

**WILL THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES COME IN AGREEMENT
OR
WILL THEY LOSE THE IDEALS AND PRINCIPLES
SHE WAS FOUNDED UPON?**

By Rev. Christine Meier

Last month we exposed a few misconceptions that we Americans have in order to be able to come in agreement. The first is that we all have to agree about everything. The second is that folks who refuse Christianity or the God of the Bible will not experience the benefits that belief gives. The reason why people can experience the benefits God's covenant people live in, is because we have a Federal government under the compulsion of a non-sectarian agreement with the people it serves. Because the word Federal means covenant, our government is to be a non-sectarian and unbiased overseer between sovereign states and sovereign individual people. Those people have a dual citizenry: One within the state they live and the country they are a citizen of. Only the Bible purports to extend supernatural, spiritual and "other-worldly" blessings in this life and the life to come to those who follow it. No other book— not the Quran, not Sanskrit writings or any other religion, except Judaism and Christianity— extend this kind of all-encompassing promise to its followers. This same book promises to also bless the "alien" or "stranger" who agrees to live at peace with God's people. Because our Federal government holds an unbiased or non-sectarian governmental and covenantal agreement to its citizens as well as to the states — and to citizens in particular who hold an "other kingdom" covenantal agreement to the God of the Bible— there can be mental missteps for some when reviewing their relationship to one another in our country.

It is the Federal government's sworn oath to view and respect the states as well as the citizens rights within our governing compact. That compact encompasses three separate, yet equally crucial documents. Inherent in our governmental understanding is that those beliefs and ideals are given to us by a "Creator." The Declaration of Independence as well as the Constitution "tips a nod of the head" to the Creator the Bible describes; but never specifically names Him as anything but "Creator," "Nature's God," "Supreme Judge of the world," "Divine Providence," "Our Lord" (as in the year of Our Lord, or AD; literally, Anno Domini). Most citizens do not realize that the Bill of Rights or the first ten amendments are rights which cannot be taken away by any government or mankind because they are rights that have been given to us by the Creator. When citizens agree to our

governmental compact agreement, they do so by exchanging some of their God-given rights to receive safety from the country and the states they are citizens of. They also do so to protect the larger community within those entities. Yet the Bill of Rights makes it clear that the first ten amendments are rights which the people and the states agree they will never give up.

The proof of this is documented in a book you can get on this site or on Amazon and any of your favorite online or brick and mortar bookstores: “70 Years of American Captivity: The Polity of God, The Birth of a Nation and The Betrayal of Government.” To give one example of the attitude those who agreed to the Constitution had, I refer you to the ratification document of the Commonwealth of Virginia. In excerpted fashion, one of the statements she makes as she agrees to the US Constitution is this:

“Delegates of the People of Virginia duly elected...Do in the name and in behalf of the People of Virginia declare and make known that the powers granted under the Constitution being derived from the People of the United States may be resumed by them whensoever the same shall be perverted to their injury or oppression and that every power not granted thereby remains with them and at their will.....June 26, 1788, Ratification of the Constitution by the State of Virginia”¹

70 Years of American Captivity also documents the hundreds of ways the Federal government has broken the agreement it made to the states and the citizens it has sworn to protect. There is no way in this article to document all those instances. I would encourage anyone reading this to pick up an ebook copy, as it is the easiest and cheapest way to arm yourself with legal and historical proof. Paperback and hardcover is more expensive than ebook, but those forms are available if you prefer them. More modern examples of this betrayal are the way we are taxed; the way our money is spent and the size of the national debt. Never mind how money is spent to bring in Syrian refugees and illegal aliens and the benefits given them. Of course, the way ObamaCare has behaved and how it was passed, all the executive orders signed by a recent president which haven't been challenged, as well as the size of the Federal government itself, are all examples of the larger problem the Federal government has in breaking its non-sectarian agreement.

Many Christians and other Bible-believers may not find any of those examples just mentioned a problem at all. I would say that is because you do not know why they

¹ <http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/ratva.asp> Site © 2008 Lillian Goldman Law Library, New Haven, CT. Accessed 3/5/16

are problems. Because our compacting agreements limit the Federal government specifically, any law or pattern of behavior from the Federal government which breaks those boundaries has the impetus to create a government no longer controlled by the people or the states, but controlled by some other “entity.” Many Americans do not know the history of an entity like socialism to control our land, people and states. Beginning in roughly 1908 to the 1960s, socialism, within the name and title of Progressivism, implemented changes to our governing documents which set the trap for the people of the United States as well as the states themselves to be captured by communism. It would not be named communism per se. They call it progressivism (socialism) and it now controls the democrat party in America. Decades ago you could find economists from both liberal and conservative beliefs. Liberalism has a long European history, but it found an easy home in America. The democrats were formerly liberals. The reason why they worked well with the republicans is because liberalism/democrats argued for government to be as small as possible (limited), and allow the exercise of individual freedom. Its economics was conservative. Both parties were formerly two sides to a coin. Because they had many similarities, they worked on behalf of the country. Once socialism swallowed up the democrats, that unity (on the secular side) ended. There are no true liberal democrats any longer in our government. They can argue all day long and call themselves what they would like, but unless they decide to vote that way, they are gone. Unless the minority religious democrats are able to extrapolate themselves from the trap of progressivism and unite with the republicans, our government is lost.

So let’s define this entity and see what its outcome always is. To reiterate what I wrote before, it is impossible in an article this size to layout all the history, definitions and patterns involved in what socialistic behavior does to a country. I encourage you to pick up the book already mentioned. Many have misconceptions concerning socialism. The first is that it can co-exist within our American governing documents; it cannot. The second lie told by socialists is that you get free stuff. Another lie is that somehow it is more humane, kind and generous to give people “who need it” free stuff. In other words, socialism is more equal or it is about *equality*. Let’s debunk the second fantasy: Nothing is free. Contrary to popular myth, socialism/progressivism does not extend economic freedom to all, just to a select few. If you think you will be one of the beneficiaries, think again. Only the mega-corporations who tout the doctrine and implement what, over time becomes harsher and harsher controls, will benefit. As more try to sign on, the noose tightens so less and fewer beneficiaries exist. This is by design within the progressive or socialistic system because it needs capitalism to sustain itself. It

cannot produce the money necessary to sustain its ever-expanding promise of benefits. (Please see Section 4, Chapters 4 through 15 of the book mentioned.)

Socialism by definition is the philosophical, social and economic system whereby society, its money, ventures of enterprise and industry— its people and even their religion— is owned and controlled by the state government rather than by individual people or companies or religious institutions. Socialism places a special emphasis on the nationalization of monopolized branches of industry and trade. Socialism advocates state ownership of corporations in which the ownership function has passed from stockholders to managerial personnel. Smaller and less vital enterprises and institutions can be left under private ownership, thereby allowing private ownership of smaller corporations, though they are heavily regulated. The socialistic doctrine demands state ownership and control of the fundamental means of production and distribution of wealth. That is to be achieved by reconstructing the existing capitalist or other political system of a country through democratic and parliamentary means. It advocates nationalization of natural resources, basic industries, banking and credit facilities and public utilities, along with the education systems in a country. Those educational systems must now teach the nationalistic mantra of the socialists' religion or ideologies. That is because socialism (progressivism) is also an ideology with religious-like beliefs. This is why progressive-socialism swallows up any political/economic freedom which pre-existed in a country before socialism was enacted. This is why our traditional government and the freedoms it espoused are disappearing very quickly.

Since it was proven long ago socialism is quite unscientific and cannot produce a healthy economy, Marx set out to “conquer” the science by, among other things, attempting to prove logic was unable to be applied universally to all mankind for all time. That the “thought” needed to disprove socialism was applied by a class of thinkers who basically can't be trusted because of their class interests. According to Marx, this is because you are from a class which won't accept what you cannot see in socialism, or whatever brand of “correct” thinking the progressives or social engineering class want YOU, the common worker, to think. Next— and this one is priceless— the discussion over whether to be socialist or not to be socialist— the need for socialization of production and the desire not to socialize production— is unnecessary because all history will bring all societies to socialized production because it is the necessary end of all societies! Finally, socialists are basically not to engage anyone in talking about what a socialistic state will or will not look like

— because their faith says it is inevitable— that any discussion along those lines will open them up to logical thinking and that would be to renounce socialism!²

Many believe that socialism promotes ownership in common. In other words, we all own what the state owns, making us equal. That is a total lie. Only the state owns in socialism (progressivism). The people own nothing. I know the president and his party running for president are trying to tout their brand of socialism (progressivism) is softer and not Marxist or the Leninist brand of socialism. I'm old enough to remember the lie used to be, "Oh, we're not communists, we're socialists and that is totally different." Let me ask you, does it matter whether they get your property, money, land or rights at the point of a gun or at the point of a regulation or "law"? Socialism came first from the ideas of both Marx and Engel, and then through Lenin communism was birthed. This makes socialism communism's Mama. Trust me when I tell you the apple does not fall far from that tree. Both Marx and Lenin saw what became communism as the final road of socialism. Once it became obvious shouting "revolution" and "Change" were nothing more than "Give Us Your Money, Wealth, Land and Rights So WE can distribute them MORE Equitably"— and that the distribution process will always be broken, distributing common poverty— large people groups moved away from socialism. When that happened socialists realized they needed to distance themselves from communism, even decrying it as something totally different from socialism. So they came up with a different form of socialism that they called progressivism. This just slows the process, thereby slowing the final outcome of communism. Otherwise it is the same because all roads lead straight to more and more regulations and controls. These eventually become so restrictive to freedom of religion, freedom of speech and economic freedom.

Each time you prove to socialists that in every instance where it is enacted death, destruction and eventual communism (by any other name) ensues, they tell you "Oh, that's not socialism" that's called "something else." They then proceed to tell you the name of something. When you experience this, you know you are now in the moniker-zone. I call it that because they will shift whatever form of socialism you are taking about to some other entity. Recently I had a socialist do just that when I told him that Hitler was a socialist. He then said he was x, y and z instead, and "Oh, by the way, look at Sweden and all these great countries." Of course, when I gave him proof of their economies being capitalistic money ventures, and then showed him the proof that their social policies enacting socialism were

² Ludwig Von Mises, "Socialism: An Economic and Sociological Analysis," translated by J. Kahane, foreword by F.A. Hayek; (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1981) March 13, 2016 <<http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/1060>> see 8. I am not quoting Von Mises here. He more accurately translates Marx's thinking better than I could. I view what I have written as a pretty good interpretation of Marx's ideas after viewing several different aspects of them from many sources.

causing the loss of their religious, economic and self-governing rights, he basically ignored me. This is the hole of socialism. There is not one single country on the planet which has enacted it where civil liberties and freedoms have not been lost into its black hole.

For Bible believers this is especially true. Many religions have the mistaken belief that socialism is pure because it gives money to the needy. Because we don't have the space to discuss all the science, I encourage you to pick up the book I have mentioned or look at the last footnote. It lists some resources. Socialism goes counter to all the laws of natural science. It cannot function within those systems. The Bible functions within all the systems of natural science and then functions as well within a system that is supernatural. Socialism is horrified by that system because it cannot control it. As a result of never being able to function scientifically within natural systems, socialism can never cope with the poor because it views them as an anomaly to be controlled or overcome. So the poor will never escape from its clutches, no matter what form or name you give to socialism. The Bible is quite different. In relating to the poor only— I don't have the space to go further— the Bible explains why there should be a “for the moment” help made to the poor, elderly, disabled or orphaned. The book explains how that is to be done and why that is to be done, and when it must not be done.

The Bible is clear: Those who do not work, should not eat. (2 Thessalonians 3:10) It matters little whether they are legal, illegal, persecuted immigrants, the poor or the disabled. I know disabled who perform tasks to enrich their communities. The infirm and elderly or totally incapacitated disabled cannot physically work. So there are biblical exceptions as to why their need will last longer than someone who is out of work for reasons beyond their control. The New Testament is clear benevolence is to be given to widows and orphans and those widows were not to be young women who could work. These had to be those who were not gossips, sitting around idle and “talking.” They had to serve the saints and take care of many in the congregations who could not take care of themselves. (1 Timothy 5:3-16) The Catholic church developed the nunnery for this purpose. Other denominations solve this through volunteers or by other institutional programs.

In point of fact, the Bible teaches and supports free enterprise as well as private property. If that were not the case, why the commandment prohibiting stealing and covetousness? Socialism uses mankind's fallen nature, which desires what someone else has, without working for it. To yearn to possess what someone else has is to covet it. This is strictly forbidden by the Bible, (Exodus 20:17; Deuteronomy 5:21) and its root causes are to be exposed and repented of

(Philippians 2:12,13). In the biblical economy we are to care for the sick, the old and the otherwise indigent. We are also to work and expect blessing and riches to follow. God will give us enough to give to others and He will provide all our needs according to His riches and glory in Christ Jesus. (Philippians 4:19) The biblical economy is to work hard and prosper. All throughout the Old and New Testaments this is the foundation. The New Testament unlocks charity through the institution closest to the people. That institution is the church (or other religious organizations). God gives mankind talents to bless people and God with.

Socialists try to use Acts 2-5 as a support for taking people's money and redistributing it. There are several reasons why the Bible does not support that interpretation. One is seen in Acts 2:44, 47, and it is the tense of the verbs used in the Greek. Most of the time you would expect a "once-for-all-action" in a historical narrative like this, but that is not what is seen here. It's more like a "from time to time," or when the occasion arose. In fact, this is clearly seen in Acts 4:34, 35, with some translations stating clearly, "From time to time" or as the need arose, the believers would sell or give money. We see something similar in relation to Acts 5 with Ananias and Sapphira. It wasn't the fact they didn't give all the money, but they lied to the Holy Spirit and judgment fell on them. The early church had to be built in doctrinal purity and integrity of action.

Many believe giving to their church is the same as giving to the state. That is also a lie. An institution closest to the people knows the people and knows exactly what they need. That institution must work within natural laws of thrift and incentive to meet needs or else it will not survive. The state is an artificial entity, taking by deceit what is scientifically and rightfully yours. Progressivism never needs to work within laws of nature because it has an endless supply of people it owns, taking from them to sustain itself. The Bible is clear that the lie is from the devil. He is called the deceiver and all evil emanates from him. Socialism uses the voice of the deceiver exclusively to get you to give up what is yours, all in an effort to control and marginalize what and who you are. It is a shell game, playing with a sleight of the hand and removing the little item you are looking for so it is never under any cup. Just because you think it's under one cup, doesn't make it so. Capitalism allows all voices, including the deceiver access. The choice is yours as to whether you give up ownership, act greedily or work for a profit and give back (if that is your choice). The Bible encourages the giving and it encourages something else: ownership. Ownership requires responsibility and it requires something else: self-government. Once you remove ownership and responsibility, choice is gone. Once choice is gone, liberty and freedom is a thing of the past.

What is socialism/progressivism's end game? It is totalitarian manipulation of human beings. It is not some altruistic endeavor to help lift the common class worker out of his doldrums. It is selfishness personified because it demands to control all of what a society has in order to accomplish goals which are a lie to begin with. Politicians which are progressive/socialist or "democrat socialists" are only interested in keeping themselves on top and fluid with your cash. Whether or not they have been duped by socialism is irrelevant. They still take your goods and services, providing little or nothing in return. Socialistic societies are not more peaceful. That is another lie. It takes hard work and innovation to protect ourselves when the wolves are at the door. Progressivism saps this energy on many levels.

The biblical economy encouraged in both Testaments fosters the tithe, which is giving ten percent of your income. The promise is that you will see abundance and an ability for the ninety percent left over to do more than 100 percent could have done before. Obviously, this, like miracles is illogical to human minds. The Bible makes no excuses for this. When you say to Christians what they believe defies logic and so does their God, you are having a "duh" moment with them. We know it makes no sense. We also know, by experience, that it works. It freaks us out too. In God's economy this is by design. It is so you see the audacity of this, walk through the door of faith, and experience Him up close and personal. Now, you don't have to do that in a country which allows the covenant people to pray and function in the totality of their inalienable rights. That is because blessing will extend to all secular covenant citizens when biblically covenant citizens engage their covenant. Of course, you can make personal choices within that system to hamper your own personal experience of betterment, but that is your choice.

So what has this got to do with an election? Everything. If Americans continue to vote more and more socialistic politicians in office— regardless of what they call themselves— the religions which espouse the Bible will receive brutal and burdensome regulations placed upon them. This is already taking place. It is time we started to realize and address the problem and take action which our Founding Fathers encouraged us to take: Vote Them Out. It is also time we started to obey the book we claim to believe: Repent and Come in Agreement with it. This is how a nation like the United States succeeded in agreeing. We have secular as well as a majority of faith-believing citizens within our borders. We can come in agreement and get back the freedoms we have lost, before we lose the rest of them. Let's all take action before it's too late.