



## CHRISTIAN CRUSADE FOR TRUTH

### Intelligence Newsletter

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

**March - April, 1998**

### **Party Politics Versus The Bible-Continued**

*"So Manasseh made Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem to err, and to do worse than the heathen, whom the Lord has destroyed before the children of Israel." ([2 Chr. 33:9](#)).*

*"Make no friendship with an angry man; and with a furious man thou shalt not go: Lest thou learn his ways, and get a snare to thy soul." ([Prov. 22:24](#)).*

*"If a ruler hearken to lies, all his servants are wicked." ([Prov. 29:12](#)).*

In the [January-February issue](#) of the Intelligence Newsletter we were only able to show the system of federalism that has become the rule of government in the United States. We showed that it was Alexander Hamilton who, through his extraordinary charisma and cunning, was able to sway our early leaders in the interpretation of the Constitution that he desired. It is more probable that he was directed to do what he did and was sent here from his birthplace for that purpose.

From *The American Enclopaedia* of 1862 we find the following information on Hamilton: "Alexander Hamilton was born on the island of Nevis, West Indies on January 11, 1757. His father was of Scottish stock and his mother was of French Huguenot stock. His mother was previously married to a man named Levine whom she divorced. However, relatives of her first marriage played a big part in Alexander's life.

"His biological father was in the merchantile business which failed and his father died a pauper. Alexander's mother died during his childhood. Thus, it was the relatives of Levine, and perhaps Levine himself, who took over the parentage of young Alexander.

"The family lived on the island of Santa Cruz where the schooling was not of high standards. However, Alexander was skilled in both the English and French languages. At the age of 12 he was placed in the counting house of a merchant in Santa Cruz, undoubtedly of the same persuasion as Alexander's step-parents.

"It was here in Santa Cruz where his life's ambitions were established. He considered the life of a clerk in a money counting house to be too 'grovelling.' He even openly wanted a war to make his life more exciting! He was sent to the United States for his formal schooling. His early years were his formative years and by the time he finished his schooling in the United States he was equipped, in personality, training and purpose for the work he was to accomplish in the United States. Alexander Hamilton was a chosen man for a purpose."

*"Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves." ([Mat. 23:15](#)).*

It is acknowledged that Alexander Hamilton was the leader in the effort to establish a national bank patterned after the Bank of England. This has been a very powerful force in reducing this once great Christian Republic to a mere lackey of the World Zionist Order. But there has been an even more powerful force in our destruction. Party politics is that force.

Generally, our people have more concern for their political party than for the [Constitution](#). Even the Bible takes a lower priority than the political party system. Political parties have become gods to the members.

The dialectics is the basis for multiple political parties. Say, for example, the Republican Party is the thesis and the Democratic Party is the antithesis. The two parties debate, lobby and advertize their particular viewpoint on a subject. A vote is taken in Congress on the issue and it is decided between them what the law is to be. Whatever the results of the issue, both of the parties consider the best interests of their own party as to how they vote. To all outward appearances, the Constitution is not considered and certainly the Bible is not even discussed.

This process is an excellent example of situation ethics. The particular conditions in the country at the time of the debates are the important points of concern. This amounts to the realization that each congressman or senator considers his vote as his own preference in the matter. We have said before that each Congressman or Senator votes according to his god. If God is his God, then he votes in accordance with the laws of the Bible. However, if man is his god, then his vote will be in accordance with the humanist god. Such is the case.

Just what is humanism and situation ethics and has that become our god as a nation? By definition, a "preference" means: *"An act of preferring, or state of being preferred; higher estimation; prior choice; also, the power or opportunity of choosing. The act, fact, or principle of giving advantages to some over others."*

The word "conviction" means: *"A state of being convinced, especially of sin. A strong persuasion or belief; as, to live up to one's convictions."*

The act of preferring, instead of having a conviction as to sin, is the basis of Secular Humanism. We also need to define that term if we are to understand modern Party Politics.

In the publication entitled, *Texas Law Review*, we find an article written by John Whitehead and John Conlan. They define Secular Humanism as follows: *"The word Secular by definition refers to the temporal rather than spiritual. Secularism is a doctrinal belief that morality is based solely in regard to the temporal well-being of mankind to the exclusion of all belief in God, a Supreme Being, or a future eternity."*

*"Humanism is a philosophy or attitude that is concerned with human beings, their achievement and interests, and the condition or quality of being human, rather than with the abstract beings and problems of theology."*

*"Secularism is nontheistic and humanism is secular because it excludes the basic tenets of theism. Therefore, secular humanism is nontheistic. However, while secular humanism is nontheistic, it is religious because it directs itself toward religious beliefs and practices, that are in active opposition to traditional theism. Humanism is a doctrine centered solely on human interests and values. Therefore, humanism deifies man collectively and individually, whereas theism worships God."*

Applying those definitions to the modern political party system, we can readily see that our congressmen and senators do indeed vote in accordance with their god. But, at least by their actions, it is not the God of the Bible. It is the god of Secular Humanism. We can also

readily see that each vote is by preference and not by conviction, especially as to sin. Thus, there is no real concern for a conviction, neither for the Constitution nor the Bible. It is all relative to the benefits of his own party. Do we have a current example of this with which we can prove the point?

Some years ago, we delivered a message called "The Immigration Scam." That message dealt with the various immigration laws throughout the history of the United States. The message dealt in detail with political ramifications between the two major political parties. We will briefly discuss the contents of that message to make the point presently being considered.

Starting after the Civil War, the United States was literally invaded by immigrants from eastern Europe. These peoples were of a different background with their own peculiar customs, morals and mores. A great percentage of them were Khazars, thus they were Askenazi Jews. Obviously, they didn't, or wouldn't, even consider that this was a Christian country and our Constitution and laws were based upon the Christian Bible. (We proved that point in the [May-June, 1997 issue](#) of the *Intelligence Newsletter*). These people immediately sent their sons to the finest universities in the country and within one generation they became congressmen and senators. They also greatly influenced the American Christian people in matters of "equality." By the time World War II occurred, our men looked at the world in a somewhat different light. They saw the beauties of other civilizations (which exist) but apparently our people did not consider which god we were to follow in our own civilization. So after World War II, our country was ripe for changes in our "repressive" immigration laws. One can already see Secular Humanism and Situation Ethics at play here.

After the war, a long string of immigration laws were perpetrated by Congress and each one further eroded the long-standing policies of our country. Of utmost concern to us was the "open door" policy for immigrants (legal **and** Illegal) from the south (Mexico, Central and South America). We at Christian Crusade for Truth have spoken many times at "eat, meet and retreat" meetings in all of the southwestern states. It has been with very little success because American businesses wanted to take advantage of the cheap labor being provided them. Interesting enough, the greatest opposition to this "open door policy" has been the Hispanic families of long standing in the Southwest. Also of interest is the fact that Republican and Democratic congressmen were equally stumbling all over themselves to be eager to show each party's "superiority" in this area.

Among those new immigrants from the South, along with certain militant Mexicans already citizens, there came the cry for *reconquista*, or reconquest. As is most always the case, the leaders among the educators within the school system, as well as some legislators, put the thought into action. The movement is to reunite the southwestern states **with** Mexico. The states in contest are those which were given up to the United States in the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. They now want it back and intend to get it, one way or another.

There is a political movement known as *Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlan (MEChA)*. Their aim is to drive all European and African people from these states and create the nation of Aztlan. This information can readily be found in many of their writings. As reported in the *Spotlight* newspaper, 300 Independence Ave., SE, Washington, D.C. 20003, there is support coming from the Mexican government, too. The "friend" of our current Administration, Mexican President Ernesto Zedillo, informed Washington that "Mexico will not tolerate foreign forces dictating and enacting laws on Mexicans." He told Larry King on one of his talk shows, "Mexicans have a right to free education (In the United States). Illegal immigrants are not criminals. Illegal immigration is not a crime."

We have visited with and assisted Sheriff Gary Painter of Midland, Texas in his investigation about the training camps which these Mexican groups have in the mountains of Northern Mexico. Sheriff Painter is a good Christian law officer and he strives for what is best for the United States. According to Glenn Spencer of *Voice of Citizens Together*, and reported in the *Spotlight* (March 2, 1998), "What we are witnessing is *Reconquista*, using drugs and drug money to help drive Americans out of the Southwest. These militant Mexicans have established training camps in the mountains of Northern Mexico and across the borders in California, Arizona, New Mexico and Texas. Recruits receive basic training, weapons introduction and political indoctrination in the camps located in Mexico where they're also assigned to specific U.S.-based combat units."

Does this sound far-fetched? Hardly. Nearly every night we hear of another assassination among the drug lords in Northern Mexico. We see the actual TV footage of Mexicans shooting at Border Patrol officers along the borders. We see actual footage of a Mexican rushing across the border and assaulting American citizens and then rapidly returning to Mexico.

To relate a personal example of their intent, this writer was in a hardware store negotiating a purchase with a clerk, who happened to be of Mexican descent. While discussing the sale with the clerk, another Mexican came up and rudely started a rather long conversation with the clerk. When it was finished, mention was made to the clerk that if that situation was the other way around with an Anglo interrupting two Mexicans talking, there would be loud and vicious repercussions. The Mexican clerk responded, "You ain't seen nothing yet!" Knowing what he meant, the immediate response was, "As Yogi Berra once said, 'It ain't over till the fat lady sings.'" The Mexican clerk looked astounded and shocked when he was redressed by a "lowly white man."

This somewhat lengthy, but necessary, introduction is to prepare for the example of how Congress responds to situations of government which are of extraordinary importance. Certainly, the sovereignty of this once Christian nation is of extraordinary importance.

Again, found in the March 2, 1998 issue of the *Spotlight*, we find this editorial report, which will be excerpted for brevity: "Americans are a resourceful people. We have great confidence in our own ability to solve national problems by taking responsible and just action. For guidance, we look to the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

"For leadership, we look to our elected officials and all constitutional officers. But today we note how the courts have failed us and the White House totally ignores us and Congress treats us with contempt.

"Especially pressing on the American people is the gigantic problem of immigration, both legal and illegal. This is a problem that must be solved. It won't go away by itself.

"America is reaching the point of anarchy unless swift action is taken to return to the immigration policy advocated by our Founding Fathers. These American heroes called for a 'protective' immigration policy that guaranteed to maintain the cultural character of America's original immigrants-mainly northern and western Europeans.

"The McCarran-Walter Act of 1952 mandated such a policy. But the Reform Act of 1965, a product of LBJ's Great Society, set in place a new immigration policy that would eventually transform the United States into the Third World look-alike it is quickly becoming.

"Liberty Lobby, the original citizens' lobby of Capitol Hill, advocates a 'protective' immigration policy. And so do the American people. In fact, in this column of November 10, 1997, we showed that every poll finds that the American people want less immigration. They want controlled, protective immigration, just as Liberty Lobby advocates.

"For example: Sixty-seven percent of teens polled by the Horatio Alger Association believe immigration to the United States should be scaled back. An NPG/Roper poll, February, 1996, shows that 83 percent of Americans favor a lower level of immigration; 70 percent would reduce immigration to 300,000 persons annually, and 20 percent want to halt all immigration. A Time/CNN poll shows that 80 percent consider it important for the federal government to track down illegal aliens and 73 percent feel the United States should 'strictly limit' immigration. A CBS/New York Times poll, September, 1995, shows that 63 percent of Americans think immigration levels are too high; 66 percent of Republicans want less immigration and even 60 percent of Democrats want less immigration."

Here is the example of how Political Parties have become gods to our leaders. Continuing in the *Spotlight* article, "Yet, Sen. Pete Domenici (R-N.M.) in an interview on the Evans and Novak television show, said that the GOP should save itself from extinction by easing up on its immigration and English-only policies. His goal is to 'vote' the immigrants for the GOP. He cares little-perhaps nothing-about the country as a whole. His only interest is the good fortune of the GOP. The fact is that Hispanics vote overwhelmingly Democratic." End of the *Spotlight* example of the evils of Party Politics.

Both parties will attend their Party Platform Conventions and wrestle for days over what should and should not be included in their "planks" of issues and beliefs. Yet, even before the ink is dried on their platform, they will vote in direct opposition to that which is in their respective platform. This is hypocrisy and the American people are realizing it and thus more and more good, honest citizens are staying away from the voting polls. The gods called Political Parties don't seem to notice, at least that appears to be so from their actions in Congress.

However, we must understand that we, the people, keep these gods in power. It is a known truth that our alignment with a given party is mostly a sense of psychological attachment to a party and that starts when we are young. We tend to remain in the same party as our parents and this partisan identification remains from one generation to another. Individuals tend to vote their *party* unless there is an issue, or an individual, in another party that very strongly draws them.

This rather untenable situation has been this way since the days of Andrew Jackson. Starting with his election, the national conventions have represented each party as a sovereign entity. Thus, the party is the sovereign entity, not the nation.

However, since television was invented, the national conventions are now more a television special than a decision-making body. When those families which have voted for their party for generations get a first row seat at their own TV set of the spectacle called the national convention, they become disgusted with the whole process.. This, too, has further destroyed our electoral process. We now choose our leaders with only a very small number of voters and they have their own, very special, interests.

As one small example, and it is happening all over the country, the city of El Paso, Texas recently had an election of city and county officials. The turnout for the election was minimal with approximately 10 to 15 percent of the registered voters casting ballots. But they were not from the old time families who built that once fine city. The voting came from newer families recently arriving from Mexico and Central America. Consequently, nearly every position within the city government, as well as the county government, is now

occupied by Hispanics. What about the old-time American families? They apparently "love to have it so" because many are becoming wealthy by taking advantage of the NAFTA Treaty. What is the end result? We see *reconquista*, or reconquest, being fulfilled, all of this because of party politics where each party is trying to increase its members and in the end is giving away our country.

Now for the way it was intended to work. The Bible is rather specific as to how a government is to be run. God has told us in His Word that we are to live in a Theocratic "Republican" form of government. In the Book of Exodus we find this passage:

Jethro, Moses' father-in-law, advises him as to how the nation of Israel should be governed. *"Hearken now unto my voice, I will give thee counsel, and God shall be with thee: Be thou for the people to God-ward, that thou mayest bring the causes unto God:*

*"And thou shalt teach them ordinances and laws, and shalt shew them the way wherein they must walk, and the work that they must do. Moreover thou shalt provide out of all the people able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness; and place such over them, to be rulers of thousands, and rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties and rulers of tens: And let them judge the people at all seasons: and it shall be, that every **great** matter they shall bring unto **thee**, but every **small** matter **they** shall judge: so shall it be easier for thyself, and they shall bear the burden with thee. If thou shalt do this thing, and God command thee so, then thou shalt be able to endure, and all this people shall also go to their place in peace."* ([Exodus 18:19-23](#)).

In Deuteronomy, chapter one: *"Take you wise men, and understanding, and known among your tribes, and I will make them rulers over you. And ye answered me, and said, The thing which thou hast spoken is good for us to do. So I took the chief of your tribes, wise men, and known, and made them heads over you, captains over thousands, and captains over hundreds, and captains over fifties, and captains over tens, and officers among your tribes. And I charged your judges at that time, saying, Hear the causes between your brethren, and judge righteously between every man and his brother, and the stranger that is with him. Ye shall not respect persons in judgment; but ye shall hear the small as well as the great; ye shall not be afraid of the face of man; for the judgment is God's: and the cause that is too hard for you, bring it unto me, and I will hear it."* ([Deu. 1:13-17](#)).

We have written in past issues of the *Intelligence Newsletter* about how the people of ancient England, before William the Conqueror invaded them, actually had a government closely resembling that found in Exodus and Deuteronomy. That all ended with William the Conqueror.

The United States, after our freedom from England, developed a Constitution that was intended to work similar to the system in the Bible. It was to be a true Biblical Republican form of government, at least as true as they could make it. Obviously there were "cracks in the Constitution," or at least in the manner in which it was applied, thanks to Alexander Hamilton and his colleagues.

However, the motto on our coins says it all, "In God We Trust." If that motto was truly meant to be there and for the right reason, then this nation was to be a Theocracy, a Republic under God. Alas, it didn't turn out that way and we will now show how, and when, the changes took place.

We have all heard of the "Golden Years" of the United States. They were the years from the Constitution to about 1830. Alexis de Tocqueville visited the United States in the 1830's and made this statement in his book *Democracy in America*: "Americans were born equal

rather than having to fight a revolution to achieve equality. Men were not frozen into a fixed station, in which they grew up, lived, and expected to die; what counted was individual effort." What happened after 1830 that would have changed that image? Why did we start the long downhill slide at that time?

In the early years the president was nominated by Congressional Caucus by the Representatives from each state. They went into caucus and nominated several men from which the people could choose. The men nominated were, in the opinions of the Representatives of the combined states, the best qualified.

We must understand that the state legislators were nominated and voted into office from each district of their respective state. Also, the officials at the lower levels, county and town, were elected in the same way. All of this was accomplished without political parties. It is recognized that even in such a system there is a strong potential to nominate "cronies" for their own benefit. Only by Godly citizens is it possible to hold that malpractice to a minimum. Apparently, it was held to a minimum, otherwise why would Alexis de Tocqueville be able to make his famous statements about Americans?

However, there are always "stumbling blocks." The vicious fight between Aristocratic Hamiltonianism and Jeffersonian Republicanism never ended and it still exists to this day.

From the book *The American Pageant* by Thomas Bailey, Stanford University, 1961, D.C. Heath and Co. we find this: "A debasement of the political tone was one unfortunate by-product of the New Democracy, commonly called Jacksonian democracy. A statesman was unable to elevate the unlettered masses to his own intellectual level. Rather, the masses dragged the politician down to the level of their own emotions and prejudices. Mudslinging frequently proved more effective than a sober discussion of issues. Candidates for office also made increasing use of banners, badges, parades, barbecues, free drinks, and baby-kissing. Yet cutthroat competition for public favor did have the virtue of 'bringing out the vote.'

"Successful politicians were now forced to unbend and curry favor with the voting masses. Fatally handicapped was the candidate who appeared to be too clean, too well-dressed, too grammatical, too high-browishly intellectual, too conspicuously fit. The Western belief was spreading that a man was well qualified for high office if he was a superior militia commander or a victorious Indian fighter, like Andrew Jackson, or even an outstanding hunter. The semi-literate Davy Crockett was elected to the legislature of Tennessee, mainly on the basis of his prowess with the rifle. Later he killed 105 bears in a single season, and his constituents began to talk of running him for the Presidency."

Do you see modern America in those words written by the Stanford University professor Thomas Bailey? We now have comedians and singers running, and winning, seats in Congress. We have movie stars winning. We have the wives of these men, after they die, replacing them. Were any of these men trained in the intricate skills of statesmanship? We certainly see the baby-kissing at rallies and even "intern kissing" for that matter! Returning to the book *American Pageant*:

"With the emergence of 'nose-counting' democracy, the masses were demanding and securing a fuller measure of popular control. Jeffersonian democracy had preached that the people should be governed as little as possible; Jacksonian democracy argued that the people might govern as much as they liked. Members of the Electoral College, to an increasing degree, were being chosen directly by the people, rather than by state legislatures. Presidential nominations by a Congressional caucus, meeting secretly behind closed doors, were no longer in good odor. This procedure was now regarded as furtive, aristocratic, and subversive of good government. The delicate checks and balances among

the three federal branches were weakened when the President was indirectly indebted to Congress for his exalted office.

"New and more democratic methods of nominating presidential candidates would have to be found. In 1824 the voters, bawling 'The People Must Be Heard' and 'Down with King Caucus,' turned against the candidate (Crawford) who had been selected by the Congressional clique. For a brief period nominations were made by some of the state legislatures. But these did not seem democratic either, and in 1831 the first of the circus-like national nominating conventions was held. Here the people exercised, or seemed to exercise, a higher degree of direct control, though regrettably their will has sometimes been thwarted by paunchy bosses in smoke-filled rooms."

"People Must Be Heard" and "Down With King Caucus." These utterances came from the people on the streets. There was no regard to Biblical Republicanism in their thoughts. It was stated in the above excerpts from the *American Pageant* that "the delicate checks and balances among the three federal branches were weakened when the President was indirectly indebted to Congress for his exalted office." In reality, the opposite is true. The President is required to execute the requirements placed on him by Congress. Thus, the President should be indebted to Congress and should do what he is told to do instead of the current system of his doing as he pleases by Executive Order, etc.

With the loss of separation of powers and the President acting in the capacity of dictator instead of an executive, we find the situation that Frederic Bastiat wrote in his famous works *The Law*.

"Man can live and satisfy his wants only by ceaseless labor; by the ceaseless application of his faculties to natural resources. This process is the origin of property.

"But it is also true that a man may live and satisfy his wants by seizing and consuming the products of the labor of others. This process is the origin of plunder.

"Now since man is naturally inclined to avoid pain, and since labor is pain in itself, it follows that men will resort to plunder whenever plunder is easier than work. History shows this quite clearly. And under these conditions, neither **religion nor morality** can stop it.

"When, then, does plunder stop? It stops when it becomes more painful and more dangerous than labor.

"It is evident, then, that the proper purpose of law is to use the power of its collective force to stop this fatal tendency to plunder instead of to work. All the measures of the law should protect property and punish plunder."

The reason that Bastiat can make the statement that "neither religion nor morality can stop it" is because the system of plunder now being used is a religion in itself. But it is not the religion and morality of the Bible. It is the religion of Talmudism. The Sept.-Oct. 1996 issue of the Intelligence Newsletter was dedicated to the United States now being a Talmudic nation.

This didn't come upon us suddenly. It was a slow process and did not fully materialize until the "reign" of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

There was a book entitled *The Constitution of the United States*, by Harry Atwood which was published and distributed. The War Department of the United States distributed that book and even wrote a Training Manual No. 2000-25 based on that book. Shortly after the "bank holiday" ordered by President Franklin Roosevelt, there was another order emanating from the White House. That order required the Government Printing Office to withdraw all

copies of that book and training manual and destroy them. What was in that Training Manual that was so dangerous to this system of plunder, as described by Bastiat? From Training Manual No. 2000-25 we find these definitions:

"Democracy: A government of the masses. Authority derived through mass meeting or any other form of 'direct' expression. Results in mobocracy. Attitude toward property is communistic--negating property rights. Attitude toward law is that the will of the majority shall regulate, whether it be based upon deliberation or governed by passion, prejudice, and impulse, without restraint or regard to consequences. Results in demagogism, license, agitation, discontent, anarchy.

"Republic: Authority is derived through the election by the people of public officials best fitted to represent them. Attitude toward property is respect for laws and individual rights, and a sensible economic procedure. Attitude toward law is the administration of justice in accord with fixed principles and established evidence, with a strict regard to consequences. A greater number of citizens and extent of territory may be brought within its compass. Avoids the dangerous extreme of either tyranny or mobocracy. Results in statesmanship, liberty, reason, justice, contentment, and progress. Is the 'standard form' (at that time-ed.) of government throughout the world. A republic is a form of government under a constitution which provides for the election of (1) an executive and (2) a legislative body, who, **working together** in a representative capacity, have all the power of appointment, all power of legislation, all power to raise revenue and appropriate expenditures, and are required to create (3) a judiciary to pass upon the justice and legality of their governmental acts and to recognize (4) certain inherent individual rights. Take away any one or more of those four elements and you are drifting into autocracy. Add one or more to those four elements and you are drifting into democracy."

Remember what Jethro said to Moses: *"Hearken now unto my voice, I will give thee counsel, and God shall be with thee: Be thou for the people to Godward, that thou mayest bring the causes to God:*

*"And thou shalt teach them ordinances and laws, and shalt shew them the way wherein they must walk, and the work that they must do. Moreover thou shalt provide out of all the people able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness; and place such over them, to be rulers of thousands, and rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens."* ([Exodus 18: 19-21](#)).

When we look at the features of the two parties in the period 1793-1800, we can see that the two parties show a distinct difference. The essential points as revealed in *The American Pageant* are:

**Federalist Features:**

1. Hostility to extension of democracy;
2. A powerful central government at the expense of states' rights;
3. Loose interpretation of the Constitution; Government to foster business-concentration of wealth in interests of capitalistic enterprise;
4. A protective tariff; Pro-British (conservative Tory tradition);
5. National debt a blessing, if properly funded;
6. An expanding bureaucracy;

7. A powerful central bank;
8. Restrictions on free speech and press.

### **Republican (Jeffersonian) Features.**

1. Rule by the informed masses;
2. Friendliness toward extension of democracy;
3. A weak central government so as to conserve states' rights;
4. Strict interpretation of Constitution;
5. No special favors for business; No special favors for manufacturers;
6. National debt a bane; rigid economy;
7. Reduction of federal officeholders;
8. Encouragement to state banks;
9. Relatively free speech and press.

That system continued until 1816 when the voters threw out the Federalists. By 1820 there was then only one party, the Republicans, and it was called an era of "good feelings." Although there were hard economic times during that period, the citizens felt good about their **system** of government.

In 1825 there again were two parties, the National Republicans and the Jacksonian Democrats. Then in 1834, the National Republicans became Whigs and the Jacksonian Democrats became Democrats. That has remained that way until the present time with the exception of the Whigs becoming simply Republicans.

*"But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering. For he that wavereth is like a wave of the sea driven with the wind and tossed. For let not that man think that he shall receive any thing of the Lord. A double minded man is unstable in all his ways. Let the brother of low degree rejoice in that he is exalted: But the rich, in that he is made low: because as the flower of the grass he shall pass away." ([Jas 1:6-10](#)).*

The act of being "double-minded" is definitely true within the present political parties. Each has accepted the beliefs of their opposing party when it was "good for the party" as was shown in the beginning of this issue.

"The *American Pageant* shows this very clearly. "The Federalist Party expired about 1816 as a national organization, but it continued to live in spirit. Its heirs, with their conservative coloration, sought refuge with other parties, ultimately with the present-day Republicans. The Republican Party of Abraham Lincoln, to be sure, made a powerful appeal to the common people. But since the Civil War the Republicans have consistently favored the protective tariff and other profit-giving concessions to business. More than their Democratic rivals, they have been the party of conservatism, big industry, and wealth. These characteristics are distinctively Hamiltonian, and many latter-day Republicans have claimed the Federalist financier as the godfather of their party.

"The Democratic Party of later times traces its descent, in unbroken lineage, from the Democratic-Republican Party of Thomas Jefferson. It true that the Democrats, down through the days of Franklin D. Roosevelt and later, continued their open appeal to the

'forgotten man.' But they felt obliged by circumstances in the 1930's and 1940's to swell the national debt, subsidize business, increase the multitude of federal employees, and centralize the power of the federal government. All this was essentially Hamiltonian, and the Republican godchildren of Alexander Hamilton were inconsistent in bitterly condemning these practices. Conditions change and principles change, but party labels tend to remain the same."

It can be said that both political parties are Hamiltonian, each in their own way. Both have become totalitarian in their attitudes concerning the ordinary citizen. Congress, as a whole, wants to give the impression that they have a Christian Ethic. Many have "photo ops" in front of a church which they reportedly attend. But do they really understand the teachings of Jesus with respect to government?

We consider our form of government to be "of the people, by the people and for the people." The word "of" denotes the command, or control, over the people. The word "by" denotes the government being the people themselves. The word "for" denotes that the government is to be a servant to the people. One of those pronouns, the word "for," assures a Christian government and society. Without that pronoun, we do not have a government which is a servant to the people.

In the Book of John we can find a passage that relates to a master's (or government's) relationship with the citizens. Starting in [John 13, verse 2](#), *"And supper being ended, the devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him; Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God, and went to God; He riseth from supper, and laid aside his garments; and took a towel, and girded himself.*

*"After that he poureth water into a bason, and began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded. Then cometh he to Simon Peter: and Peter saith unto him, Lord, dost thou wash my feet? Jesus answered and said unto him, What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter."*

Then, dropping down to verse 12, *"So after he had washed their feet, and had taken his garments, and was set down again, he said unto them, Know ye what I have done to you? Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you. Verily, verily, I say unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him. If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them."* ([John 13: 2-7, 12-17](#))

Our form of government can not long stand when those whom we have placed in a position of governing, lose sight of the Christian Principle, of being a servant to the people instead of to their respective political party. Such an arrangement as we now have will always eventually lead to graft, corruption, greed and totalitarianism.

All good, practicing Christians must surely believe that prayers, by the hundreds of thousands, if not millions, have gone up to relieve us of these un-Godly practices. Can we honestly say that they have been heard? In Chapter One of Isaiah we can find the passage that fits our modern nation:

*"Ah sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evildoers, children that are corrupters: they have forsaken the Lord, they have provoked the Holy One of Israel unto anger, they are gone away backward. Why should ye be sticken any more? ye will revolt more and more: the whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint...Your country is desolate,*

*your cities are burned with fire: your land, strangers devour it in your presence, and it is desolate, as overthrown by strangers.*

*"Except the Lord of hosts had left unto us a very small remnant, we should have been as Sodom, and we should have been like unto Gomorah....And when ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you: yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear: your hands are full of blood. Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; Learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow. Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool. If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land: But if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." ([Isa 1: 4-7, 9,15-20](#)).*

What should, and can, all of us do? We can observe the thought processes of the nation, including the vast majority of so-called Christians. The nation thinks with emotion. As we just read in Isaiah, *"Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord."* Yes, Isaiah is still there, and the Laws of God are still there. We can not solve this with Talmudic emotion. So we must **teach, teach, teach** for a rebirth of genuine Christian Principles. We must obey the fundamental Laws of God or we perish as a nation.

Because we refuse to judge our leaders with the Judgments of God and not with emotional, situational ethics trash, we are rapidly decaying into anarchy. When we have children killing children and refuse to address the real problems, we are already there. We must attack the situations of **both** parents being forced to work, the children placed in day care centers, situation ethics and humanism being taught in schools, violence on TV and in the movies, the prohibition of discipline being allowed in the home, etc. The list is endless and **it is the fault of Congress being more concerned with their Party than the nation.**