



CHRISTIAN CRUSADE FOR TRUTH

Intelligence Newsletter

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

July - August, 1998

American Empire

In the [May-June, 1998 issue](#) we discussed briefly that the United States has become an empire. We are no longer citizens of a nation-state but rather subjects within an empire. An attorney once told us here at Christian Crusade for Truth that ownership of anything is not the important thing. The most important concept is control and not ownership.

"Then answered one of the lawyers, and said unto him, Master, thus saying thou reproachest us also. And he said, Woe unto you also, ye lawyers! for ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers. Woe unto you! for ye build the sepulchres of the prophets, and your fathers killed them. Truly ye bear witness that ye allow the deeds of your fathers: for they indeed killed them, and ye build their sepulchres Therefore also said the wisdom of God, I will send them prophets and apostles, and some of them they shall slay and persecute: That the blood of all the prophets, which was shed from the foundation of the world, may be required of this generation; From the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, which perished between the altar and the temple: verily I say unto you, It shall be required of this generation. Woe unto you, lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered." ([Luke 11:45-52](#))

In this issue we will show why our nation has become of empire status, the history of the transformation, and the individuals by name who played the key roles.

Why do we spend so much time and effort to explain the decadence of government? It is simply because we are in the Kingdom that Jesus gave us. Jesus spent so much time explaining the Kingdom of heaven and yet most people refuse to believe it. [Matthew 13](#) is the kingdom parable chapter. Read it thoroughly and carefully. Nearly each parable starts with the phrase "The kingdom of heaven is like unto." We must note that he is obviously not describing a perfect paradise but rather problems that need to be overcome and how to perfect properly that kingdom.

Our forefathers gave us what could be classified as the unperfected kingdom. The key overriding principle was this: *Government derives its power from the consent of the governed.* That is Biblical. It is paramount in Biblical kingdom living. Our founders knew the weakness of man. They knew the thought processes of lawyers. Therefore, they provide the *Separation of Powers* concept. Thus we have the Legislative, Judicial and Executive Branches. It was mandatory in the minds of the founders that they remain absolutely separate.

Yet, today, they have become one and the same with the thought processes of a lawyer. Most of Congress, plus the Judicial, as well as the Executive Branch are lawyers. Thus, they are of a single mind with a single purpose. *"Woe be unto you lawyers."*

The very informative Essay titled *Social Democracy*, written by Henry Lamb, writes this: "Social democracies, such as Germany, and most of the Scandinavian states, are a sophisticated version of Communism in which the people are allowed to play a greater role in the development of public policy, but where government is still sovereign.

"Social democracies retain the idea that the government is responsible for the welfare of its citizens. In a government that derives its power from the consent of the governed, the people are responsible for their own welfare. Herein lies the dilemma facing the current generation in America: shall we pass to future generations the value of self governance derived from the principle that government derives its power from the consent of the governed; or shall we accept the principle that government is responsible for the welfare of its citizens and deny future generations the freedoms that allowed America to prosper?

"It is a legitimate debate. Throughout most of the 20th century, America has been moving ever closer to the concept of social democracy, and away from the founding principle of government power limited by the consent of the people. The two concepts of self governance are mutually exclusive. Every step toward social democracy is an erosion of individual freedom that is maximized by limited government.

"Many Americans want a social democracy. It is certainly easier to let the government be responsible for health care than to be personally responsible for paying doctor bills. It is easier to let government be responsible for providing security for old age than to be personally responsible. It is easier to let government be responsible for the homeless, for those who cannot produce an adequate income, for educating our children, for guaranteeing a minimum wage--than to be personally responsible. Most of the world lives under some form of social democracy. Increasingly, so does America.

"Every time personal responsibility is transferred to the government, a measure of individual freedom is sacrificed. When government provides health care, it is the government, not the patient, who chooses the quality of the care and provider. Where the individual is responsible, the patient, not the government, chooses both. Many people gladly relinquish their freedom to choose in exchange for not having to pay the cost. Many people gladly relinquish their freedom to choose where to live in exchange for the government providing any place to live. Many people gladly relinquish their freedom to choose what their children will learn in school in exchange for the government providing an education to their children.

"All of the steps America has taken toward social democracy--and away from limited government--have come as the result of choices made through **elected officials.** (*"Woe be unto you lawyers!"*-ed.). Many, perhaps now a majority of Americans hail those choices as 'progressive,' and call for more government-provided security for individuals. But each step toward social democracy that we, as a nation, take erodes that founding principle of government power limited by the consent of the people. The benefits of socialization are often immediate and relatively short-term; the costs, however, are obscured and have profound implications for future generations." End of the extractions from the Essay by Henry Lamb (*Ecologic*, January-February, 1998. POB 191, Hollow Rock, TN 38342.

Mr. Lamb articulately points out that the nations of the world are moving toward the governmental system called social democracies. As he pointed out, a social democracy is a sophisticated version of a communist state. He points out that the United States is rapidly becoming a social democracy with no regard to the Constitution. Considering the fact that our Congress has become excess baggage within our present scheme of government, our nation has already become a genuine social democracy. But there is one great difference with respect to the United States as compared to all of the other "social-democracies."

History has clearly shown us that, with respect to governments, there can never be a vacuum among nations. There has always been one nation which considers itself strong enough to be "king of the hill." There has always been one nation which wants to be the ruler of the world. The phrase "ruler of the world" simply means empire.

Remember the term, "Rule Britannia, Rule?" That was empire and the phrase, "The sun never sets on the British Empire" was known throughout the world. The idea of Empire has been tried many times throughout history. Ghengis Khan tried it. The Moslems tried it. Alexander the Great tried it. The world-reknown Roman Empire tried it. There are many others, too numerous to mention. They have all failed. Why? Because none of them understood the demands of God.

There are two ways to be the leading nation of the world. One is by example and the other is by force. In the book of Isaiah we find how God wants us to be the leading nation. *"And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow into it.*

"And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.

"And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. O house of Jacob, come ye, and let us walk in the light of the Lord." (Isaiah 2: 2-5) The word *mountain* in that passage refers to governments.

It is written by historians that the "Golden Years" of the United States was the period between 1800 and 1830, a mere 30 years. It was during that time that we earned the honor of being the leading nation of the world, not because of raw power, but because of concept.

We wrestled with the concepts of a righteous government, a government which followed Biblical principles. The historian George Bancroft, in an address before the New York Historical Society said this, "The exact measure of the progress of civilization is the degree in which the intelligence of the common mind has prevailed over wealth and brute force; in other words, the measure of the progress of civilization is the progress of the people."

Note that he said, "the intelligence of the common mind has prevailed over wealth and brute force." He was talking about leading by example and not brute force or money. The "intelligence of the common man," meaning the ordinary citizen, wrestled with these questions during that period of the "Golden Years:"

What is the social mission of this nation in its continental home? What duties and virtues are necessary to the fulfilment of its historic mission? What opportunities for action lie open to the people? What knowledge is necessary for the accomplishment of their highest purposes? What principles, inherited or newly devised, should be applied for progress toward the goal called America?

The Bible clearly shows God's way to find the answers to these questions. The American people understood the Biblical principles and they acted upon them. The French historian Comte de Alexis Tocqueville came to the United States to study our progress in answering those questions. He returned home and wrote his book *"De la Democratie en Amerique."* (The American Democracy) in which he observed that it wasn't the factories, nor the farms,

nor the cities which made America great. It was in the churches of America where he found our greatness. "America was great because she was good and when she ceased to be good she will cease to be great." This was the fulfillment of [Isaiah 2:2-5](#) and consequently people from all over the world came to these shores to learn of our ways.

For the world to come to our shores to learn of our ways could have been a blessing to the world or it could have been a curse. It would have been a blessing if the world had come to learn of our ways and then to go home and teach the Biblical principles to their own people. But it turned out to be a curse because we opened our shores to the world of diverse cultures, principles, and morals, allowing them to stay, which resulted in their teaching America of **their** ways. History proves that in every case of developing empires, they would start with the right concepts and end with the same problems.

In our country, it took one hundred years for the process to tear down the concept which was engendered during those "Golden Years."

Those of us who are old enough to have lived during those glorious years just before World War II, will remember the end of the nation-state concept and the start of the empire concept. We realize that those included the years of the great depression, and that was traumatic, but we lived in a nation which for the most part lived with the concept that *"government derives its power from the consent of the governed."* Contrary to modern thought, it is far better to live in a depression and be free than to live under a system where the government does all of your thinking for you.

It is fully recognized that the controlling powers even then created that depression, just as they did in creating World War I, the Versailles Treaty, Communist Russia, Nazi Germany, and World War II. But America was not yet infected with government interfering in our private lives as it now is throughout the Western civilizations. We were free. Churches were free. Private organizations were allowed to organize without permits, etc. Even driver's licenses were not required in most states. We could go on and on but the point is made. We were free.

The question is asked, "Who was at fault?" It was us! As Pogo said, "We has met the enemy and he is us!" Why do we have a Congress which does absolutely nothing about the Executive Branch travelling all over the world, making end-runs around the Constitution by creating some sort of "contractual" agreements that don't need Congressional approval? They respond by claiming that nothing can be done. How about cutting off the money flow!

But alas, as Henry Lamb clearly showed in his essay, many Americans want a social democracy, or so the so-called polls released by the news media indicate. All of Congress pledged allegiance to the Constitution, and that includes the responsibility of making all laws and for the entire funding of the total operations of the government. They are totally misreading the will of the people and they are entirely too occupied with out-performing the opposing Party. **Anything** for the growth of their Party. The nation comes second and the people last. **WHERE ARE THE CHURCHES?**

Once upon a time the Christian Churches were at the forefront showing, not only the average citizen, but the church-going congressmen and senators the proper role of government in a Christian society. But now, those who do go to church, in both the private sector as well as our leaders in government, receive at best "canned sermons" prepared by Bible publishing houses (mostly owned by non-Christians). Much of the time they receive sermons by trained socialists or Marxists in liberation theology, situation ethics, humanism and now, the "new kid on the block", environmentalism which believes in the mother god *gaia* concept.

Paul tells us in [1 Timothy 5:8](#), "*But if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.*" The word "house" in that passage is *oy-ki'-os* in the Greek and it means family and kindred. Those instructions are equally applicable for our Congress. As a nation, we should be taking care of our own first.

But no, we have become an empire, just like the Roman Empire, wherein we are supposedly "responsible" for the entire world. Our government has a supposed duty to police all of the other nations. We send our boys to all corners of the world to die for our "empire" just like the British Empire did. It was so proudly said, "The sun never sets on the British Empire." It would have been more appropriate if the ditty had said, "The sun never sets on the graves of English boys who secured and protected the British Empire." So it is with us.

Up through World War II, the United States still had some resemblance of a nation-state. That is said even though we recognize that World War II was conducted to "Make the world safe for Democracy." (Read **Communism!**)

The well known historian and writer Gore Vidal explained the mechanism that was used to transform us from a nation-state to that of an Empire. The following main points he made are extracted from his article as found in the magazine *Vanity Fair* for November, 1997:

"The trouble appeared to be over Germany, which, on February 11, 1945, had been split at the Yalta summit meeting into four zones: American, Soviet, British, and French. As the Russians had done the most fighting and suffered the greatest losses, it was agreed that they should have an early crack at the reparations from Germany-to the extent of \$20 billion. At a later meeting at Potsdam the new president Truman (Roosevelt had died-ed.), with Stalin and Churchill, reconfirmed Yalta and opted for the unification of Germany under the four victorious powers. But something had happened between the euphoria of Yalta and the edginess of Potsdam. As the meeting progressed, the atom bomb was tried out successfully in a New Mexico desert. We were now able to incinerate Japan-or the Soviet, for that matter- and so we no longer needed Russian help to defeat Japan. We started to renege on our agreements with Stalin, particularly reparations from Germany. We also quietly shelved the notion, agreed upon at Yalta, of a united Germany under four-power control. Our aim now was to unite the three Western zones of Germany and integrate them into our Western Europe, restoring, in the process, the German economy-hence, fewer reparations. Then, as of May 1946, we began to re-arm Germany. Stalin went ape at this betrayal. The Cold War was on."



Gore Vidal

Gore Vidal clearly shows that it was the nuclear bomb which gave Truman the impetus to renege on the Yalta Agreements and try for "The King of the Hill!" But really was it the haberdasher Truman who figured this all out by himself? Hardly.

With respect to the destruction of the economy of Germany, it was Morgenthau who developed the so-called "Morgenthau Plan" which was planned to systematically reduce Germany to nearly an agrarian society. But Truman brought the German experts in missile science to the United States to create phase two of the plan for the American Empire. Phase two was the development of the missiles to deliver, with great accuracy, the then recently demonstrated nuclear bomb.

History also shows that it takes something unusual, something extraordinary, in the military power structure to create an Empire. Those whom you want to conquer must be so awe-struck with your military prowess that they will readily submit. The Romans developed the siege engines, the attack ships loaded with Marines equipped with boarding rope ladders, the multiple shield system used by the infantry which allowed an entire squad to advance well protected. Atilla had the lightning fast horse cavalry, etc. The United States decided to use "high-tech" with the A-bomb, missiles, superb aircraft, etc. and, of course, money. Continuing with Gore Vidal:

"At home, the media was beginning to prepare the attentive few for disappointment. Suddenly, we were faced with the highest personal income taxes in American history to pay for more and more weapons, among them the world-killer hydrogen bomb—all because "*the Russians were coming*." No one knew quite why they were coming or with what. Weren't they still burying 20 million dead? Official explanations for all this made little sense, but then, as Truman's secretary of state, Dean Acheson, merrily observed, 'In the State Department we used to discuss how much time that mythical average American citizen put in each day listening, reading, and arguing about the world outside his own country...It seemed to us that ten minutes a day would be a high average.' So why bore the people? Secret 'bipartizan' is best for what, after all, is-or should be—a society of docile workers, enthusiastic consumers, obedient soldiers who will believe just about anything for at least 10 minutes. The National Security State, the NATO alliance, the 40-years Cold War were all created without the consent, much less advice, of the American people. Of course, there were elections during this crucial time, but Truman-Dewey, Eisenhower-Stevenson, Kennedy-Nixon were of a single mind as to the desirability of inventing, first, a many-tenacled enemy, Communism, the star of the Chamber of Horrors; then, to combat so much evil, install a permanent wartime state at home with loyalty oaths, a national 'peacetime' draft, and secret police to keep watch over homegrown 'traitors,' as the few enemies of the National Security State were known. Then followed 40 years of mindless wars which created a debt of \$5 trillion that hugely benefited aerospace and firms like General Electric, whose longtime TV pitchman was Ronald Reagan, eventually retired **to** the White House."

What is Gore Vidal alluding to but not quite saying? Who was it that created Communism? Where did the money come from? Who was it that funded Germany? Where did that money come from? Who were the "traitors?" Wasn't it at first coming from the Communist left and now from the Christian right? This was to be what Mr. Vidal called "The Last Empire." Perhaps so but that's up to God, not man.

Isn't it strange that the British Empire folded following World War II so easily and so smoothly? It was the "marriage" at the time of Oliver Cromwell between money which Manneseh ben Israel secured and the British nobility that created that Empire. The promise was "Between us we will rule the world" and that they did. To give that up so easily had to mean that another empire was taking its place, this one to be the final "Utopia" which the professor Michael Higger describes in his book, "*The Jewish Utopia*." (The Lord Baltimore Press, Baltimore, MD) Then Gore Vidal continues:

"Why go into all this now? Have we not done marvelously well as the United States of Amnesia? Our economy is the envy of the earth, the president proclaimed at Denver. (President Clinton at the Denver summit). No Inflation. Jobs for all except the 2 percent of the population in prison and the 5 percent who no longer look for work and so are not counted, bringing our actual unemployment close to the glum European average of 11 percent. And all of this accomplished without ever once succumbing to the sick socialism of Europe (Social Democracy-ed.). We have no health service or proper public education or, indeed, much of anything for the residents of the fun house. But there are lots of ill-paid work-hours for husband and wife with no care for the children while parents are away from

home. Fortunately, Congress is now preparing legislation so that adult prisons can take in delinquent 14-year-olds. They, at least, will be taken care of, while, economically, it is only a matter of time before the great globe itself is green-spanned.

"...Today we give orders to other countries. We tell them with whom to trade and to which of our courts they must show up for indictment should they disobey us. Meanwhile, F.B.I. agents range the world looking for drug fiends and peddlers while the unconstitutional C.I.A. (they don't submit their accounts to Congress as the Constitution requires) chases 'terrorists' so that their onetime colleagues and sometime paymasters in the Russian K.G.B. have gone out of business.

"While we were at our busiest in the fun house, no one ever told us what the [North Atlantic Treaty Alliance](#) was really about. March 17, 1948, the Treaty of Brussels called for a military alliance of Britain, France, Benelux to be joined by the U.S. and Canada on March 23. The impetus behind NATO was the United States, whose principal foreign policy, since the administration of George Washington, was to avoid what Alexander Hamilton called 'entangling alliances.' ...We were now hell-bent on the permanent division of Germany between our western zone and the Soviet zone to the east. Serenely, we broke every agreement that we had made with our former ally, now horrendous Communist enemy."

He then goes on to mention the contents of the book *Drawing the Line (The American Decision to Divide Germany 1944-49)* (publisher unknown-ed.) in which the author Carolyn Eisenberg, describes the efforts of the United States in building this empire by converting its allies, and then the former enemies like Germany, Italy, Japan into client states which made them subject to our military and our economic power.

There were those who vehemently opposed this deception of creating an empire by allowing communism to remain intact to be used as a tool. General George Patton, for example, wanted to totally destroy communism by taking down the Soviet Empire so we could return to a nation-state status. But he met his demise in a truck "accident" and several books have been written on the subject. General Walter Bedell Smith, in a letter to General Eisenhower, wrote regarding this concept to regularize (regulate) European matters. He said, "The difficulty under which we labor is that in spite of our announced position we really do not want nor intend to accept German unification in any terms the Russians might agree to, even though they seemed to meet most of our requirements." General Smith simply said that we didn't really want the unification of Germany, all we wanted was to create a "Cold War" with which to bring in our empire status. Stalin countered with the famous Berlin Corridor Blockade. We in turn responded with the reknown Berlin Airlift. That was in true keeping with the showing of spectacular force as have all nations dreaming of an Empire of their own.

Mr. Vidal shows that the idea of an American Empire was never allowed to be debated in Congress. What little debate there was centered on what the C.I.A. reported was the Soviet Union's desire to conquer the whole world.

Truman released what has become known as the "Truman Doctrine" in which he stated, "The policy of the United States is to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure." With that official policy, never debated by Congress, we became the policeman of the world.

Dean Acheson tried to stir up Congress by telling them of the Soviet's attempts by stating, "They had brought the Balkans to the point where a highly possible Soviet breakthrough might open three continents to Soviet penetration." As Gore Vidal states, "Senators gasped; grew pale; wondered how to get more 'defense' contracts into their states. Of the major politicians, only former vice president Henry Wallace dared answer

Truman's 'clearer than truth' version of history: 'Yesterday March 12, 1947, marked a turning point in American history, it is not a Greek crisis that we face, it is an American crisis. Yesterday, President Truman... proposed, in effect, that America police Russia's every border. There is no regime too reactionary for us provided it stands in Russia's expansionist path. There is no country too remote to serve as the scene of a contest which may widen until it becomes a world war.'

Wallace was considered a communist for such statements. Whatever is the truth, one thing becomes clear. The Soviet's were very probably trying for an even larger empire. They already had one but that apparently wasn't big enough. The United States, perhaps (let's be kind!) was trying to stop that effort but in the process was building an empire all of our own. It was the East versus the West, so to speak. But in doing all that, we have just about expended ourselves as a nation.

Now, there are two more kids on the block, wanting to be "King of the Hill." They, of course, are China and the Moslems. Now, what if Russia, China and the Moslems (of which many are in Russia) come together and the three of them take on the American Empire? It appears that this could be possible. In our incessant drive for an even larger empire we keep troops all over the world. The numbers are staggering, considering we are not in a "war" scenario. Continuing with Gore Vidal's humorous, but serious, article:

"So, after five years in the fun house, we partially emerged in January 1950, to find ourselves in a new sort of country. We were also, astonishingly, again at war: this time in Korea. But as Truman-Acheson were nervous about asking Congress for a declaration, the war was called a United Nations police action; and messily lost. Acheson did prepare a memo assuring Truman that, hitherto, 87 presidential military adventures had been undertaken without a congressional declaration of war as required by the old Constitution. Since 1950 the United States has fought perhaps a hundred overt and covert wars. None was declared by the nominal representatives of American People in Congress Assembled; they had meekly turned over to the executive their principal great power, to wage war. That was the end of that Constitution.

"As it will take at least a decade for us to reinvent China as a new evil empire, the moon is in a state of pause over the old fairground. We are entering a phase undreamed of by those 'present at the creation' of the empire. Although many still reflexively object to the word 'empire,' we have military bases in every continent, as well as 10 aboard the aircraft carrier called the United Kingdom. For 50 years we have supported too many tyrants, overthrown too many democratic governments, wasted too much of our own money in other people's civil wars to pretend that we're just helping out all those poor little folks all round the world who love freedom and democracy just as we do. When the Russians stabbed us in the back by folding their empire in 1991, we were left with many misconceptions about ourselves and, rather worse, about the rest of the world.

Mr. Vidal then goes on to show that there have been several books written on this subject of The American Empire which was created starting at the end of World War II. Some of these books were critical of such an effort but they were ignored because after all, "Truman was a staunch anti-communist!!" Or was he really? If we take into account the excellent article by Henry Lamb on Social Democracies which we reported at the beginning of this issue, maybe we can evaluate this a little differently. Mr. Lamb shows that a social democracy is close to communism. The whole world is rapidly moving toward social democracies. The United States is the official policeman of the world insisting on social democracy. It sounds like an empire consisting of social democracies. Isn't that what both Greece and Rome were, even though Rome called itself a Republic.

One such book which is critical of Truman's concept is *NATO and the Korean War: A context* by Walter LaFeber. As Mr. Vidal describes the contents of LaFeber's book, "...But the link between universities and imperial Washington has always been a strong one as Kissingers dart back and forth between classroom to high office to even higher, lucrative eminence, as lobbyists for foreign powers, often hostile to our interests." He then shows that the book *Drawing the Line* by Carolyn Eisenberg, is a step-by-step description of the years 1944-49, when we restored, re-armed, and reintegrated our German province into our Western Europe."

In building the American Empire in accordance with the intent in Michael Higger's book *The Jewish Utopia*, we reneged with nearly everybody. In our blind effort to make use of Germany, that nation is in a very strange state of limbo among the other Western nations. Walter LaFeber's *NATO and the Korean War: A Context* as well as the book *Drawing the Line* by Caroline Eisenberg are not considered the politically correct reading for our public.

Gore Vidal writes this, "For those who feel that Eisenberg dwells too much on American confusions and mendacities (a lie, a falsehood-ed.), there is always the elegant Robert H. Ferrell on *The Formation of the Alliance, 1948-1949*. A court historian, as apologists for empire are known, Ferrell does his best with Harry Truman, reminding us of all the maniacs around him who wanted atomic war at the time of Korea....At one point, Ferrell notes that Truman actually gave thought to the sufferings of women and children should we go nuclear in Korea. As for Truman's original decision to use two atomic bombs on Japan, most now agree that a single demonstration would have been quite enough to cause a Japanese surrender..." Returning to our statement earlier, "History also shows that it takes something unusual, something extraordinary, in the military power structure to create an empire. Those whom you want to conquer must be so awe-struck with your military prowess that they will readily submit..."

Then a very powerful statement was made by Mr. Vidal: "The climate of intimidation that began with the loyalty oath of 1947 remains with us even though two American generations have been born with no particular knowledge of what the weather was like before the great freeze and the dramatic change in our form of government. No thorough history of what actually happened to us and to the world 1945-1997 has yet appeared. There are interesting glances at this or that detail. There are also far too many silly hagiographies (a writing or study of the lives of the saints.-ed.) of gallant little guy Truman and superstatesman George Marshall, who did admit to Acheson that he had no idea what on earth the plan in his name was really about. But aside from all the American and foreign dead from Korea to Vietnam, from Guatemala to the Persian Gulf, the destruction of our old republic's institutions has been the great hurt. Congress has surrendered to the executive not only the first of its great powers, but the second, the power of the purse, looks to be up for grabs as Congress is forcing more money on the Pentagon than even that black hole has asked for, obliging the executive to spend many hot hours in the vast kitchen where the books are forever cooking in bright-red ink. As for our Ouija-board Supreme Court, it would be nice if they would take time off from holding seances with the long-dead founders, whose original intent so puzzles them, and actually examine what the founders wrought, the Constitution itself and the Bill of Rights."

We have become "The Great Satan" to the greater portion of the world. Those whom we classify as "enemies" want us destroyed. Why? The biggest single reason is our incessant pursuit of empire along the lines of Michael Higger's book.

Those whom we classify as our friends also want us to disband the idea of empire. Gore Vidal discusses that too. He writes, "In the wake of the Madrid NATO summit, it is time for

the United States to step away from Europe--gracefully. Certainly the Europeans think it is time for us to go, as their disdainful remarks at Denver betrayed, particularly when they were warned not to walk more than a block or two from their hotels for fear of being robbed, maimed, murdered. Yet why do we persist in holding on to empire?

"*Cherchez la monnaie* (looking for money.-ed.), as the clever French say. Ever since 1941, when Roosevelt got us out of the Depression by pumping federal money into re-arming, war or the threat of war has been the principal engine to our society. Now the war is over. Or is it? Can we afford to give up our-well, cozy unremitting war? Why not-ah, the brilliance, the simplicity!--instead of shrinking, expand our phantom empire in Europe by popping everyone into NATO? ...With an expanded NATO, our arms, makers-if not workers-are in for a bonanza....Upon joining NATO, the lucky new club member is obliged to buy expensive weapons from the likes of Lockheed Martin, recently merged with Northrop Gumman. Since the new members have precarious economies, the American taxpayer, will have to borrow ever more money to foot the bill, which the Congressional Budget Office says should come to \$125 billion over 15 years with the U.S. paying \$19 billion. Yeltsin correctly sees this as a hostile move against Russia.

"There comes a moment when empires cease to exert energy and become symbolic. The current wrangling over NATO demonstrates what a quandary a symbolic empire is in when it lacks the mind, much less the resources, to impose its hegemony upon former client states. At the end, entropy gets us all."

Then, Mr. Vidal closes with this thought which is one of the important features of a falling empire. "The optimum economic unit in the world is now the city-state. Thanks to technology, everyone knows or can know something about everyone else on the planet...In the next century, barring accident, the common market in Europe will evolve not so much into a union of ancient bloodstained states as a mosaic of homogenous regions and city-states like Milan, say, each loosely linked in trade with a clearinghouse information center at Brussels to orchestrate finance and trade and the policing of cartels. Basques, Britons, Walloons, Scots who want to be rid of onerous nation-states should be let go in order to pursue and even-why not?-overtake happiness, the goal, or so we Americans have always pretended to believe, of the human enterprise. That is the end of Gore Vidal's very interesting and revealing, article.

The signs of a falling empire have always been the same. The Roman Empire has always been considered the classic example but all of them exhibited the same signs. The multitude of people from all of the colonies of the empire flood into the controlling state. The incessant cry then is for "bread and circuses" with the ensuing welfare state.

The money system is then debased and the taxes become astronomical which in turn causes the producers (the farms, ranches, factories) to quit and go into the cities for the bread and circuses.

The positions of government are purchased using the wealth of the monied class. The "elected" members of government are then indebted to the monied class which, in turn, further reduces the living standards of the average citizen. The rich get richer and the poor get poorer.

Finally, the morals of the once powerful empire are reduced to that of the lowest standards of the many classes of immigrants living in the country. Morals, like any thing else, seek the lowest common denominator.

Pompeii, for example, was once a classic Roman city. It was the home of well-to-do Roman citizens and was a model for the world. Mount Vesuvius erupted in 79 A.D. and

destroyed the city with a deep blanket of ash. It has been recently excavated and the signs of immorality were everywhere. Human bodies were excavated in amazingly good condition with the immorality being obvious. Signs and artifacts also depicted the moral standards of this once "show place" of the Roman Empire. The fall of the Grecian Empire was similar. Homosexuality was rampant and it is taught that even the Olympiads were affected by that immorality.

Then finally, with a total lack of good government, the empires fall into a city-state arrangement such as Mr. Vidal depicts as the current "optimum economic state." Anyone with an ordinary deductive sense will realize that "civilization" under such an arrangement is simply starting all over again. The city-state arrangement lasts just about long enough for another "big, bully, kid on the block" to conquer these city-states and make them into a "nation-state" and then into an empire.

What is wrong with all of this? Everyone in power wants to exclude God's Rules. Each wanna-be conqueror intends to be god and make the laws and totally ignore the one and only Rule Book, the **Bible!**

Our understanding of God's system is the nation-state with the system of law clearly delineated in the Book of Deuteronomy. God's definition of "nation" refers to ethnic nationality. The word "nation" means nationality and it is ethnic based. You can have a "nation of law" ONLY if it is based on ethnicity and God's Laws, Statutes and Judgments. Congress, if it works properly, does not make law. Congress can only convert God's Laws into meaningful modern language.

Our once great Christian Republic has now turned into a Social Democracy and with the tumidity of wanting an empire all of its own. The outcome was predictable many years ago.

[Chapter 28 of the Book of Deuteronomy](#) tells it exactly as it is. We are now living the proof of God's Words found in that chapter. But so many churches will tell us, "But, according to Paul, the Laws, Statutes and Judgments are done away with." Well, then, why is everything as found in that chapter coming to pass and for the very reasons that God said they would? It's like the debate over "The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion." If those protocols were declared to be a forgery, why have all of the things depicted in them come to pass?

Finally, God told us in [Deuteronomy 28:63](#), *"And it shall come to pass, that as the Lord rejoiced over you to do you good, and to multiply you; so the Lord will rejoice over you to destroy you, and to bring you to nought; and ye shall be plucked from off the land whither thou goest to possess it."*

In case anyone wants to excuse the word "rejoice" in that passage, it is the word *soos*, or *sece* in the Hebrew and it means to be glad, joy, mirth. Would God do that? In [Isaiah 45:5-7](#) we read, *"I am the Lord, and there is none else, there is no God beside me: I girded thee, though thou hast not known me: That they may know from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that there is none beside me. I am the Lord, and there is none else. **I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil:** I the Lord do all these things. We are to keep God's Laws in our government. He will not tolerate anything less. Jesus said, *"If you love me, keep my commandments."* ([John 14:15](#)) Those are the same Laws no matter how much society wants to renege on them just so we can do it our way instead of God's.*