Prize for Progress in Religion. As chairman of the Prison Fellowship, he knows intimately the number of people who are in prison because they have stood up against this beast which is our present American Culture. With that in mind, his closing arguments, which follow, as to what can be done about this, should be especially interesting.

"Only the Church collectively can decide at what point a government becomes sufficiently corrupt that a believer must resist it...Most orthodox Christians are likely to find it impossible to support a political regime under which the judiciary, without any legislative license, sanctions abortion, euthanasia, and homosexual marriage. And if, after prayerful deliberation, Christians corporately determine that our present government has violated its God-given mandate, what then? After the pattern of the confessing German church, the Church would first have to separate herself and declare her independence, disavowing any moral legitimacy indirectly or unofficially provided for the state in the past.

"But would even active disobedience be effective against our current judicial state? When peaceable means and limited civil disobedience fail--at least according to the Protestant theologians Knox and Rutherford--revolution can be justified from a Christian viewpoint. While Knox called for the overthrow of a ruler in the interest of the Reformation, Rutherford advocated revolt in any instance when a king or ruler acted contrary to the written. Apparently, many Christians in colonial times agreed with Rutherford.

"Of course, the same standards Augustine used to evaluate the justice of a war apply to the justice of a revolution: no other alternative is feasible; the advantages outweigh the

suffering caused; and the evil employed in the revolution prevents far greater evil. The churches would have to be convinced that our present government had become totally opposed to God's purposes and that there was no other solution to prevent massive evil. And this point, I believe, we have not yet reached.

"The fervent and ceaseless prayer of every Christian should be that the discussion of resistance and revolution remains an academic exercise. We must continue for now to work relentlessly within the democratic process. Abhorring a confrontation, we should be engaged in a search for wisdom and a consensus to help us respond to the crisis of the time. Our discussions about the duty of Christians to the current American political order must be conducted with great care, in a manner that is formal rather than intuitive, deliberative rather than spontaneous, regulative rather than pragmatic. Calmness and seriousness of demeanor is necessary both to prevent the media dismissing us as fanatics and to prevent individuals from taking matters into their own hands.

"We dare not at present despair of America and advocate open rebellion. But we must-- slowly, prayerfully, and with great deliberation and serious debate--prepare ourselves for what the future seems likely to bring under a regime in which the courts have usurped the democratic process by reckless exercise of naked power." That is the end of Mr. Colson's remarks.

Mr. Colson and the others are obviously writing for a very large number of Christians who honestly believe they have been removed from the present culture of this once great Christian nation. Some comments are in order before we continue with some of the responses to these very serious debates.

Mr. Colson stated that it must be the "corporate Church" which would "separate herself and declare her independence...from the government." He used the German church as the example. The only problem with that is we no longer have a cohesive "corporate church!" There is no unity on any issue and this is all because of self-righteousness. Further, because of that ugly self-righteousness, many Christians have left the corporate Church and are acting as independent, believing Christians, living with a Christian ethic and worshipping in their own homes and in small groups. If there is such a thing as a corporate Church, it would be in that huge group. The only problem is how to unite these individual families.

That is not a unique problem. It has been done before. As we all should know, the Jewish people are the strongest proponents of "Separation of Church and State." They, themselves, do not operate as a corporate body. They go to their synagogues to learn more about Talmudism but they carry out their purpose as individuals working in unison. Throughout history they have been a very unified, cohesive, dedicated and disciplined body. It was that body, not the "corporate Synagogue" that declared war on Germany in World War II. Throughout modern history, it has been their strong and dedicated belief that gave them unity, allowing them to possess the power to accomplish their mission. That is the concept that allows them to create and fund the ADL, the Southern Poverty Law Center, the WJC, the AJC, etc.. As Christians, we can, and must, learn from this.

The *First Things* debate, conducted in the symposium in November, 1996 is still being rationalized among this country's intellectual community. The professionals within the judicial, theological and civil communities are either strongly for or violently against the arguments presented by Charles Colson, Robert Bork, Hadley Arkes, Russel Hittinger and Robert George. They all presented the argument that "the time has come to reformulate one's compliance with a democratic society whose laws are no longer set by the people."

Those who have written opposing remarks have argued that the system can heal itself. They all agree to one degree or another that conditions have become insufferable in terms of this being a republic (they use the erroneous word "democracy"). But they used the arguments that Congress can simply pass laws prohibiting such actions by the Supreme Court. They consider the media to be a viable and useful tool in educating the American people. They consider the schools still useful in educating our children. They believe the Judicial Branch and the Supreme Court will somehow change their position!

There is no mention of the totally unbiblical and unconstitutional system of money wherein it is brought into circulation through usury. It is a Talmudic system acquired in ancient Babylon. The same system is used in all of the nations of the world. All of us are victims of this crime. There is no mention of a school system wherein situation ethics, humanism, sex education, and every other unGodly concept imaginable, is taught. All of us are victims of that crime.

There is no mention of the fact that family-owned companies are being bought up and destroyed by multinational corporations. The corporation/government combine now replaces the free enterprise system our founding fathers gave us. Individual initiative has disappeared. That, too, is a crime. Taft-Hartley and their antitrust laws; where are you when we need you?

They make no mention of the well known fact that the entire media, from the old time newspapers, to TV, radio, magazines and the movie industry, is totally captured by the socialist (read communist) left. Anyone who opposes them is cut and quartered to be hung out on a line to dry!

There is no mention of the fact that time honored immigration laws in this country have been totally destroyed with the party faithfuls named Kennedy and Johnson driving the last coffin nails into it. Those immigration laws, the first one being passed by Congress in 1793, were developed to protect our Western European Christian Culture. We now have every other culture on the face of the earth here voting in their own culture and removing ours. Further, they are allowed to do this without even the basic requirements of being an American citizen who is able to read and write in the English language. How can we possibly re-acquire our culture under these circumstances? President Clinton recently gleefully stated that in a few years Americans from the white European nations will be a minority in this country. Again, we are the victims of a crime.

Finally, there is no mention of the fact that the party politics system has become so corrupt that no individual would dare run for office who is not a party hack. He would be destroyed even before the election day. That, too, makes us the victims. Perhaps the cardinal point of the last days of the Roman Empire was that their Senate seats were sold to the highest bidder!

The comments of Bork, Hittinger, Arkes, Colson and George were generally in unison with their views. They sincerely believed that our culture has been degraded to the point that the system itself is in disarray.

Some of the comments of the opposing members of the panel have merit. A lady named Midge Decter opened her comments with this: "When I first read the editorial introduction to the symposium presumably devoted to the subject of judicial usurpation, I could hardly believe my eyes. *Mit Brennender Sorge*, indeed: it turned out that the symposium was not intended by you to be a discussion of the ills of judicial usurpation--hardly either a new or in any sense a controversial concern in the *First Things* community--but about nothing less than the legitimacy of the United States government. And to prove that raising the question

of legitimacy is, so to speak, no mere slip of the ideological tongue, we are before we know it into mention of civil disobedience and even, for God's sake, 'morally justified revolution'!"

She went on to make this point: "...One certainly cannot deny that the Court has usurped powers rightly belonging to the political process, nor can one in all sanity deny that it has been using those powers to reach extraconstitutional and illegitimate decisions. But of course usurpation has been going back and forth among the three branches of government from the beginning, and the job of balancing and rebalancing involves a continuing and very difficult process of public persuasion. People, that is, must first be made to care. What we are dealing with is, in short, a cultural, rather than primarily a judicial, problem." Midge Decter was the Distinguished Fellow of the Institute of Religion and Public Life prior to her retirement.

She made some points worth comment. The entire argument of the last several newsletters is that we are in a cultural war. True, the three branches of government have always tried to usurp power from the others. But this lady makes one grave mistake in her thought processes. Culture is created by people. In all of those attempts at usurpation of power in the past between the branches of government, they were made between people and citizens of the same ethnic culture. Because of the unbiblical concept of universalism. Midge Decter, as did other commentators, makes the grave mistake that we can assimilate other cultures to the point of ours being the minority and still have our same culture. Nonsense! That's an oxymoron!

Another participant who made opposing arguments was Mary Ann Glendon. She is the Learned Hand Professor of Law at Harvard University. She made this comment: "No one can accuse First Things of ducking big questions. But its editors, Bork, Hittinger, Arkes, Colson and George have been uncharacteristically reticent in naming the causes of the decline of the democratic elements in our republican experiment.

"The regime question they raise is real. There is a good case to be made that we are already living in a *de facto* oligarchy. It is less clear, however, that the courts are, as all six writers seem to think, principally to blame. To be sure, the judiciary has steadily usurped power over matters that the Constitution wisely left to ordinary political processes. But the courts could never have carried off that power grab were it not for pathology in other parts of the body politic.

"For many decades now, control over the most important decisions affecting the conditions under which Americans live, work, and raise their children has flowed steadily from the people most affected toward state and federal legislatures and administrative agencies. The courts were hardly the only agents in this process, nor is it certain that they could have held it back. Yes, legislatures are more representative than courts, but they, too, are increasingly responsive to the interests and values of 'elites.' Yes, the judiciary all too often mirrors the biases of the knowledge class, but the legislative and administrative process are all too often captured by the money class.

"And look not to the political parties, as presently constituted, for help. It does not seem an exaggeration to say that we currently have a party of big business paying lip service to traditional moral values, and a party of big government paying lip service to the need of working people and the poor. Even that distinction is collapsing as Democratic Party leaders cozy up to big business, and Republicans discover the joys of big government. The cracks in the democratic pillars of the republic, alas, may extend to the cultural foundations. Hittinger recognizes this when he questions whether the people have 'tacitly consented' to the new regime...Unlike in Eastern Europe, the machinery of democratic government is here at hand. Why not repossess it, using ordinary political processes? Why not 'Pass out a leaflet,

call a meeting, speak your mind, decide to do something about it' in the words of the old union song? Why not organize to reclaim participatory government?"

Would you not believe that a distinguished Professor of Law at Harvard University would be able to teach prospective judges, lawyers, congressmen and executors (nearly all of whom are lawyers) that our nation was designed around a culture? That culture was a white European Christian culture. Wouldn't one believe if these professors wanted to keep this a white European Christian culture that they would not have permitted the destruction of our immigration laws?

Professor Glendon made this sage, and so very true, remark, "On this neo-feudal landscape, we find precious little politics in Aristotle's sense of ordering our lives together. You might say of anyone who is looking for sturdy, independent citizens these days what Rousseau said of Diogenes with his lantern: **The reason he failed is that the man he was seeking lived in a different age.**"

The reader should now see why we included the comment found in the book *The Church Impotent*. When we think with emotion we have become impotent. We must think in terms of the lessons of the Bible. Returning to the expository verses in the Book of Numbers used for this issue:

"The Lord is longsuffering, and of great mercy, forgiving iniquity and transgression, and by no means clearing the guilty, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation. Pardon, I beseech thee, the iniquity of this people according unto the greatness of thy mercy, and as thou has forgiven this people, from Egypt even until now.

"And the Lord, said, I have pardoned according to thy work: But as truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled with glory of the Lord. Because all those men which have seen my glory, and my miracles, which I did in Egypt and in the wilderness, and have tempted me now these ten times, and have not hearkened to my voice; Surely they shall not see the land which I swore unto their fathers, neither shall any of them that provoked me see it:" ([Num 14:18-23](#))

Is everything lost? Do we have a future to look forward to? Of course we do. The words are faith and hope. Faith in the Word of God means: "moral conviction especially upon the reliance of Christ for salvation" That salvation is the physical salvation as promised in [Luke 1:70-75](#). Hope means "expectation with confidence; anticipation."

Having lived through the last great depression of 1929 I can say with certainty that it healed the nation. It caused families to gather together. It gave a work ethic. It made men out of boys. It made women out of girls. We turned to God for deliverance.

We should not fear a serious depression. It could be the event which returns our culture to us. Yes, it could cause another war. But it could also be the fall of Babylon. [Jeremiah 51:8-9](#) says this: *"Babylon is suddenly fallen and destroyed: howl for her; take balm for her pain, is so be she may be healed. We would have healed Babylon, but she is not healed: forsake her, and let us go every one into his own country: for her judgment reacheth unto heaven, and is lifted up even to the skies."*