

The Roots of Abortion

the slaughter of innocents in the American Empire

by Terry Sullivan

RADICAL CHRISTIAN PRESS

topics

I	The Failure of the Pro Life Movement	1
II	The Moral Collapse of Catholicism	16
III	The Aborted American Lifestyle	23
IV	America's Stinky Self Righteousness	33
V	The Great Land Hunt	42
VI	The Founding Slave Owner	50
VII	Them or Us	60
VIII	The Compost Patriot	64
IX	Child Sacrifice to the Goddess of Liberty	72
X	The Death of Christendom	84
XI	The Imperial Faith	91
XII	Confronting Mister Evil	98
XIII	Hitler Deploys the Patriot Pastors	103
XIV	The Empire Devours Vietnam	nnn
XV	The Secret Faith of the Founding Fathers	nnn
XVI	The French Connection	nnn
XVII	The Twin Revolutions	nnn
XVIII	The New World Order	nnn
XIX	The Plot Against the Family	nnn
XX	Fruited Plain becomes Dust Bowl	nnn
XXI	The Empire Strikes Back	nnn
XXII	Zionism versus Judaism	nnn
XXIII	The Anti Family Economy	nnn
XXIV	Secular Christianity versus Christian Society	nnn
XXV	Christian Society and Christian Economy	nnn

PRO LIFE NONVIOLENT ACTION P.O. Box 16861 Denver CO. 80216

*Open your mouth for the speechless, In the cause of all who are appointed to die.
Open your mouth, judge righteously, and plead the cause of the poor and needy.* Proverbs 31.8-9 (nKJ)

For this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. John 18.37

Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me. Matthew 25.40

January 22nd 2003 35 & 1/2 years since Reagan signed California abortion bill

LET US RECOGNIZE THE REAL REASONS FOR THE FAILURE OF THE ANTI ABORTION MOVEMENT

WRONG HISTORY: LEGAL Abortion in America **DID NOT** begin with the *Roe versus Wade* decision in 1973. It began in 1967 when the states began passing liberalized abortion laws. It began June 15th 1967 when **Governor Ronald Reagan** *reluctantly* signed the new California abortion law. It began April 25th 1967 when the Republican Governor of Colorado signed the new abortion law passed by the Republican legislature. These laws still had substantial restrictions, but, as their opponents accurately predicted, once you start allowing abortions for some reasons, they will soon be allowed for any reason. In the late 1960s and the early 1970s, the movement for LEGAL abortion continued to gather momentum. As California and New York and Colorado went, so went most of the other states. In June 1967, the American Medical Association called for *abortion reform*, their first change in policy since 1871.

The 1973 Supreme Court decision did not make abortion legal. It allowed it to remain legal. It swept away the remaining obstacles to legal abortion. But most of them had already been swept away by the movement for legal abortion which began in the 1960s. *Roe versus Wade* brought a few *backward* states like Louisiana into line with all the rest. **THE SUPREME COURT READ THE NEWSPAPERS.** It went along with what was already done. It affirmed what The American People were doing regardless of what they pretended to believe. It affirmed a legal status quo which was engineered by Republicans as much as by Democrats, by Conservatives as much as by Liberals. The only real difference is that Conservative Republicans still keep up a pretense of opposing abortion, because they use the *issue* to get votes, while the so-called Christian so-called Conservatives use the *issue* to raise money. The **LIBERALS** raise money and win votes off the opposite pretense. None of them really care except for that. It is a power and money game.

Why was there so little effective resistance to the passage of liberal abortion laws in 1967 ? California was not that liberal in 1967, as witness the fact that it had elected Mr. Conservative as Governor. Colorado was not a liberal state and still isn't, judging by the fact that it regularly elects Republicans to most political offices. The answer is that abortion, legal or not, was already common in America by 1967. And then the impetus of the 1960s was to bring things out into the open that had long been hidden. The lid came off Pandora's box. The things which first appeared in the 1960s did not originate in the 1960s. They had been a hidden part of American life for a long time. And that is what we are up against: **THE DEEP ROOTS OF ABORTION IN AMERICAN LIFE.** The truth is the wholesale destruction of innocent human life by **war**, by **slavery**, by **poverty**, and by **abortion** are **AMERICA'S FOUNDATION STONES.**

The pro life lobbies base their fund raising on the false proposition that *Roe versus Wade* is the cause of abortion in America and the pretence that they are working effectively to overturn it. Abortion became legal in America for the same basic reasons it became legal in Europe. It isn't some legal fluke which can be readily reversed. That **ILLUSION**, constantly promoted by the political pro lifers, is a **FALSE FAITH** which **BLINDS PEOPLE** to the real challenge of stopping abortion. **The cause is HOPELESS, while this blindness continues.**

[Later Note, January 2006: With the confirmation of John Roberts and Sam Alito to the Supreme Court, there is supposedly the opportunity to overturn *Roe v. Wade*. The striking thing is that neither one could say 1. *yes, abortion is murder.* 2. *which is strictly forbidden by the Law of God* 3. *So I must do everything in my power to stop abortion.* Instead, they believe in **The Rule of Law**--the rule of the lawyers.] [Later Note, November 2006: the strict ban on abortion in South Dakota was

defeated 56 % to 44 %. Even in South Dakota, morality cannot achieve popularity. So we may as well give it up, because The People Have Spoken.]

LEGAL AND ILLEGAL

WRONG FOCUS: The challenge **IS NOT** to end **LEGAL** abortion. The distinction between **LEGAL** and **ILLEGAL** abortion is not important. Abortion became legal in 1967 because it was already common in America. That is what generated the pressure to make it legal. California already had an estimated 100,000 abortions annually as of 1967, most of them still nominally *illegal* under the new law. Which didn't prevent them from happening. By 1967 abortion and contraception had become as common among Catholics as among Protestants. Abortion came from the **IMPERATIVE** of the luxury-loving American life style to which these Secular Christians had already conformed: **MORE MONEY, FEWER CHILDREN.**

Abortion is common in all the nations of Central and South America despite the fact that it is still nominally against the law in those places. Brazil has 2 million abortions a year. Peru even had a program of **forced abortion**. [These figures are exaggerated by those who promote legal abortion and minimized by those who raise their funds by a narrow focus on abortion laws.] The Philippines have a **HIGHER** abortion rate than the United States, despite a ban on abortion written into the Constitution. They **HAVE** a **Human Life Amendment** and they ignore it. As **PROHIBITION** showed, the law is not enforced when many dissent from it, even if the law is an Amendment to the Constitution. Is marijuana still illegal ? You would hardly know it.

This **WRONG FOCUS** is not just an intellectual error. It is the necessary justification for the pro life lobbies which have to pretend that abortion can be stopped by what they are doing in Washington. This **WRONG FOCUS** is necessary for those sham ecclesiastical and political *pro lifers* around the country who use the **ABORTION ISSUE** to raise money and promote careers. They milk it like they do any other issue they can catch hold of. They are adept at taking out of the collection plate while pretending to put something in. This **WRONG FOCUS** represents the **FALSE HOPE** of the Secular Christians who must cling to it because otherwise they have **NO HOPE**. They have promulgated this illusion until they have become trapped in it themselves. And they find it easy to promote this **FALSE HOPE** among Secular Christians who are used to buying their way out of a moral obligation with a small donation and the flip of a voting lever. Who already devoutly believe that it is up to the government to establish Christian morality, because it cannot be up to them. They have to believe it, because they do not have the Spirit of Courage which is required for Christian Witness in opposition to the Powers of this world.

THE MORAL MINORITY

FALSE FAITH: There is no such thing as a **MORAL MAJORITY**. Morality cannot be established by popular vote. **IT IS IMMORAL TO VOTE FOR MORALITY.** The Commandment has already been established by the One and Only Vote that counts. It is a **COMMANDMENT**, not an Amendment that is to be ratified or rejected or modified by a plebiscite of The People. It is to be ratified by Christians living their lives in obedience to it. Not by people flipping a lever behind a curtain of anonymity. Which says: *I don't have the Courage to stand up for what is right, but I give my secret proxy to the politician who promises to do it for us.*

The basic **FALSE FAITH** of the Secular Christians is that they can stick with the crowd. They don't have to join that unpopular minority which is persecuted for opposing the crowd. Morality can be Popularity. You can **VOTE FOR VIRTUE**. Morality can be established or re-established in the anonymous safety of the voting booth. You don't have to stick your neck out. You don't need the Courage to Bear Christian Witness to the Truth.

The government is really on our side. Or soon will be. Despite temporary aberrations like *Roe v. Wade*. The Senators, the Judges, the Army and the Police are on our side. If they aren't, we will stay on their side until we can persuade them to switch. That attitude defines the Secular Christian: *I will live the Christian life if--and only if--everyone else does. I'm not getting out there by myself. I will live the Christian life to the degree that the police officer permits. Meanwhile, I will sign petitions. I will slip behind the curtain and vote. What more can you ask ?* And their pastors know better than to ask more. Even when they cast a vote, they wear sun glasses. When they sign a petition, they scribble the name so it can't be read. *No use taking chances.*

When morality has to be popularity, we can only have as much morality as the majority agrees with. But the morality we need is the morality which the **COURAGEOUS MINORITY** will stand up for, will work for, will live and die for, in opposition to the cowardly and immoral majority. When Christians were a courageous minority, they were real Christians. The cowardly and conformist mob were afraid of them. When they joined that mob, when they let that mob join them, they ceased to be real Christians. Going along with the crowd, waiting for the crowd to go along with you--is the **SURE SIGN** of Secular Christianity.

Voting for Virtue

A group of us are trying to decide whether to go for pizza or for hamburgers. So we vote on it. The losers good-naturedly go along with the vote rather than split the group. A vote may be the best and simplest way to decide such a question.

Someone suggests we pull the plug on Uncle Fred so that we can collect the insurance. He is dying anyway, and his medical bills are enormous. Someone else suggests that we vote on it. Obviously, you cannot vote **for** such a proposition. Can you vote against it? **NO!** You cannot let such a question be decided by voting! What you have to say instead is that no one has the right to do such a thing, that a 9 to 1 vote against you is meaningless, is null and void, and that, instead of merely outvoting you, they have to kill you first, before they can kill Uncle Fred!

Suppose you are sure of winning. You are confident that you can muster a majority for Uncle Fred's life. Why not do it that way? Why risk making a martyr of yourself when you have the votes to do it an easier way?

Because once you have gone along with voting on such a proposition you have conceded that it can be decided by voting. When it comes up again, and this time you are out-voted, you have abandoned the moral principle you need to effectively oppose this decision. Because you thereby subscribe to the illusion that morality can be popularity, that it can be established by majority vote, that it doesn't require courage and sacrifice, that there is no need to fight, that there is an easy way to do it. Because you thereby forever after limit yourself to such morality as can be made to be popular with a majority.

Do you abide by the results of an election only when it goes your way? The essential requirement of an election is that all those who participate in it have made an implicit good faith agreement to abide by the result. So when you vote in a contest between vice and virtue you have thereby agreed to accept vice if that is the will of the majority. You have said *let the people decide and I will go along with it, even if the decision is against God.* That is what Aaron did when he **BOWED TO THE WILL OF THE PEOPLE** and made the golden calf for them to worship. That is what everyone does when he participates in a vote to decide a moral question.

When you vote for a **LESSER EVIL**, you vote for evil. You testify to your belief that it is not really possible to live in this world and faithfully do good and avoid evil. Some day you will have the opportunity to stand before Jesus Christ and explain your theory to Him! Good Luck! **YOU WILL NEED IT!**

HOW TO STOP ABORTION IN AMERICA

WRONG FOCUS: The challenge facing us **IS NOT** Ending Abortion in America. Focusing upon abortion in America is the **WRONG FOCUS**. It is **too wide** and it is **too narrow**.

It is--intellectually--too narrow: When you focus upon the fact that the abortion situation in France, Italy, Germany, England, Japan, etc. etc. is essentially the same as it is here, it shows the true dimensions of the challenge. It shows the uselessness of those who propose to end abortion in America by getting themselves elected to Congress or by settling in there as lobbyists. We are never going to have a Pro Life Government which appoints a Pro Life Supreme Court which then dictates a Pro Life America. Getting rid of that illusion, and the people who peddle it, is the first step towards really doing something about abortion in

America. No where in Washington is there an answer to abortion. The first step in the direction of doing something effective to stop abortion is to forget about Washington D.C. and the Great Pretenders who hang out there.

It is--practically--too wide: the abortion you can stop is the one scheduled for this morning at that abortion clinic near your home. The **Sidewalk Counselors** who are out there this morning **Stop Abortion in America** every day of the week. On December 26th 1999, three babies were born the same day to three different women we had **SIDEWALK COUNSELED** in front of the Planned Parenthood abortuary at 20th and Vine. On the average, we **RESCUE** two babies a week by daily **SIDEWALK COUNSELING**. If sidewalk counselors weren't so few in number, many more babies could be saved. But they are ignored and dishonored by Secular Christians and their pastors who do not recognize that *Bearing Witness to the Truth* is something which Christians **MUST DO**. *Bearing Witness* is not one of the options of a Christian life, **it is the TEST of whether you are one**. Christians who lack the Courage to Bear Witness become shriveled in that Spirit which is the source of the Christian life. That describes the Christian church today--what pretends to be the church. That loss of Courage is the **FIRST CAUSE** of abortion as of every other evil we suffer.

The woman you can turn away from abortion is the one you encounter at the local high school or elsewhere, when you wear an **ABORTION KILLS CHILDREN** badge and carry *The First Nine Months* to hand out in person. That is how a Christian **VOTES**: every day, **IN PERSON**, with the Courage which the Spirit gives. Never mind abortion in America. What about abortion in your own town, in your own family even? A basic reason for joining the **SIDEWALK COUNSELORS** is that it is a necessary moral exercise which develops the Courage which is that first gift of the Holy Spirit. It is the essential and irreplaceable foundation of a Christian Life.

We will never stop abortion in America or in the world. But that isn't the right question. The right question is whether we can stop it in our families and in our Christian communities. The answer is that Yes, we can. If we can re-build a truly Christian community. If we were serious about living that Christian life style which is the only real alternative to the abortion-bound Secular Christian life style. If we escape from our cowardly conformity to the crowd and our childish dependence upon the state. If we wean ourselves from our false faith in **AMERICA**.

Saving the Nation

There is a fundamental moral and spiritual reason why **AMERICA** is the wrong focus in the war for the unborn. Neither **AMERICA** nor any other nation can be the proper focus for those who truly follow Jesus. The focus upon **AMERICA** grows out of that **NATIONALISM** which replaces true Christian theology with the **PERVERTED PATRIOTIC THEOLOGY** of Secular Christianity. Jesus did not come to **SAVE THE NATION**. He came to save us **FROM THE NATIONS**--from that **WORLD**, ruled by Satan, which is made up of **NATIONS**. That is a fundamental Christian truth which has been obscured by the Secular Christians who joined the apostate Imperial Church of the 4th century, and by those who still cling to the Imperial Church of the 21st century.

Jesus allowed his own nation to be destroyed while he established a *new nation*, drawn from all nations but which belongs to none of them. Which defines itself by its spiritual **DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE** from the nation. When it loses that independence, when it joins the patriotic mob in offering incense to Caesar, in joining the cross to the flag, in saluting the flag of empire, when it succumbs to the ancient idolatry of the state, it is no longer the Christian Church. It represents instead **DE NATURED** Christianity, a Christianity which has betrayed its fundamental nature. Which has lost all spiritual power. Which instead relies upon political and military power, the power of money and popularity with the mob. It is **SECULAR CHRISTIANITY** which has conformed to **THIS WORLD** in defiance of the teaching of Jesus and his apostles. It is the nemesis of real Christianity and it joins the State in the persecution of faithful Christians, like the Imperial Church of Constantine and Augustine. (I have written about the early history of this apostate church in my book, **THE CHURCH OF THE EMPIRE**.)

It is the Church which is the **BRIDE OF CHRIST**. Not the Nation. The call of Jesus Christ is to individuals. He calls them to join a community which can only survive by maintaining a constant

spiritual and moral warfare against the nations which are ruled by the Prince of this World. There has to be a **fundamental antagonism** between the follower of Jesus and the world. *The world is crucified unto me and I unto the world* says Saint Paul. (Gal 6.14) He exhorts us to live *blameless and harmless, the sons of God without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation, among whom ye shine as lights in the world.* (Phil 2.15) *Whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God.* (James 4.4) *If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him.* (1 Jn 2.15) *Marvel not, my brethren, if the world hate you.* (1 Jn 3.13) *And we know that we are of God and the whole world lieth in wickedness.* (1 Jn 5.19)

AMERICA cannot be saved. No more than any other empire can be saved. No more than the Roman Empire could be saved. The sword by which it is established is the sword by which it will perish. The terrible expense of those wars which are necessary to maintain its world power will bring about its ruin. The American Empire is already far down that road. Christians did not save the Roman Empire. They saved themselves and their families from the inevitable collapse of the empire through the Christian community to which they belonged. The refugees from the ruin of Israel built a Christian community in the ruins of the Roman empire.

OPINIONS VERSUS CONVICTIONS

WRONG ANALYSIS: It is not a *BATTLE of opinions*. As if cowards are serious about fighting. As if hot air was the antidote to hot air. Opinions are worthless. Or, if you like, they are worth one penny, as in *a penny for your thoughts*. In truth, a pro life **OPINION** is not worth a fart. The *opinions* don't matter and the endless arguments don't matter. What matters are Beliefs, Passions, Convictions--whatever it takes to make people Stop Talking and Start Doing. Whatever will push them in the direction of Bearing Christian Witness. Opinions carry no moral weight. Opinions are feathers that float away in the breeze. Convictions that drive people to act are bulldozers that knock down fortresses. (cf. 2 Corinthians 10.4)

An opinion may lead to a vote. That is, it leads to the Great Illusion that you are **DOING SOMETHING** by voting. What you are doing is expressing the vain hope that some politician will do something. He won't. He can't. He has too many cowards for constituents. He understands his real job in respect to the *ISSUE* of abortion: **pretend to be doing something, so that the voters can pretend that they did something by voting for me.** The futile, feeble, immoral half measures, 1/4th measures, and 1/64th measures, upon which the silly political battle is focused, are the result. Ban homicides carried out with one model of hand gun. Unless it is necessary for your *HEALTH*. An opinion may lead to a vote. What is a vote worth? \$ 1? Maybe several dollars in Chicago. But a real pro life witness is worth \$ 10,000. A real pro life witness is priceless because it may save the priceless life of a baby. When you **BEAR WITNESS TO THE TRUTH**, you *cast your whole vote, not a strip of paper merely*. It generates that power of the Spirit of Courage, which is necessary to stop abortion.

We don't need more arguments against abortion and we don't need better arguments against abortion. Why isn't the simple and indisputable statement that **ABORTION KILLS BABIES** enough? It would be, if we believed it ourselves, if we acted like we believed it. We don't need to convince others, we need to convince ourselves. If our actions were in accordance with what we pretend to believe, we would have no difficulty in convincing others. Like playing cards, arguments provide entertainment and pass the time. But they are all but useless towards creating moral conviction in ourselves or others. How can you convince someone else to do what you are afraid to do yourself? We have to teach by setting the example.

FACTS VERSUS TRUTH

WRONG ANALYSIS: It is not a battle of INFORMATION. A sidewalk counselor does not save a baby just by giving the abortion customer INFORMATION. He does it by showing that person an example of the Courage she will need to make the right choice, the courage to stand up for her baby. He shows her that he cares about her. He sets an example of that Spirit of Love which overcomes all obstacles. He has to somehow counter the pressure of the boy friend, the parents and the false friends who are pushing her towards abortion. If she will take on the burden of

that baby, we will help her with that burden. The Spirit of Truth, the Spirit of Courage, and the Spirit of Love are all one Spirit. Without it, there is no use throwing *Facts* at people. They do not believe it because we obviously do not believe it. We convince no one because we **DO NOT ACT** like we believe it. It is no good trying to give people **The Facts** about abortion. We need to give them **The Truth** about abortion. On some level, the most uninformed teenager knows what being pregnant means: she is carrying a baby. And she knows the abortion will end the life of that baby. But people refuse to know what they can't afford to know. They avoid thinking about it and they avoid information which would force them to think about it.

People don't want to know the truth about the war, so they neglect the available information. They don't want to know about the children killed and crippled by bombs or the prisoners left to suffocate by the war lords. When they go along with what they know to be wrong, they pull a mental curtain over the crimes and paint a heroic scene on the curtain. They do the same with abortion. The human mind has a remarkable ability to screen out what it refuses to know. That darkness is defended by a powerful demon. It cannot be dispelled except by the power of the Spirit--by the Light of Truth. That is why **Dropping The Facts** on people is useless unless it is accompanied by the Personal Witness of someone who has that indivisible Spirit of Truth, Love and Courage. That is why **person to person** witness has to be an integral part of any effort to give people information about abortion. **That is how you GROW in the Spirit of Courage.** When you hide in the pews instead, you soon become shriveled in the Spirit. That describes the modern church. It describes most of those who claim to be *PRO LIFE*.

It is naive to suppose that people are simply misinformed about abortion. It isn't simple. It is a compound and willful ignorance deeply rooted in the necessities of the American life style, an ignorance which is mandated by the way we live, by the way we are forcing others to live their lives. They cling to their ignorance because they CAN'T AFFORD to lose it. The heart of the problem IS NOT that Americans lack **INFORMATION** about abortion. They are ignorant because they are determined to be ignorant. They can't afford to know the truth about what they are doing because they intend to keep on doing it. The directly related problem is that the nominal pro lifers do not have the Spirit of Truth. They do not have the Courage to **BEAR WITNESS** to the truth about abortion. They are unwilling to pay the price which is necessary to make the Truth prevail. No amount of money can make up for that moral deficit. No broadcast distribution of mere **INFORMATION** can penetrate the darkness. Only real Christian Witness can do that.

The current fad is to buy more ultrasound machines as **THE ANSWER** to abortion. But women don't wander into the *Alternatives Center* on their way to an abortion clinic. Getting them to go there in the first place is two thirds of the battle. And only a handful of people have the courage to actively engage in the Sidewalk Counseling which is necessary to accomplish it. The first thing I hand an abortion customer coming to Planned Parenthood is a copy of *The First Nine Months*. This leaflet has three major advantages over the ultrasound machine: 1. It is **portable**--you can take it to the woman, she doesn't have to come to it. 2. The beautiful fiber optic color photography is superior to an ultrasound photograph. 3. **IT COSTS 30C** ! If she will take it and look at it, it will often turn her around. And why not give it to women **BEFORE THEY EVER GET PREGNANT** ? And their parents and boy friends as well--everyone in fact. It could be done, if those who pretend to be *pro life* had the **Courage to Bear Witness**, instead of buying their way out of it by **SUPPORTING** Something; if those who pretend to be **Doing Something** weren't preoccupied with finding another fund raising gimmick. The Pretenders and their *Supporters* feed off one another. They walk that broad and easy road together.

SELLING PRO LIFE

BAD STRATEGY: You can't sell pro life the way you sell new cars and beer. The secular media is useless for delivering the pro life message. It is easy enough to sell beer to someone who drinks beer, if you take something off the price. It is easy enough to sell new cars--everyone wants one. They already **BELIEVE** in new cars. You can sell **EASY JESUS**, instant coffee and **INSTANT SALVATION**. But it is an illusion to believe that the pro life imperative fits neatly into the American life style. And it is an illusion to believe that the pro life message can be tailored to fit neatly into the stream of messages which the mass media delivers.

To sell pro life you have to convince people of the proposition that **YOU MUST NOT DESTROY THIS LIFE, EVEN IF YOU RISK DESTROYING YOUR OWN LIFE**. You must sell sacrifice to people who have been taught to buy pleasure. You must sell the hard way to people who have the American faith in the easy way, who have bought **CHRISTIANITY MADE EASY**. Secular Christians, who are themselves immersed in the luxurious life style are hypocrites when they urge others to give it up, and liars when they assure them that they won't have to. How can you sell what you don't believe in ? How can you pretend to believe in it when you are living in contradiction to it ?

The mandate to buy a new car is everywhere on television. Everyone believes it. If you have any faith in America, you have faith in your new car, in the necessity of getting your new car. Contra this, the pro life message is that you will probably have to give up the new car if you decide to keep the baby. You will be lucky to have any car. You may have to join the single moms who wait for the bus while the career woman breezes by in her new car. The message which television relentlessly delivers, leaves no question as to which one should envy the other.

What shall we tell them ? *You can keep the baby without giving up your chance at the luxurious life style ?* It isn't true. The luxurious life style is built upon not having babies. The necessity of the luxurious life style, the fear of losing it, is the fundamental cause of abortion. To effectively oppose abortion you must have a faith which the Secular Christians have lost, a faith which runs counter to their faith in the American Dream of luxury and ease. Which runs counter to the faith in My Career. What shall we tell them ? You can still have **FUN IN THE SUN IN YOUR NEW CAR** with a **baby in the back seat** ? It doesn't fit. The ad writers know better. Leave the baby out of it. He needs changing. He wants to go home. The party is over. TV constantly testifies to the great modern truths that **FORNICATION IS FUN** and that you owe it to yourself to buy a new car and head for the beach. The pro life message cannot be entrusted to an ad man. It requires a different messenger, one who believes it and lives it.

Yes, you can hire them to play your message, if you have the money. How convincing will it be mixed in with the opposite message ? How will it compete, mixed in with a dozen New Car messages and following a **FORNICATION IS FUN** sit-com ? Is the strategy to mix your pearls in with the swill so that the swine will gulp it all down without realizing what they swallowed ? Why spend money to pour the pure water of the gospels into the sewer of the media ? Even if they they wanted to, they are not capable of the spiritual truth and the moral passion required to convey the pro life message. It isn't in them to do it, any more than a parrot can spout prophecy.

YOUR BABY FORGIVES YOU

PHONY FORGIVENESS: In place of any serious program to prevent abortion, a lot of groups--nominally Christian and nominally pro life--have programs which focus exclusively upon trying to comfort those miserable women who have had abortions. It is like taking measures to treat smallpox, without taking any measures to inoculate people from getting it in the first place. They belatedly substitute what is supposedly Christian Compassion for the missing Christian Courage which could have prevented the abortion. They seem never to have learned the adage that **AN OUNCE OF PREVENTION IS WORTH A POUND OF CURE**. And what cure can they offer ? Truly, women who have aborted a baby are like *Rachel, weeping for her children, and would not be comforted*. These **BELATED COMPASSION** programs substitute what pretends to be a spiritual answer for the moral answer they have ignored. They do nothing effective to stop abortion, then offer **TEA AND SYMPATHY** to its victims. They pretend to forgive the woman's sin as a cover for **the Great Sin of Omission** for which they themselves must bear the blame.

What use is such PHONY FORGIVENESS ? Who is forgiving whom ? Should we all forgive anything and everything ? Is that what Jesus taught about forgiveness ? Do we have the standing to forgive others for what they did to others ? Do you forgive Adolph Hitler for what the Germans did to the Jews ? Do you forgive Joe Stalin for what the red army did to the women of Europe ? It is not our business to forgive them. It is our business to see how far we are in complicity with the causes of genocide and mass rape by what we do and, mainly, by what we neglect to do. Americans allowed these things to be done, that is the truth.

Father Paul Marx once said in respect to abortion that *God always forgives, man sometimes forgives, nature never forgives*. You can see the terrible truth of that in the lives of those who have had abortions. If I get drunk and crash my car into someone else's car, killing that person and putting myself in a wheel chair, will God forgive me ? I suppose. Will the mother of the fellow I killed forgive me ? Maybe. Will I soon get out of my wheel chair ? Probably not.

I have no standing to forgive a woman who has had an abortion--*Speaking on behalf of God and your baby, I forgive you. Don't worry about it. You didn't do anything wrong. We are all sinners*. I cannot speak for God, nor can I speak for her baby. Will her baby forgive her ? Would you forgive your mother for throwing YOU into the trash ? Anyway, it is between them. We have nothing to do with it. Can she ever forgive herself ? Will outraged nature ever forgive her ? I have to say on the basis of meeting some of these women that the answer is *probably not. You will always remember the child you never knew*.

pro life pretenders

Which is why the real question is not whether we shall deploy the modern doctrine of instant and easy **AUTOMATIC FORGIVENESS** on behalf of 50 million aborted women. The question is whether we can be forgiven for our criminal complicity in a society which relentlessly pushes women to have abortions. The question is whether God will forgive us for failing to rescue *the least of these* while there was still time. The answer which Matthew 25.31-46 gives on that point is *probably not*. The forgiveness **WE NEED** demands **SINCERE REPENTANCE**. Repentance for what we failed to do and what we are still failing to do. It means we have to turn around and start doing it. That is the test of sincerity. We can't change the past. We can and must change the future. There is very little we can do for women who have had abortions, except to pretend that we are somehow helping them with something that can't be helped. There is a great deal we can do to help women who have not yet had abortions. If we don't do it there is no forgiveness for us in this world or in the next. And 99 % of those who pretend to be *pro life* are not doing it. It is better to make no such pretense than to have it used against you on judgment day. Those **PRO LIFE PRETENDERS**, who use the **ISSUE** to promote political careers and raise money, will surely stand among the goats on judgment day.

We conceal from ourselves the real horror of abortion just as we conceal from ourselves the real horror of our wars, the real horrors of real American history. We look away from those veterans whose intolerable memories drive them to self destruction. Did you ever accidentally hit a stray cat or a dog when you were driving down the street ? And how did you feel ? Bad. Even though it was an accident and you were not at fault. Suppose you hit a kid, instead of a stray animal. Suppose that it was your own kid. Finally, suppose that it was not an accident. You did it on purpose. How do you feel about it ? That is how people must feel about abortion, if they allow themselves to feel anything. Often, they don't feel anything at all because they can't afford to feel anything. People carry out an emotional lobotomy on themselves because they cannot deal with those terrible feelings. They go through life in that condition until they break down. A woman worked in the pro life movement for many years before finally admitting to herself and others that she had once had an abortion 20 years before. As a society we are in denial. What pretends to be a pro life movement goes along with this denial. They pretend to have the answer. They prescribe aspirin for cancer.

As a society, we are prone to silly solutions for terrible problems. **HANDS ACROSS AMERICA** to end world hunger. Run around the park 5 times or camp out on a billboard in the cause of world peace. Those who turn out once a year in the *Race for the Cure* are infuriated when you show up with signs saying *Abortion Causes Breast Cancer* and *1 oz prevention = 1 lb cure*. But there is something very similar going on in the pro life movement. A refusal to squarely face the real causes of abortion. A refusal to take a realistic measurement of the task we face. An unwillingness to recognize how we got into this terrible moral mess, and what it will cost us to get out of it. Are you a model father when you take your kids some where once a year ? Can you raise a garden by working at it one day a year ? Those who **TURN OUT ONCE A YEAR** will some day get to spend one day a year in heaven. And the rest of the year at the other place.

THE FOLLY AND IMMORALITY OF HALF MEASURES

WRONG STRATEGY: Although they cannot admit it, the pro life lobbies have implicitly conceded the failure of the attempt to overturn *Roe versus Wade*. Instead, they have adopted the **INCREMENTAL STRATEGY** of chipping away at abortion through half measures, quarter measures and one 64th measures. This strategy, which would be immoral if it succeeded, is also a political failure. Meanwhile, **IT CONSUMES 99 % OF THE TIME, ENERGY AND MONEY** of what pretends to be a pro life movement. This **CRIMINAL WASTE** of resources is a major reason for the defeat of the pro life movement. It is the basic cause of its chronic loss of momentum. By teaching false hope, it distracts people from the only real hopes we have for stopping abortion.

A variety of these 1/64th measures have been pushed in various states, accompanied by inflated claims of what they will accomplish, and accompanied by the usual two-faced dishonesty which conventional politics requires and which the rulings of the O'Connor Court require. They are implicitly presented to pro lifers as the first step towards abolishing abortion. Meanwhile, they must give public assurances and legal assurances that they do not intend to interfere with a Woman's Right to Abortion. They only intend **REASONABLE RESTRICTIONS**. They have to concede the right to abortion in order to win votes. And they have to concede the right to abortion because that is the position of the Supreme Court. We are left to hope that the public concession is not honestly given. That is how you win in politics, via deception. We can proceed with confidence that The Deceiver is on our side. But, despite the dishonesty, the assurances are true: these measures will do nothing to interfere with the Right of Abortion. They will help secure it. They would, that is, if they had any chance of ever becoming law.

After 12 years of supposedly *pro life* Presidents appointing supposedly *pro life* Judges, the 1992 *Casey* decision not only affirmed *Roe versus Wade*, it even rejected the minimal regulations enacted in Pennsylvania which had been crafted to fit Justice Sandra Day O'Connor's position that **REASONABLE RESTRICTIONS** on abortion were all right so long as they did not substantially interfere with the right to abortion. Then, in 2000, in *Stenberg v. Carhart*, the Court struck down the Nebraska ban on **PARTIAL BIRTH ABORTION**, thereby voiding laws passed by 26 other states. Because, said O'Connor, the definition was **TOO VAGUE** and because it did not have an exception for **WOMEN'S HEALTH**. Remember that we have Ronald Reagan to thank for O'Connor as well as for the California abortion law. That is what comes of putting your trust in politicians. But actually we should thank O'Connor for showing us the futility of the **INCREMENTAL STRATEGY**.

It appears that the O'Connor Court will not allow **any restriction whatever** upon abortion. They will not grant even the token concessions which the pro life lobbies are willing to settle for, by way of political face saving. If the lobbies succeed in passing a measure which requires the abortionist to wear a clean gown, the O'Connor Court will strike it down, unless it has a definition of **CLEAN** and a **WOMAN'S HEALTH** exception. But, believe it or not, the current major pro life strategy is to pass a *New, Improved PARTIAL BIRTH ABORTION BAN* **which will meet these specious objections !** [later note: in April 2007, the Supreme Court upheld such a ban while affirming, not just the Right to Abortion, but the right to third trimester abortions.]

It shows the moral bankruptcy of this doomed effort to pass Something--**ANYTHING !**--which will give them even a fig leaf of political success to hide their shame. Which will give them another season of Pretending and Raising Money on the Pretence. Boulder abortionist Warren Hern is one of their allies in this Great Struggle. He despises the **PARTIAL BIRTH ABORTION** method as crude and unnecessary compared to the elegant methods of third trimester abortion which he has pioneered. No doubt they will call him as a witness if there are hearings. Like all those who get caught up in the pursuit of political success, they have no shame left. But even if these silly and immoral measures were passed, they would not take us in the direction of a complete ban on abortions, any more than restrictions on alcohol will bring about a **RETURN TO PROHIBITION**. Severe penalties for drunk driving, a ban on under age drinking, and restrictions on the hours which taverns keep, serve to regulate and legitimize the consumption of alcohol. They thereby take us in the opposite direction of ever prohibiting alcohol entirely. **REASONABLE RESTRICTIONS** on abortion set abortion in legal cement by eliminating the worst abuses.

And they land us in the morally absurd position of thinking up arguments for these **REASONABLE RESTRICTIONS: it is wrong to kill your baby, unless you notify your mother first.** But don't you think a teen age girl should tell her mother ? No I don't. If you are going to commit murder, the fewer people that know about it the better. Telling her that you intend to kill her grandson or granddaughter will contribute very little to your future relationship with her as the lonely years go by. If you tell her ahead of time, it makes her *AN ACCOMPLICE TO MURDER*. If you wait until afterwards, she is merely *AN ACCESSORY AFTER THE FACT*. Don't you think a woman should be fully informed about this *operation* just like any other ? No I don't. It is not a medical procedure, it is a dismemberment procedure. If you are going to dismember your baby, or drop a bomb on a village, it is best to take no pictures. The less you know about it, the sooner the nightmares will stop. These immoral and doomed measures also tend to be downright silly. The **ABORTIONIST** is commissioned to tell women about abortion in some of these *INFORMED CONSENT* measures. As if he were ready and willing to tell a woman the truth about abortion. As if he could stop lying to himself long enough to do it. Instead of passing out pro life leaflets themselves, these political pro lifers try to make the abortionist do it.

By striking down these measures the Court is actually doing us a favor. It is showing us the political futility of this immoral movement. How can there be *reasonable restrictions* on acts of murder and madness ? It is like the official pretense that strict standards are being followed in waging the war. It is never true. When you kill that first baby and shrug it off, that is the end of it. All the rest is lies and self-deception. When you drop a bomb on one family, that's it. We only killed a thousand or so civilians in the Afghan war, 10,000 in the Iraq war. Not worth mentioning, especially compared to our other wars. If you only kill a few hundred kids, it is still a Just War. As *JUST* as any other war, that's the truth. What people are doing of course is playing the political game with the *ABORTION ISSUE*. If they never get any further in the direction of stopping abortion, they don't mind, so long as they can continue to use the *ISSUE* to get votes and raise money.

the law follows, it does not lead

There is a basic political folly--a confidence game, really--in the assumption that the law leads the way in changing society. The law does not lead social change, it follows social change. Society changes because of moral crusades that legislators and lawyers oppose until they see that they are going to succeed. At that point, they switch sides and take the credit for the change. Contrary to the pretensions of the legislators, the laws they enact are those they are pushed to enact. That is true even in an autocratic society, but it is especially true when the government is popularly elected. An elected legislator who gets more than a pace or two ahead of his supporters will soon find that he has none.

The Civil Rights Movement did not succeed because the legislators finally passed some legislation, or because the Supreme Court finally made a ruling. The laws were passed and the rulings were made because society had changed. The change came through a long struggle by Abolitionists like William Lloyd Garrison and Henry David Thoreau who went to jail to abolish slavery. Elijah P. Lovejoy kept publishing his abolition paper, even after the mob destroyed his press, until he was finally shot and killed. The radical Christians who were jailed or even killed in the nonviolent direct action Civil Rights movement, tipped the scales against racial segregation years before President Johnson found it expedient to proclaim *We Shall Overcome !*

Martin Luther King's speeches and those who applauded them had very little to do with it. Like the General who is given the credit for the battle, he was given the credit for things he had nothing to do with after the networks selected him to be the National Leader of the Civil Rights Movement. Because people only want to learn one name. Because, while they are applauding the General, no one can raise the question as to where they were when the battle was fought. The American People and The Negro People had nothing to do with it. 99 of 100 never gave a dollar or a day of their lives to the Civil Rights Movement. They *SUPPORTED* it by watching it on television and applauding. The change came because a small band of men and women, black and white, had the spiritual courage to confront the powers of darkness that stood behind racial segregation. The change came because of a very few who bore personal witness at great risk.

For a generation, laws guaranteeing basic civil rights to Negroes were routinely defeated or filibustered to death in the United States Congress. When the landmark civil rights bills of 1964 and 1965 finally swept through the Congress, it was because of the irresistible momentum created by the direct action civil rights movement which began in the 1930s, which carried out sit-ins in the 1940s and the 1950s, and which finally got half a million people out on the sidewalks in the summer of 1963. These laws passed because of the blood of the civil rights martyrs, not because of the maneuvers of the lawyers, lobbyists and politicians who claimed the credit. And these laws were still only pieces of paper except to the degree that people everywhere personally adopted the attitudes written into the law. The so-called Affirmative Action laws passed since then, supposedly for the benefit of Negroes, have benefited a few at the expense of others and have created new injustice instead of curing the old, because we still have not made the moral commitment to basic justice for the under class where most Negroes are forced to spend their lives. The focus on politics and law turns what was once a moral crusade into a lobbying effort on behalf of a small, unrepresentative interest group. They appoint one black man to the Supreme Court to pay off the millions stuck in the slums.

excommunicating slavery

George Fox led the Quakers in opposing slavery 100 years before William Wilberforce made his first speech in Parliament against the slave trade in 1787. They led the movement which abolished slavery in England itself by 1772. Those who pursue seats in Congress want to give Wilberforce the credit because that is how they justify their own commitment to coming in at the high end or not at all. By 1776, American Quakers excluded from their membership anyone who owned slaves. They **ABOLISHED SLAVERY** from their own community at a time when George Washington, Thomas Jefferson and Patrick Henry were still buying slaves. Imagine today's church excommunicating those who practice contraception and tolerate abortion. Which is to imagine a church which has taken the road back from that **MASS CHURCH OF NO STANDARDS** which was established by Secular Christianity. Which is to imagine a Church which no longer **CATER TO THE CROWD**. Is it impossible to imagine? Almost. But how shall we abolish abortion in the larger society if we cannot do it in our own Christian society?

The American "statesmen" shamefully surrendered on slavery when they wrote the American Constitution in 1787 and this act of unprincipled political expedience on their part led directly to a major increase in slavery and in the power of the slavery interest in America and to the death of half a million people in the Civil War. There is a price that has to be paid for a moral society. If we do not pay it now, we must pay it later--with heavy interest penalties.

Meanwhile Pitt and Wilberforce persuaded the British Parliament to pass an Act in 1788 which said that the number of slaves carried in British slave ships must be in proportion to the tonnage. Partial measures actually increased the evil of slavery instead of alleviating it. An act of the British Parliament in 1807 supposedly abolished, not slavery itself, but only the slave trade. This led to a situation in which *the traders made great efforts to carry as many slaves as possible in every voyage, and practised atrocities to get rid of the slaves when capture was imminent. It was, besides, the interest of the cruisers, who shared the price of the captured slave ship, rather to allow the slaves to be taken on board than to prevent their being shipped at all. Thrice as great a number of negroes as before, it was said, was exported from Africa, and two-thirds of these were murdered on the high seas. It was found also that the abolition of the British slave trade did not lead to an improved treatment of the Negroes in the West Indies. The slaves were overworked now that fresh supplies were stopped, and their numbers rapidly decreased.* (Encyclopedia Britannica, 9th edition, essay on Slavery)

The lawyers, the legislators and the lobbyists will never do anything effective to end abortion. The pro life movement cannot even get started until we acknowledge that basic fact. Ambitious people use the movement to pursue political power just as Jesse Jackson and a thousand other ambitious blacks used the Civil Rights Movement to pursue political power and personal wealth. These fellows pretend to be pushing the wagon but they are only riding on it. We fall for it because we are foolish and because there is *a little bit of larceny* in our hearts also. We

also dream of success, of rising to a position at the top. And we fall for it because of our bedrock faith in *THE EASY WAY*. We have to believe that to justify our cowardice. We do not believe a real battle is necessary--not if we have to fight it.

We forget what Jesus taught us about how Christians change society. We do not wish to remember it. There is a legion of those who are willing to change society from the high end, from the prestige and comfort of a Senate seat. But real moral change is brought about by those who have given up on being respectable in the eyes of their fellow citizens, who don't demand to be paid. Who have no political careers to sacrifice. Who have already made the sacrifice. The Pro Life Revolution will not be carried out by those who have to be paid \$ 200 an hour for their services. A long lost first century Christian catechism, *THE TEACHINGS OF THE APOSTLES* says *if he asks for money, he is a false prophet*. You can see why they had to lose it. When we begin to apply that standard to today's false prophets, we will have taken a necessary step forward in putting an end to abortion.

Christians did not need the help of the Roman Senate and the Roman Emperor in building Christianity. That is the false faith of Secular Christianity. When they did get the sponsorship of the Emperor, it established that false Christianity which is with us still. Which is the crippling disease, the chronic and epidemic spiritual disease, of that which pretends to be the Christian Church. Which is the fundamental cause of abortion. A real pro life movement cannot depend upon The Man at the Top of the American Empire. That is the false faith which is destroying the American pro life movement as it has destroyed the Christian church.

The pro life movement has to be a moral crusade. A moral crusade has to chart a course which avoids the futility of the Law and the immoral compromises that are in the very nature of conventional politics. We aren't going to win the battle in the court or in the legislature until we have won the battle out on the sidewalks and inside the shopping malls. Until we have won the battle **WITHIN THE CHURCH**. We are a long way from winning that battle because we haven't even begun to fight it seriously. Most of our nominal "pro-life" organizations are too faint-hearted to even think about fighting it.

LEAVING IT UP TO GOD

PRAYER WHICH OFFENDS GOD The prayer of the complacent Pharisee (Luke 18.10-14) offended God with the assumption that he was already justified. The Pharisees *paid tithes* and *omitted the weightier matters of the law*. (Matthew 23.23) The Secular Christians **OMIT** to do all the things they could do to prevent today's abortions. Then they Pray, Pray and Pray some more. They Petition the Government to Do Something about abortion, and they Pray to God that He will Do Something. By way of concealing from themselves who is responsible for abortion and who has neglected to **DO SOMETHING** about it. They talk all morning at God and say nothing to someone bound for an abortion. Who might turn back if someone would say: **DON'T DO IT ! LET YOUR BABY LIVE !** They make a virtue of their cowardice. You don't see me getting exited ! As if there was a murder ! You don't see me shouting at people. I preserve church decorum at all times, even when I am not in church. It is righteous to drop bombs on villages where *EVIL DOERS* may be lurking, but it is unChristian to open your mouth to stop them from doing evil, unless you are delivering a banquet speech or running for office. The sidewalk is not a respectable forum. That is why you get arrested, and you deserve it.

Matthew 5.24 says *first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift*. Jesus tells us what has to come first. Laying a sacrifice upon the altar will not be accepted from those who come like Cain with blood-stained hands. And your hands are just as red if you have committed the Great Sin of Omission, if you have neglected to help *the least of these* in their hour of need--if you have left it up to God and the Government to do what it was up to you to do. An accomplice to murder is also guilty of murder. We are all accomplices in abortion when we refuse to do what we could to prevent it. Or when we do useless things to sustain **THE GREAT ILLUSION THAT WE ARE DOING SOMETHING**--Make More Rosaries, Pray More Rosaries, Collect Canned Goods for The Poor--pumpkin, prunes and pickled beets--all the things The Poor love and we don't like anyway. March once a year. Most won't do that much.

The Worldly Church is full of those who use *LONG PRAYERS* as a robe of concealment. In Mark 12.40 Jesus tells us what will happen to them *Which devour widows' houses and for a pretence make long prayers. These shall receive greater damnation.* Those who raise money by the **PRETENCE** that they are doing something to stop abortion are playing with fire. The Holy Hours which are set aside to pray for the unborn are very unholy hours when they are used as the excuse for Doing Nothing to rescue the unborn from their appointed doom.

WE NEED LESS PRAYER. We need to stop this offensive prayer altogether. People are only digging a pit for themselves with their mouths. They are reminding God of what they have omitted to do. They are calling attention to the fact that they do not love their neighbor and that they do not have the Courage to rescue *the least of these*. As if He needed any more reminders. As if a million abortions a year were not enough to remind Him.

Is mass, marathon prayer the answer to abortion ? A lot of pious folk seem to think so. If quality of prayer doesn't work, try quantity. If ordinary prayers don't work, try special or extra long prayers. What is prayer ? Isn't it talking to God, a conversation with God ? Suppose that you really are having a conversation with God--what should be the character of that conversation ? You do all the talking, while God does all the listening ? Shouldn't it be the other way around ? Does God need our information ? Is he unaware of what is going on and dependent upon us for the latest news ? That seems to be the premise of a lot of prayer. If God really does depend upon us for his information, it is no wonder he is so badly misinformed as to what is going on down here.

Does God need us to tell him what to do ? Does he need our wisdom and our advice before he can come up with a plan of action ? It is a reasonable assumption that God is at least as smart as we are. Is God a kind of genii that we control ? By saying the magic words we invoke his power and then we get our wishes carried out ? Is He our servant? Aren't we supposed to be serving Him ?

Does he need persuading--mass lobbying--to push him into doing something ? People seem to think of God as the big politician in the sky--you go after him just like you go after the big politician in Washington. If we get everyone jawing at him, he will finally do something. There is a difference. The big politician in Washington has to get re-elected. If he gets a million calls and letters telling him to do something, he knows he had better do it, whether he agrees with it or not. But God doesn't have to stand for re-election. If we know anything at all about God, we know that he has a mind of his own, that he isn't much influenced by the latest opinion poll.

praying and doing

And we who claim to be Christians should know something else: when Jesus gave us His Holy Spirit, He gave us a commission to **DO IT ALL** in his name and in the power of His Spirit. He **WORKS THROUGH US !** He does not take care of it for us while we stay safe in the pews. Since the time of Jesus Christ there is a new definition of God. He is God become man and He is that Spirit of Courage and Love and Truth which he breathed into his first followers. Which means that it really is up to us to establish the Kingdom of God on Earth. It is up to us as individuals and as members of a true Christian community. As James 1:22 tells us, we must be *doers of the word, and not hearers only*. It is not up to the government or to the timid bureaucrats of the Worldly Church, which bless our timidity to justify their own.

The prayer campaigns against abortion are substitutes for action--excuses for inaction. They appeal to those who are following the old four point program: 1) say a prayer 2) cast your vote 3) make a small donation 4) then you can forget it and go out and enjoy yourself. It's the way we deal with most of our problems. Let George do it or let God do it--anyone but me. I take care of a problem by asking someone else to take care of it. If the air conditioner is broken I call maintenance. If society is broken I write the president or call upon the congressman and tell him to fix it. If the moral order is broken down, I send God a spiritual memo to get it fixed. If the first call doesn't do it, sometimes you have to call back and nag them a little.

Does God ordinarily intervene in a miraculous way to take care of things for us ? For some odd reason, people who believe that also believe in spending 100 billion dollars a year on super weapons. Then they think they have done all they can to stop abortion when they have offered a prayer and made a \$ 5 donation to a pro life organization. Will God do our work for us if we keep asking ? Do you sit in front of a pile of dirty dishes and pray to God to get them done ? If God takes that prayer seriously, he will answer it with a lightning bolt to your rear end to get you on your feet and doing the dishes.

Is abortion a mysterious plague from heaven ? Is it something that God is doing to us ? No, it is something that we are doing to ourselves. It is an evil practice that grew up while Christians pursued money and avoided kids. It persists because most of us are too chicken to seriously oppose it. It is rooted in the materialism that infects Christians as much as everyone else. It is only a gross example of the way our pseudo Christian society destroys families and discards human lives.

A man goes into a bar and orders a dozen drinks while saying a prayer that God will keep him from getting drunk. That is like us praying for an end to abortion while we do nothing to end it and everything to perpetuate it. Since God ordinarily works through us, it is up to us, not to God, to do something about abortion. Let us try the other kind of prayer, the kind where we listen to God instead of talking at him. When the prophet went out to find a God of power in the storm, he didn't find him. Instead God came to him as a *still small voice*. When we listen to that quiet little voice, we come out at a different place. Instead of telling God what we want him to do and then waiting for him to do it, we learn what it is that God wants us to do.

handing back the obligation

And is it really that hard to find out ? Has God left us no directions ? Does each one of us need a special set of instructions ? Do I really need to pray and search my soul as to whether Jesus calls me to pursue money and position or whether he wants me to save the babies from imminent death ? A person who sincerely studies the teachings of Jesus Christ would have no difficulty concluding that he or she has a **personal responsibility to get out there and do something**. In the 25th chapter of Matthew, at the very end of his time of teaching, Jesus gives a startling picture of what a Christian must do to be saved. It has very little in common with what most people today practice as Christianity: faithfully observe all the pious rituals; embrace instant salvation and then rely upon your faith to make a bundle in stocks or real estate.

In the last judgment of Matthew 25, those people are saved who have given food to the hungry and drink to the thirsty, who have taken in the stranger and visited the prisoner. And those that refused to do it are condemned ! But why is He making such a big thing of it ? Isn't it easy enough to do ? Visit the county jail with your high school class--that takes care of that. Send a few bucks to the soup kitchen--that takes care of the rest of it. Do it by proxy !

What he means and how much he means it become plainer when you read the whole gospel. He says that the entire law comes down to two commandments: love God and love your neighbor, and he says that one is the test of the other--you can't love God if you don't love your neighbor. And then, in the story of the Good Samaritan he draws out what is meant by loving your neighbor. This isn't just a nice story, a suggestion of something you could do some day if you had extra time. It is a response to the question: *what shall I do to inherit eternal life ?* (Luke 10.25) It illustrates a **commandment** and, in fact, it illustrates *the* commandment. And what the Good Samaritan does is to rescue a stranger at considerable expense and trouble to himself.

When you add that to Matthew 25 and the rest of the gospels, what you have is an **imperative responsibility** to go out **in person** and rescue those who are in serious need of help. You are called upon to appear **in person** by the King's command! To pass the buck to others, to make a donation to "charity"--is to shirk the obligation while pretending to fulfill it. How is it then, that you can call yourself a Christian and not go to the rescue of the baby who is about to be killed by an abortion ? Is it enough to say a prayer ? Or 10 prayers? **YOU THEREBY HAND BACK TO GOD THE OBLIGATION HE HAS HANDED TO YOU !** Is it enough to vote for a politician, sign a petition,

make a donation? = to do it by proxy? You have a very good chance of winding up in that bunch of folks who are condemned for refusing the plain Christian duty of rescuing those in desperate situations--what else does He mean? It is obvious that babies scheduled for abortion fit that description. Matthew 25 says it is Jesus that we meet when we carry out the commandment to rescue those in distress. Where else will we find Him if we are afraid to meet Him there? We are turning our backs on Him, when we turn our backs on those in distress. Will Jesus be glad to see you in church after you have stood Him up out on the front line where He told you to meet Him? That is the false faith of the cowardly church.

It was said of the monks: they pray with their whole lives. We need to pray with our whole lives, not just by mouthing a set of words. Prayer can't be just speaking because sincere speaking leads on to doing. We are commanded to love! Does love mean we keep repeating: *I love you, I love you*? No it means we go and do what love demands--what God demands!

Let us have a national day where we shut up and listen. Where we carefully re-read the instructions which He has already given us. There is one prayer that God always answers: send me the Spirit which gives courage; courage to throw open the doors, to come out from hiding, and to bear witness to the truth. It says to God, not: *here is what I want you to do* but rather: *I'll do what you ask if you help me do it.*

SECULAR CHRISTIANITY

WRONG ANALYSIS: The cause of abortion IS NOT *Secular Humanism*. (As if we were helpless to resist wrong ideas.) Abortion is caused by SECULAR CHRISTIANITY. It is caused by the false Christianity of that Church **which has conformed to this world**. Of those many Churches, Catholic and Protestant, which have conformed to THIS WORLD. Which must define themselves by that conformity and by that DEPENDENCE. The oldest form of Secular Christianity is found in that false church of the 4th century which became the official church of the Roman Empire, which thereafter persecuted the real Christians of the Roman Empire. (as I described in *THE CHURCH OF THE EMPIRE*.) One of the most conspicuous modern forms of Secular Christianity is THE AMERICAN CULT, the false faith that *America is a Christian Nation*. It is a false faith that is common to both American Catholics and American Protestants. It is the source of that false hope that the President or the Supreme Court will somehow re-establish the Christian morality which American Christians have abandoned. We will stop having abortions when the policeman tells us to stop.

The essential characteristic of the Worldly Church is that it is a mass church on a minimal basis. It has a mandate to include the entire population of the empire. So any moral discipline must come from the outside, from the Emperor's decree. Once it has been disestablished, it is helpless to maintain any moral standards. It can only continue in the forlorn hope of some day once again enjoying the emperor's favor. In modern times that means the favor of the fickle SOVEREIGN populace. Morality must be established by popularity. It is a truly hopeless strategy.

The law never did establish morality. What it established was hypocrisy--the pretense of morality, the public facade of righteousness. That is in fact what Secular Christians are aiming at, whether they realize it or not. They want a restoration of hypocrisy. The challenge is to make abortion illegal again. So long as the laws against prostitution remain on the books, we can shrug off the fact of prostitution. The aim is to restore the Christian State--the State which pretends to be Christian. They are comfortable with that pretense and refuse to look behind the pretense at what is really there. So long as the State shows up at Church on Sunday, dressed in his Sunday suit, we don't need to know about what he did on Saturday night.

II THE MORAL COLLAPSE OF CATHOLICISM

A major cause of abortion is that **Secular Catholicism**, or *kennedyism* which characterizes 99 % of American Catholics today. The **MYTH** is that the Catholic Church is the bulwark of the Pro Life Movement. The **FACT** is that Catholics are the bulwark of abortion. Catholic politicians lead the way in promoting contraception and protecting abortion, and they are routinely returned to office by Catholic voters. They shrug off the occasional formal and feeble demurrers of the bishops. They take such statements as seriously as they are meant to be taken. Rank and file Catholics in overwhelming numbers practice contraception and allow abortion. Catholic hospitals are complicit in abortion and contraception and Catholic bishops don't dare do anything about it, or even say anything about it, for the most part. That is even assuming that they wanted to, a very doubtful assumption in the light of the recent history of the Church. Catholic Hospitals--so-called Catholic Hospitals--cannot even deny staff privileges to abortionists, because of the federal money they receive through medicare and medicaid. Or so they tell us. They cannot **DISCRIMINATE**. Conformity to the state because of the money is the epitaph for Christian morality.

The reason that Catholic politicians go along with abortion and contraception is that Catholic voters want them to. The Catholic Bishops go along with the politicians and the voters because they have to. The rest is all pretense and the refusal to face reality. What can they do about the fact that Catholic constituencies regularly elect pro abortion politicians ? The formal statement is the best they can do. If the pro abortion Catholic politicians publicly dismissed it the same day, what can they do ? Since *automatic excommunication* has taken care of it, the bishops can go in to lunch with the pro abortion politician. Invite him to the Al Smith Dinner. Perhaps influence him a little. In the direction of their own moral cowardice. It seems to be working.

pro life illusions

The illusion that the Republicans are on our side or that the Catholics are on our side is an illusion that the pro life movement must abandon as a first step towards a real pro life movement. At best, they are treacherous allies, more dangerous to us than our open and avowed enemies. It isn't that American Catholics are worse than American Protestants. They are worse because they suppose themselves to be better. They cling to the illusion that they have preserved basic Christian morality in respect to divorce, contraception and abortion, because the Catholic Church still has formal statements against these things. On paper, they have not yet succumbed to the Worldly Christian lifestyle which is tied to divorce, contraception and abortion. They have preserved hypocrisy and delude themselves that they are thereby preserving morality. *I can take care of my enemies, God protect me from my friends*. Rush Limbaugh, who is nominally opposed to abortion, encourages his listeners to support pro abortion Republican candidates. And that produces a "Pro Choice" or "Big Tent" Republican Party. Like all the political pro lifers, his real passion is the pursuit of political power. He is typical of the so-called *conservatives* who pretend to be pro life and routinely sell it out.

On paper, the Catholic Church stands four square in opposition to contraception and abortion. If it were a paper battle, it would already have been won. There is a Model Church somewhere, stored safely on a high shelf in the Vatican Museum, I suppose, a *paper mache* Church which has preserved its moral integrity. But the actual church, its people and its institutions, its universities, its high schools, its hospitals, is deeply complicit with the contraceptive life style, and with all the basic causes of the contraceptive life style. The actual Church to which actual Catholics belong **IS NOT** on the side of the pro life movement, except for an heroic handful who find themselves alienated from other Catholics. This Church, far from being a bulwark of the pro life movement, is a major obstacle in the way of any serious pro life movement.

On paper, Catholics provide major support for the pro life movement. In fact, most Catholics support abortion and contraception. They are not even part of the solution. They are a major part of the problem. On paper, the Catholic Church still opposes both abortion and contraception. In fact, they are helpless to prevent either. They still preserve hypocrisy but they long ago abandoned morality. On official paper, they don't allow **DIVORCE**. They only allow

100,000 *ANNULMENTS* every year. The anti family and anti child forces of America are solidly entrenched **WITHIN THE WALLS** of the American Catholic Church.

kennedyism

It is *KENNEDYISM*, not *MODERNISM*, which has eroded the faith and morals of the American Catholic Church. The full flowering of *SECULAR CATHOLICISM* is symbolized by the arrival at the pinnacle of American wealth and power of a family which pretended to be Catholic, even while they provided the most conspicuous model of a secularized and modernized Catholicism which had been stripped of traditional faith and morals. President John F. Kennedy presented the new model two child Catholic family, while the media routinely concealed his shameless private life and the playboy life style which marked the whole family. The wealth and glamour of the Kennedys and their rise to the highest position the American Empire has to offer illustrates the Rise of Catholics in America and their Falling Away from Christian faith and morals. (*Trudeauism* is the Canadian counterpart.)

The Kennedys and the many other American Catholic families which have achieved wealth and political power display that luxurious life style which millions of Catholics envy and imitate. Social climbing Catholic ladies encourage their children to aspire to the Kennedy life style. Contraception and abortion are not incidental to this life style, they are the necessary basis for it. The lack of inherited wealth creates the mandate for pushing your daughters and your sons towards Harvard Law School, or any other path that leads to \$ 50,000 a year.

American Catholics have followed the Kennedys in the pursuit of power and money. And adopted the morals of the Kennedys along the way. They had no spiritual resistance to adopting that luxurious American life style which depends upon contraception and abortion. They still support the Kennedys with their votes and they imitate them in the way they live. Like the Kennedys, they left their Catholic faith and morals behind in the old parish church when they moved to the suburbs. They took as much as would fit into the station wagon. There was no room for the ban on contraception. Family size had to be adjusted to fit the new house and the new life style. Now they must sacrifice all their children to the two career life style which is necessary to hold on to affluence.

The Worldly Church to which they belonged had no alarm bells to warn them that the pursuit of wealth and power is a road which steadily diverges from the path of faithfulness to Christian morals. There was a time when the poverty of American Catholics and the persecution they suffered prevented the weeds of *SECULAR CATHOLICISM* from growing. But once Catholics began to achieve that American Dream, the weeds grew unchecked. Now they have grown until the Church is choked by those weeds. Millionaire cardinals long set a conspicuous example of the righteousness of living in wealth and luxury. Is it surprising that so many conspicuous evils have appeared among men who live like that ? *the love of money is the root of all evil.*

The recent statement of the Catholic Bishops, *A MATTER OF THE HEART, The 30th Anniversary of Roe v. Wade*, concludes with the statement that *Roe v. Wade must be reversed*. Do the Bishops really believe that this is the answer to American Catholic women having abortions ? Is it the pastoral theory of the Bishops that Catholics have abortions because the Supreme Court said they could ? Why do they pay no attention to the Pope and the Bishops when they say they shouldn't ? Why did they ignore the Pope's encyclical against contraceptives ?

Joe Got Me Drunk

This analysis by the bishops looks suspiciously like a formal version of the *JOE GOT ME DRUNK* thesis, the first thing they teach you to stop doing at the AA meeting. Don't blame others for what you did. Joe didn't get you drunk, you got yourself drunk. The thesis grows out of the implicit theology of Secular Christianity. A mass church cannot preserve Christian morality except through external discipline. Without the support of the emperor, the bishops cannot enforce Christian morality in the Church. When the Imperial Church was dis-established, it lost the power to maintain Christian morality.

The usual willful blindness in respect to blaming abortion in America on *Roe v. Wade*, is especially conspicuous in this statement because the Bishops belong to an international Church which claims to have moral standards that transcend those of any national Church. Is *Roe v. Wade* the reason that so-called *Catholic* Countries around the world have abortions just like America? What is the reason for abortion in Spain, France and Italy, where everyone is supposedly Catholic and where *Roe v. Wade* does not apply?

The reason for **LEGAL** abortion in Italy is that Italians voted to keep it legal in a 1981 national referendum. Despite the pleas of Pope John Paul II. A country which is 90 % Catholic, which is the home of the Pope, voted against him on a fundamental question of Christian morality. So much for establishing Christian morality by voting. The basic reason that abortion could not be outlawed in so-called *Catholic* Italy is the same reason it cannot be outlawed in so-called *Christian* America: **THE PEOPLE want it that way**. In fact, contraception and abortion have become integrated into the Italian life style. Native Italians have so few babies allowed to live that they are becoming an endangered species.

voting for morality

And **THE PEOPLE** have been taught to believe that you can vote on morality. It is moral if 51 % think it is moral. If only 49 % think it is moral, it isn't. It is moral one year and immoral the next, depending on how the vote goes. What was once a terrible crime is now a **STANDARD MEDICAL PROCEDURE**. When you vote against abortion, you in effect concede that it is something to be voted on. If the vote goes against you, you still have to go along with it. If you aren't bound by the results of the vote, why is anyone else? If the vote goes your way, the way is open for those who were beaten this time to bring the issue up again. The Pope asked the Italians to vote against abortion. But they voted the other way, thus proving that the Pope was wrong about abortion. What else is the moral logic of entrusting morality to the voters?

The fact of legal abortion in the Catholic countries of Europe and the fact of illegal abortion in the Catholic countries of South America shows the realistic context in which abortion among American Catholics has to be understood. Clearly, abortion is not something outside the Catholic Church, which has been imposed upon it by some legal fluke. Abortion is **INSIDE** the Catholic Church. Until Catholics face up to that fundamental fact, until they begin to deal with it, no change is possible. Catholics who decry that **CULTURE OF DEATH**, which has reached flood stage in modern times, are still trying to ignore five feet of sewer water in the Church itself. Nor do they know how to free themselves from that **LOVE OF MONEY** which breached the dike in the first place. The pursuit of wealth **NEEDS** contraception backed by abortion.

Catholics should focus upon stopping abortion **WITHIN** the Catholic Church. If the Catholic Church were the pro life bulwark it pretends to be, the abortion situation in America would be entirely different. *Roe versus Wade* came about because abortion laws were passed not despite Catholics but **BECAUSE OF THEM**. Because by, 1967, they had already adopted that Kennedy life style which depends upon contraception and abortion. Legal abortion continues because Catholic voters routinely elect pro abortion politicians. States with **the most Catholic voters**, provide **the most reliable support** for *Catholic* pro abortion Senators.

The American Bishops are deeply infected by Secular Christianity. The Worldly Church cannot maintain morality in a mass church without the support of the State. The armies of the Empire took on the task of establishing Christianity in far off places. The imperial police had the job of enforcing Christian morality among the pagan populace. They pretended to do it anyway. They at least enforced hypocrisy. So the bishops have no alternative strategy when the state declines to enforce morality, when it declines to even continue the old hypocrisy. It is not possible for the Worldly Church to establish Christian morality without the backing of the police and the courts. The fundamental premise of the Worldly Church is that it has to be so governed. So they have no hope except the forlorn hope that *Roe v. Wade* will somehow, some day be reversed. If they succeed in this mock serious effort to reverse *Roe v. Wade*, no doubt they will go on to try and reverse *Griswold v. Connecticut*, so that Catholics will stop using contraceptives. That was the case in which the Supreme Court first stated the *right of privacy* doctrine.

The final document of the Vatican II Council, *The Church in the Modern World*, reads like something which has been revised and edited by various committees. It is written in a vatican style *officialese* which makes it hard to discover what the real thought is behind the amorphous prose or whether there is any. If Saint Paul had written like that, no one would remember a thing he said. So it is perhaps unfair to accuse it of saying anything definite. But there is a persistent attitude in the document which indicates a willingness to erase the lines between *The Church* and *the Modern World* or to pencil them in as faintly as possible. There is virtually no trace of the gospel doctrine that *THE WORLD* hates Jesus Christ and hates his true followers, who are true *CHRISTIANS*, **if and only if**, they refuse to conform to The World.

The Imperial Church first sanctioned the merger with the Empire of the World back in the 4th century. But the Church of the Empire was later divided, splintered and dis established in many places, along with the empire to which it had tied itself. What persisted was a basic theology which claimed the right to unite with the world and govern it. Fifty years ago the attitude of the Vatican was expressed by the inscription on the triple crowned Papal *tiara*: *to the infallible vicar of Jesus Christ, to the supreme governor of the world on earth, to the father of nations and kings*. The Catholic Church intended to merge with the world by re-establishing the authority it once had as the official church of the great World Empire.

Church Merges with World amidst (almost) universal rejoicing; stocks rise

The change of policy implied by *The Church in the Modern World* is that the Church has more or less agreed to merge with the world without preconditions. If the world won't join us, we will join them. It will meet the world on its own terms, even while it reserves the right to try and change those terms. I will marry the pagan woman and then try to convert her. And it was less a change of policy than a de facto recognition that Catholics have already conformed to the society which surrounds them. Catholics not only marry Protestants, they marry non Christians. John Kennedy was President of the United States and Pierre Trudeau was Prime Minister of Canada. Catholic clerical scholars join the faculty at Yale or Columbia and learn to appreciate the atheist point of view. The Pope prays with Moslems and Buddhists and works for peace through the U.N.

In fact the document is full of statements which show a strangely ambivalent attitude towards what the World is up to. In Section 5 it says: *the human race is giving steadily increasing thought to forecasting and regulating its own population growth*. Do they mean that **THE WORLD**, ruled by Satan, has predictably succumbed to an abomination which the Christian Church still energetically opposes? Or do they mean that they are ready to accept contraception? On the historical record, many of them meant the latter. Obviously, International Planned Parenthood is the part of *the human race* which has given the most *thought to family banning*. The positive attitude towards *regulating population growth* seems to have displaced the recognition of what this means: 50 million children killed by abortion every year; the aggressive promotion of contraception by international agencies, funded by America.

The concept set forth in Chapter 2, *The Community of Mankind*, shows how far they have drifted from the basic doctrine that the Christian community founded by Jesus Christ was the only one worthy of the name, the model upon which any real **COMMUNITY** must be based. Instead there is this concept which conveys a false faith that The World which is ruled by demons can still somehow be called a **COMMUNITY**. It can't. Because it isn't. The simple fact of 100 million people killed by the wars of the 20th century constitutes sufficient proof that there is something radically wrong with *The Community of Mankind*. Which only the Holy Spirit of Jesus Christ can fix. They are right in their tacit recognition that the Worldly Church has no answer for the epidemic evils of The World. Their new faith in the U.N. isn't going to get us very far either.

In sanctifying the world, in embracing it, half sanctified or not, the American Catholic Church has almost arrived at the same position which the Protestants have long occupied. The belief that The American Empire and the (Protestant) Christian Church have been united in holy matrimony is the fundamental doctrine of the American Cult. They pray around the flag pole and add patriotic hymns to the service. They believe that George Washington was the new

Moses and that the founding fathers were clones of the apostles. That America has the call to establish the Kingdom of God every where in the world by supplying Israel with the newest weapons and dropping 1000 pound bombs on villages where *evil doers* may be hiding.

The Lost Battle

The battle over abortion was lost **WITHIN** the Catholic Church just as the battle over contraception was lost **WITHIN** the Catholic Church. If you can even call it *A BATTLE*. It was a forfeit for all except a few of the bishops. The rest surrendered without firing a shot. In fact, there is convincing evidence that many of them were on the other side of the battle, first to last, as were the Canadian bishops and the bishops of Europe. Father Charles Curran claimed that he had the tacit support of 40 American bishops in his rebellion against the 1968 birth control encyclical *Humanae Vitae*. There is no reason to doubt it. He was obviously the front man for many in the American Church and he had powerful support in Rome. The American Catholic Bishops did not go as far as the hierarchies of some other countries in openly opposing *Humanae Vitae*. But they did essentially the same thing by their equivocations and by the way they ignored the American dissenters, and tacitly encouraged them, and later rewarded them.

Catholic historians avoid admitting it, but it is apparent that Pope Paul VI himself was in complicity with the pro contraception movement in the Church before and after he yielded to the pressure to re-affirm the ban on contraception in his 1968 encyclical. Who else was responsible for appointing all of the pro contraception people to the Papal Birth Control Commission ? Including the chairman, Father Henri de Riedmatten, who is reported to have stood and applauded when the Commission voted for contraception.

There was obviously a behind the scenes struggle going on when *The Church in the Modern World* was issued at the end of 1965. An ambivalent anti contraception statement was added to section 51 along with *famous footnote 14* which referred to statements against contraception by earlier popes but which also reserved the question of birth control to the Pope himself in consultation with the commission he had appointed--the commission which was loaded with supporters of contraception. Then this footnote disappeared from the document. Then it was restored at the printer's. Even though the Pope yielded to the pressure from the conservatives in the Church when he later re-affirmed the ban on contraception, the other things which he did, and which he failed to do, guaranteed that the birth control encyclical was **DEAD ON ARRIVAL**. There is good reason to believe that he was a closet liberal, as many people have assumed. That would explain why he not only tolerated dissent to *Humanae Vitae* but in effect encouraged it. The dissenters not only escaped discipline--or even a reproof--but many of them later received papal appointments.

The Pope's apostolic delegate, Jean Jadot, is blamed for the subsequent appointment of 100 *liberal* bishops to the American hierarchy, over a 10 year period. But who was responsible for these appointments except the Pope himself ? What kept him from recalling Jadot ? Which is what his successor did. By then, toleration of contraception was simply the fact in the American Catholic Church, as it is today. On one occasion, Jadot reproached Bishop Sullivan of New Orleans for refusing to let Charles Curran deliver a talk at his seminary. Joseph Bernardin was appointed Cardinal Archbishop of Chicago despite his compromises with the pro contraception forces and his private description of *Humanae Vitae* as *that God damned encyclical*. Or was it because of that ? Many of these liberal bishops protected priestly pedophiles for years until a vast irruption of criminal cases and million dollar lawsuits forced them to acknowledge the situation. Meanwhile, they do nothing about the adult homosexuality in many Catholic seminaries, which does not carry the same legal liability. It only destroys the priesthood.

But contraception was long established among Catholics by 1968. Catholic G.I.s knew all about contraception by the time they came back from World War II and bought that little suburban house which was just big enough for a wife and two kids. Catholic chaplains in World War II had to go along with condoms being passed out to Catholic soldiers. Women working for wages was an accomplished fact by the end of the war. The life style which depends upon two incomes was already coming. The woman's right to be a stay at home mom was already eroding. America's big wars are a basic cause of the moral breakdown in American society.

The traditional values of Catholic families were already being pushed aside by the wealth-pursuing life style of the larger society characterized by one-or-two-child families, divorce, cohabitation, and rising rates of illegitimacy. Contraception and abortion inevitably belong to such a life style. When they ceased to be a subculture in America, and joined mainstream America, Catholics soon abandoned the moral standards in respect to family life which had once set them apart. They proved they could be **GOOD AMERICANS** by becoming **BAD CATHOLICS**.

decline and fall

In the past 50 years there has been a total erosion of the old Catholic Church as it dissolved into the morally corrosive mainstream of American life. In the 1960s, tens of thousands of priests and nuns left their orders. In many cases, those who remained behind were the ones that should have left, as subsequent scandals have proven. In the past year the American bishops have finally had to confront hundreds of cases of clerical molestation of minors because they are criminal cases which leave them vulnerable to huge money judgments. But they are still ignoring the homosexual groups which dominate many Catholic seminaries and convents. In orders like the Sisters of Loretto, the good nuns left and the old nuns retired, leaving the feminist lesbians in charge. They discarded the old faith, the old morals, and the old vows. The only thing they held on to was the property. That is what happens when the Church is defined by how much real estate it owns. Why is it tolerated? A 1999 book by Monsignor Luigi Marinelli, *Gone with the Wind in the Vatican*, describes the homosexual corruption in the Vatican bureaucracy.

The dedicated and valiant priests and nuns who still faithfully serve in the Catholic Church cannot help but feel abandoned by the rest of the Church, including most of the bishops, and including the Vatican, which is unable or unwilling to deal with the wholesale apostasy of the Church in Europe and America especially. Catholic lay people who remain loyal to their Catholic roots are increasingly driven to rebel against this apostate Church. Those who are not still in denial have a deep sense of betrayal. The evidence is that they have been betrayed.

The exodus of teaching nuns destroyed the old Catholic School system. What was once a real alternative to the public schools has largely disappeared and the Church would be better off if a lot of the remaining schools also disappeared. The primary school system, which was staffed by nuns vowed to poverty and which charged \$ 10 a semester, now costs as much as a private school. They prepare the young for the 1 kid, 2 income life style. Contraception and *Pro Choice* is a necessary part of the curriculum.

At a time when Catholics had a fraction of the income they have now, they supported a Catholic school system which was the wonder of the church world, without taking a dime of government money. Every parish had a primary school, within walking distance of where parishioners lived. There were a dozen Catholic high schools in every city which taught strict morals and orthodox faith. Which warned Catholics that they would lose their faith if they went to the State University. They did go and they did lose their faith. And their morals. How can you fit in at these **PARTY SCHOOLS** if you don't learn to party? A Catholic father of a large family was happy when his son got scholarships to Stanford and then Harvard. Now he is dismayed because his son is a *pro choice* atheist. What else did he expect? Where did he get the idea that the road to worldly success was **THE WAY** which Jesus showed us?

Now, with all their money, Catholics cannot imagine how to maintain a school system without government money, without *vouchers*. What the government funds, it inevitably controls sooner or later. Which means that the government will pull the vouchers of a school which refuses to admit Planned Parenthood or which **DISCRIMINATES** against homosexual teachers. That is the kind of thing that has happened to Catholic hospitals which take medicare patients and Christian universities where students have government backed loans. This financial dependence upon the government parallels the spiritual and moral dependence of **SECULAR CHRISTIANS** upon the state. We can't live as Christians unless the Senators and the Judges mandate it. We can't have Christian schools unless the government gives us the money. We ask the government to return some of the money we have given it. **WHY NOT KEEP THEM FROM**

GETTING IT IN THE FIRST PLACE ?! Of course no one can figure out how to do that. They are helpless and hopeless without the government and its power to tax. Anyway, since *pro choice* now prevails at these nominally *Catholic* high schools and colleges, (with a few exceptions) they no longer provide a moral alternative to the public schools and it would be better to close them. Catholic hospitals today are Catholic in name only in respect to maintaining traditional Catholic medical ethics. The secular management hardly bothers to keep up a pretence, while the bishop looks the other way. The loss of the hospital sisters means they charge the same rip off prices as the *for profit* hospitals. The next time they charge you \$ 100 for aspirin, remember: that is what you get for making fun of nuns.

contraception and abortion

In 1963, a Catholic Doctor, John Rock, was a co-inventor of the birth control pill which many influential Catholics, including many of those in the various Catholic family organizations, hoped would escape the Church ban on *artificial* contraception. Dr. Rock's real attitude is shown by a statement he made justifying abortion: *embryos have the same responsibility to the preservation of the human race as soldiers*. These tiny soldiers must bravely sacrifice themselves to preserve the American Dream of Living on Easy Street. Just think of it the same way you think about war. Then you will have no trouble justifying it. They are dying for their country. Involuntarily perhaps, but it is a noble act all the same. They should have more flags in front of abortuaries to bring out the patriotic aspect of it. And aren't they helping to alleviate world hunger? That is what we hear from abortion customers--either she was raped--perhaps--or there might be something wrong with the baby, or they are concerned about world hunger and **OVER POPULATION**. It is surprising how many people believe that Wyoming is over populated.

Several years ago, Father Paul Marx published a substantial article in which he showed from abortion industry sources the solid connection between contraception and abortion. Anyone who seriously sets out to stop abortion discovers that connection. There is no such thing as a reliable contraceptive method and so abortion is the necessary back-up to contraception. In fact, nearly all methods of contraception, including The Pill are abortifacients at least part of the time. *Humanae Vitae* states that *contraception degrades women*. Gandhi said: *contraceptives are an insult to womanhood; Divorce of the sexual act from its natural consequence must lead to hideous promiscuity; [it] can only do great moral injury to the people*. He could not have imagined the things that have happened to modern India. Sex selection abortions have produced a dearth of marriageable women. Men without women turn to prostitutes. From whom they get AIDS. So childless men can look forward to early death.

Women who know all about contraception neglect to use it and don't insist that their boy friends use it. Something in her pushes her to rebel against being a **SAFELY STERILIZED SEX OBJECT**. Something in her pushes her to test the relationship by taking a risk, by seeing how the man will respond--*what would he do if I got pregnant? Could he take the responsibility?* They naturally rebel against waiting until age 35 to have a baby. Something in her rebels against being one more desk in the labyrinthine bureaucracy of commerce, industry and government. *Is this my Wonderful Career? Is this my life? What a bore!* A name plate on the door, a carpet on the floor and dinner at the French Restaurant is supposed to atone for having no family. Since men are now brought up to decline any responsibility--**IT'S HER CHOICE!**--they usually end up at the abortuary. Planned Parenthood also thinks it has an "information" problem. But it is something much more fundamental.

There is a basic connection between contraception and abortion. They are two aspects of the luxurious and anti child lifestyle. It is a moral illusion to think that you can separate them. They both belong to the one imperative: avoid having lots of kids so that you can instead have lots of money. So your wife can work and bring in that second paycheck. The original pro abortion Supreme Court decision drew upon the legal reasoning in a decision which struck down a Connecticut law against the sale of contraceptives. The Justices recognized that they were fundamentally the same issue. And they are. When Planned Parenthood crusaded for legal contraception, the push for legal abortion was implicit. Contra their own false propaganda that contraception is the alternative to abortion. They know better. When the Reagan-Bush

Supreme Court rejected any serious restrictions upon legal abortion in the 1992 *Casey* decision, they said that Americans had come to rely upon easily available abortion to maintain their lifestyle. They told the truth. And it was true long before the Supreme Court said it. The Secular Christian lifestyle, requires contraception and abortion. The Catholic lifestyle and the Protestant lifestyle are based upon contraception and abortion.

When Protestant Churches tolerate contraception, they tolerate the abortion-bound lifestyle, whether they admit it or not. The Catholic bishops cannot do anything effective to stop abortion among Catholics because they cannot do anything effective to stop contraception. They can only maintain a *PAPER POSITION* which they have abandoned in reality. When the Republican led Congress left it up to the incoming President to place a nominal restriction on abortion in the Foreign Aid Bill, they also increased the *FAMILY PLANNING* funding to \$425 million. No one even wanted to argue about that. It is established American policy to promote contraception at home and abroad. The Republicans don't even pretend to oppose it.

III THE ABORTED AMERICAN LIFESTYLE

There are technical distinctions with moral implications which can be made between abortion, contraception and so-called *natural family planning*, but all three aim at the same lifestyle, a lifestyle which is built upon the principle of *MORE MONEY, FEWER KIDS*. The higher you aspire in worldly terms, the tougher times get, the more the Christian community disintegrates, the more that principle becomes the **IRON LAW** of the modern American life style. **NOT HAVING BABIES** is the foundation of that luxurious life style which is now an American Necessity. It is a necessity for the prosperous hanging on to the precarious position they have reached on the steep and slippery slope of American prosperity. It is a necessity for those trapped at the bottom who are paid a **SERVANT WAGE** which precludes having kids for all except the most reckless.

The prosperous must rely upon contraception and abortion in order to pass their prosperous life style on to their children. Her college scholarship is out the window if she does not get rid of the baby. Either her baby goes into the trash or her career goes into the trash. The poor are forced into abortion by an **ANTI FAMILY ECONOMY** in which your own survival on a subsistence wage demands the sacrifice of your children. Her husband has been deported back to Mexico and her uncle will put her out of his tiny house, if she does not get rid of the baby.

The logic of contraception is fornication. If **CARELESS LOVE** is necessary for married couples, it is even more necessary for unmarried couples. And their parents have set them the example. After looking in their parents' bedroom, they know what brand to buy. And their parents have brought them up in that luxurious lifestyle which mandates **CAREERS FOR WOMEN** because **it requires two incomes**. It means a woman must wait until she is 35 to have her one and only child. So, from 15 to 35 she must remain a virgin. Or turn to Planned Parenthood for help. What is the realistic choice ?

Is it surprising that sailors patronize prostitutes, that soldiers rape captive women, or that prisoners become involved in homosexual relationships ? When you separate young men at the lustiest time of their lives from any possibility of having a wife or girl friend and then send them halfway around the world to where they may get killed or crippled the next day, it is entirely predictable that desperate desires will get hold of them. Neither is it surprising that Nature escapes from the un natural constraints imposed by the pursuit of the luxurious lifestyle.

Young men and women, facing 20 years of enforced celibacy, end up throwing off all restraints. Sex is the only adventure allowed them. The **URGE TO PARTY** is a natural rebellion against the sterility and deadly boredom imposed upon them as the price for securing a place in the bureaucracy where they will spend the rest of their lives. The frantic bacchanal is a temporary escape from an unnatural bondage which closes off any good alternative for finding the love they need and establishing a home of their own. Like the slaves and servants and laborers of the 19th century, they are effectively prohibited from getting married and having children. Lady Bellamy did not allow her servants to marry. Dame Affluence does not permit it either.

preaching chastity to teens

is stupid when we also teach them to aim for Law School. She will be 18 by the time she finishes high school, 22 when she finishes College, 25 when she finishes law school, 30 by the time she establishes herself in the legal profession. Can she then give it up, throw away a \$ 300,000 investment in her education, in order to stay home and raise children ? Obviously she has to keep on working. She has to pay back all that borrowed money, which could have bought a farm or a small business. We have a society in which 12 year old girls are already dedicated to the pursuit of males and in which 32 year old girls are still not allowed to have babies. It is a sure fire recipe for contraception and abortion. It is silly to expect anything else. It is silly to preach **CHASTITY** while you raise your children in a life style which has no place for it.

Is she going to wait until she is in her thirties to have a boy friend ? Wait until she is 35 to have the one baby she is allowed, which she must then put in day care ? Is she going to remain a virgin until she is 35 ? If she doesn't, she must use contraception backed by abortion. If she gets pregnant during those **20 YEARS OF STERILITY FOR THE SAKE OF MONEY** there is only one answer. In an *investment* minded society, abortion is the best investment there is. Counting the \$ 200,000 it cost to raise her, the \$ 300,000 it cost to educate her, and the \$ 50,000 a year she can make in her career, a \$ 400 abortion yields a million dollars in money saved and money earned.

People may not consciously make that kind of a calculation, but they understand it quite as well as if they did. The Saint Mary's girl we met going into Planned Parenthood told us that her friend had a scholarship to college and had no choice except to get rid of the baby. And realistically what choice did she have ? The American Dream--get your kid into law school--leaves only one choice. **CAREERS FOR WOMEN** and **ABORTION** go together like ham and eggs.

Fifty years ago you could tell a 16 year old girl to wait. Don't spoil it for yourself. When you are 18 you can get married and start having babies. And, if she couldn't wait, getting married at 16 wasn't the end of the world. Today, if she gets pregnant and refuses to get rid of the baby, she is bound for the welfare roles. For a short while anyway. Thanks to the de facto **WELFARE REFORM** alliance between the Radical Feminists and the Conservatives, she will soon be forced to go to work at a minimum wage job while they subsidize food, housing, child care etc. They don't care how much the subsidies cost just so the main objective is achieved: **do not allow women to stay home with their children.**

For a while the American welfare state provided some minimal support for lower class families. There is no realistic alternative so long as lower class men have no access to jobs which pay a **FAMILY WAGE**. (Unless they get into the rackets--the **FREE ENTERPRISE** system of the slums.) The alternative is to give up on having children. You can't afford it. Since women of the affluent class are not allowed to have children, why should they subsidize these lower class women who insist upon doing it ? The current American solution is to **PUSH CAREERS FOR ALL WOMEN**. All women, even those of the lowest class must seek entry to law school, medical school or business school. It is the American way. It is the American way and the feminist way to have someone else raise your children while you work for wages. No amateur child-raising allowed. Eight dollar an hour *professionals*, hired off the street, will raise your children while you pursue your wonderful career. *Amateur* child-raising, by someone whose main qualification is that she loves the baby, is obsolete.

Bring back the shotgun wedding

Some years ago, a 16 year old gentleman of my acquaintance, who lived in a small town, got his girl friend pregnant. There was only one answer: they had to get married. His parents agreed and her parents agreed. What surprised me was the response of his male buddies, who were also her friends. They planned to beat him up after they heard about her being pregnant. He squared it with them by assuring them that he intended to do the right thing by the young lady and that they were all invited to the wedding. And it worked out. They got married and raised several more children. A basic reason for the precocious passion was that they really did like each other.

Which illustrates the old code which said that, if you were old enough to have sex, you were old enough to take responsibility for the result. It had the effect of teaching people to be responsible. When you are about to be hung or about to be married, it concentrates your attention. Seeing your buddy married at 16 made you think. It wasn't such a bad thing. Now they don't have to think. *If it feels good, do it!* Now American society perpetuates adolescence and encourages irresponsibility.

But 50 years ago it was possible to support a family on one income. It wasn't that hard to find a **FAMILY WAGE**--an income which would allow a man to support a wife and kids by working a 40 hour week. Today's young men are encouraged to be as responsible as a baby's rear end. If you allow your 16 year old to take the car, even though the insurance does not cover him, and he runs into someone else's car, you and he may both end up in jail. But if you allow him the sexual freedom to ruin some young girl's life, there is no penalty.

In fact, your 16 year old might very well point out that he is effectively precluded from finding a job which would allow him to support a family in today's economy. Why should he take responsibility for a baby when he has no parental rights? It is Her Choice whether the baby lives or dies. There is a **PHONY PRO CHOICE MALE** who keeps saying **IT'S HER CHOICE!** usually while leaning out the car window and giving the finger to the sidewalk counselors in front of the abortuary. What he means of course is that **It is her problem, not mine!** Not even Ted Kennedy and Bill Clinton can afford to be really **pro choice**: *Well it is your choice! If you want to have an abortion, send me a bill for \$ 400 (or use this Kennedy Family Coupon.) Or, if you want to keep the baby, and raise him, send me a bill for \$ 400,000. It is all the same to me.*

The Luxurious Life Style

American women now have every luxury except the luxury of staying home with their children. That is the one thing they cannot afford. In fact the economy is rigged against it. People who might once have had to count their pennies to buy necessities now engage in the national past time of recreational shopping. They buy new cars, they dine in restaurants. But babies are a luxury they can't afford. What was once a necessity has now become a luxury. While all the things that used to be regarded as luxuries are now necessities. The one begets the other.

The modern American life style is a **SECOND PAY CHECK LIFE STYLE**. It is tied to **CAREERS FOR WOMEN**. Putting the women to work doubles family income. That is its first effect. Its second effect is to cut wages in half, because you have doubled the labor supply. That is why it now takes two wage earners to make the equivalent of what one could make 50 years ago. The third effect is to eliminate the family, because women permanently in the work force have no time or energy left to raise children. The more women work, the more they have to work. Now it takes two pay checks to buy a house. So both have to work. Before 1970 only the man's income was counted when banks wrote mortgages. The assumption was that the woman would soon quit work to stay home with the kids. When the feminists and their business allies forced a change in policy, the effect was to double and triple the price of a house every where in America. Since you can now afford a house which costs twice as much, we will double the price of the house you want to buy. In the 1990s the price of a house has tripled again. Has your income tripled in the past 10 years? Has the demand for houses tripled?

A major part of the inflation comes from two career childless couples with money to invest. So they buy an extra house for an investment. The result is that the one income family winds up paying rent to the childless couple which owns the house they live in. The whole of American society is committed to **INVESTING**, that is to **USURY, making money off money--reaping where you did not sow, and taking up what you did not lay down.** (Luke 19.21-32)

SEXUAL FREEDOM has become the most **ABSOLUTE** of American Freedoms. The homosexual who spreads AIDS to hundreds of other men cannot be held liable, even though he effectively sentences them to death. It would violate his *privacy* even to publicly acknowledge it. Why do homosexual groups support abortion? What does it have to do with them? The answer is that they are committed to **ABSOLUTE SEXUAL FREEDOM**, even if someone else must die to pay for it. **ABSOLUTE SEXUAL FREEDOM** means that we lay down THEIR lives for OUR Liberty.

President Clinton could not be impeached for crimes of *perjury* and *obstruction of justice* connected with the exercise of his sexual **FREEDOM. America Stands For Freedom !** The failure to define **FREEDOM** in America--what could men who owned slaves really mean by it ?--has reached its full flowering in our time: Freedom to throw embryo children in the trash. Freedom to spread AIDS. Freedom to use others without obligation = *Careless Love*. The founding fathers had the **FREEDOM** to make their fortunes by taking land from the Indians to establish tobacco plantations worked by African slaves. That was the **FREE ENTERPRISE** system in colonial America. They then complained about restrictions on trade passed by the British Parliament. **GIVE ME LIBERTY (AND SLAVERY) OR GIVE ME DEATH ! FREEDOM** meant conscripting men into the army and jailing those who refused. It meant turning the bully boy **SONS OF LIBERTY** loose on those who refused to take the oath of loyalty to the new rebel government.

America's Contraceptive Mission

Now that American women have been liberated, America has a mission to **LIBERATE** Moslem women: **SHOW SOME SKIN AND START USING BIRTH CONTROL !** On the one hand you have a society which makes women veil their faces. On the other hand you have a society in which women have 1.5 million abortions every year. Which spends \$ 2 billion a year on hard core pornography in addition to being blessed with a population of free and easy females. Which society has the worst problem ? Which one needs the **VALUES** of the other ? Since women are not allowed to have a baby until they turn 35, we should encourage them to wear the *burka* until that age. Instead they are encouraged to put on high heels and low cut dresses and start vamping at age 12. They spend the next 20 years romping on the beach in *thong* bikinis over spring break, smoking pot and drinking Zima. Is it surprising that we have epidemics of venereal disease and abortion ? The *thong* bikini shows how degraded this loveless sexuality has become. People have become so desensitized that total nudity inspires a yawn.

Are these the **AMERICAN VALUES** we need to impose upon Afghanistan and the rest of the Moslem world ? Mr. Bush's feminist allies believe it and he knows better than to disagree. Catching up with *the women's vote*--which means the **ABORTED WOMEN'S** vote--was a major political goal of the Afghan campaign and shaped the way it was fought. Eleanor Smeal, the president of the Feminist Majority, said that her organization *absolutely agreed with the administration's campaign*. Why else was it necessary to bomb the police station in Kandahar ? Mr. Bush does not comprehend why the Moslems reject the **FREEDOM** for which **AMERICA** stands or why they resist having it imposed upon them. In the eyes of devout Moslems, American women are whores and our children are bastards--the few that are lucky enough to escape abortion. The Moslem standard of sexual morality is the same one that Christians and Jews once upheld. Whatever is wrong with the extreme the Moslems have arrived at, it hardly compares with the extreme found in America and Europe and Israel: the systematic and relentless destruction of family life. America is the bane of the moral values which are necessary to preserve the family. Mr. Bush's daughters need to learn some **MOSLEM VALUES**.

The **EMANCIPATION** of the women of Afghanistan actually began back in 1978 when a Communist government was installed in Kabul with the backing of the Soviet Union. When they refer to *the freedom of Afghan women* before the Taliban that is what they mean. The **EMANCIPATION OF WOMEN** through contraception, abortion, divorce, and letting them have careers in the factories and the coal mines was a basic part of the ideology of the Russian Revolution. This *emancipating* government was finally ousted by the rebellion which the American C.I.A. financed. Then the war lords, who had killed 30,000 people in their battle for Kabul, were beaten by the Taliban who had received 70 % of the C.I.A. weapons and supplies.

Now Women's Liberation--the attack on Moslem tradition--is there again under U.S. and U.N. sponsorship. Oddly enough, this **WOMEN'S LIBERATION** ideology, from two rival sources, is originally from the same source--the radical feminist ideology which was an integral part of 19th century socialism and communism. Whatever women's liberation is supposed to mean, it is unlikely to come about in a country over run with armies and carpeted with land mines. The new government is a coalition of the most murderous thugs in Afghanistan, temporarily bribed into a semblance of cooperation by enormous pay offs from America. Every kid has an AK 47, supplied by the C.I.A, which supplied Russian rifles to conceal the source.

liberated from children

The radical feminists of the 1960s consciously aimed at a society in which all women would be **LIBERATED** from home-making and child-raising so that they could have **CAREERS**. That was the public face of a group which had kept alive a secretive faith in the original **ABOLISH THE FAMILY** ideology of radical feminism. **Careers for women and raising all children in government funded child care centers** were essential parts of an anti Christian religion which can be traced back through 19th century socialism and the French Revolution to the secret faith of the late 18th century Freemasons in France and America. Their mystique of a *new world order* is modeled upon Plato's *Republic*, from which sexual morality and the family have been banished. But the radical feminists were a minority of a minority. They could never have carried out this program without the support of Secularized Christians who had long since abandoned everything that Jesus taught about money. The materialism of the American Dream and the false faith in America pushes people to pursue a paradise on earth which is defined by the mandate to have **MORE MONEY, FEWER CHILDREN**.

The false faith in My Career is a secularized version of the true Christian faith in **my vocation**. It is a moneyed-up version of it which has lost moral integrity and spiritual purpose--which has been endowed with a pseudo purpose based upon feminist fantasies: Find a Glorious Destiny in the Safety of the Bureaucracy--Great Adventure and Money in the Bank. You can have it all and not miss a meal. By the time they find out they have been suckered, they are too old to have children and hurting in every way. So, having sterilized themselves via contraception, abortion, and putting off child-bearing, they pay out large sums of money for fertility treatments or try to find a child to adopt in a third world country. Meanwhile, **a million and a half American babies** are dismembered and thrown in the trash every year. The sheer criminal insanity of **LIBERATED** contemporary culture and the blind folly of **LIBERATED** so-called *women* is thereby grotesquely illustrated. (They have really been turned into *anti-women* by the feminist virus which destroyed them.)

The mandate of Careers for Women teaches them to put Security and Money First. But what is Secured after your Family is Lost ? What can Money ever buy which will replace that Missing Family ? In a de facto way, the ancient feminist mandate to Abolish the Family has been more than halfway accomplished in America even while they concealed their real aim under the Title of **CAREERS FOR WOMEN**. It is the ancient mandate of those who seek to stop others from having families because they have been deprived of their chance and because Misery Loves Company. It is the strange fact that, in the Land of Opportunity, the opportunity to ever have a family has all but disappeared, even for the most privileged class of Americans.

The news media and the film industry carry on a relentless campaign of propaganda on behalf of women having careers. A woman with several children is never featured unless she has just murdered them. Women who stay home and raise children are treated with a disdain that borders on contempt. Meanwhile, any woman anywhere who is doing something that only men used to do is given star billing. The female golfer who flopped in her attempt to make it on the men's circuit is nonetheless a heroine to the feminists and their friends in the media. The inept attempt to gain glory by hitting that little white ball in company with the men represents the noblest tradition of feminist aspiration. They will love her forever and publicize her forever unless she decides to get married and have kids.

Whenever there is a crime scene or a fire, the TV camera rushes past a dozen policemen or firemen to interview any female police officer or fire fighter at the scene. The TV cameras pursue females in the military with the dedication of those who chase movie stars. They relentlessly sell the doctrine that **A WOMAN'S PLACE IS IN THE MILITARY**. The militant feminists in the media--male and female--are so hungry for propaganda illustrations of the **Female Warrior** that they simply fabricated the story about Private Jessica Lynch shooting it out with the Enemy. Then they ran it as **News** ! And still haven't admitted that they made it up ! You would never guess that women in combat is still against the law. Women conscripted into combat has long been the dearest dream of the feminists. They wouldn't back off the issue even though it caused the defeat of the Equal Rights Amendment in 1982. Now they proceed as if it had passed.

Network rules require all television dramas to have at least one episode of a man being beaten up by a woman. In TV sit coms, a father who attempts to assert his authority is invariably played for laughs. What a fool ! There was a time when movies like *Life with Father* or *I Remember Mama* honored and celebrated the Wonderful Father and Mother. In the movie, *Meet Me in Saint Louis*, the mother admonishes the little girl: *Don't use that insolent tone to your father !* Now a child actor who hasn't mastered *that insolent tone* will never get a part. Now our heroine is a lesbian lawyer who wins a marathon and punches out a dozen guys on her way to climbing Mount Everest--or some such. The only challenge modern women can't handle is raising children. If they do, they are banned from the media for life.

JOBS versus CAREERS versus VOCATIONS

Aside from the money, a major reason people have bought into the idea of careers for women is that it is a secular substitute for the old Christian ideal of a vocation. It is pushed, not just by the predictable disaster of modern marriages, but by the emptiness and boredom of the materialistic life style in which Americans are stuck, if they somehow escape the poverty at the bottom. The loss of community and spiritual purpose pushes people to seek the alternative in that false faith which *CAREERS* offer. They are **CALLED TO CAREERS**. The ideal of a vocation or *CALLING* is implicit in the idea of a *career* that appeared in the older wing of the women's liberation movement. Betty Friedan, the apostle of careers for women, insisted that women must be unhappy when they are limited to home-making and child-raising. In a career they would find the missing self-fulfillment. But she obviously means much more than is realistically meant by a *career*. She isn't just talking about a long-hours job that pays well and gets you a carpet on the floor and a name plate on the door.

In her book, *THE FEMININE MYSTIQUE*, she bewails the lot of a woman stuck at home with her kids and losing her chance to be a *poet*, a *scientist* or a *statesman*. Would you rather do dishes or read your poetry at the White House Inaugural ? Change dirty diapers or accept the Nobel prize for discovering a cure for cancer ? Drive the kids to school or meet with the world's elite at a summit conference ? Clearly, Mrs. Friedan had in mind, not what the **Help Wanted** ads really have to offer, but the sort of exalted destiny that only the few achieve, the grand role she saw herself as playing by leading the women's liberation movement.

Life is boring for many people, although it is hard to see that it is worse for a housewife than for a man who works at the same job for 40 years to support his family. And creating a real home is a challenge that goes far beyond keeping a house. But *CAREERS* is an illusion which hides the reality of the available jobs. Can we all be movie stars or prominent politicians or military leaders ? Such people have *CAREERS*. The rest of us have jobs. A career has come to be another word for putting in 12 hour days and never seeing your family, if you have one. Increasingly, people don't. Is it really so creative to shuffle files in some office instead of watching your children grow up and maybe having a hand in how they do it ? What people really need is *VOCATIONS*--the Call from God which gives real Purpose to life. The worst thing about the disappearance of the Christian community is that it takes away the chance to find our true vocations. *CAREERS* negate *VOCATIONS*, just like **SECULAR CHRISTIANITY** negates christianity.

There are basic disconnects in the way American children are raised. At age 3 they are given paper and crayons and encouraged to dream about what great thing they are going to do with their lives. Do you wish to become an artist or a writer ? Are you the new Beethoven ? Or would you rather have a career in the hide factory ? Later they are sold the proposition that we must all become doctors, lawyers or business persons. We can all be high salaried professionals and let the machines and the foreigners do the dirty work. Reality finally sets in when we are **DOWNSIZED** and **LAI D OFF** and stand in line to get a subsistence wage job.

But we are responsible for the economy that we have. Add up how much money you spent in restaurants last year. Then add up how much money you spent on poetry by new and unknown poets. Multiply those figures by what your friends spent and you see why there are so many waitress and bus boy jobs and why so few people can survive writing poetry or playing music--why all of our poets and musicians have to work in restaurants.

There is no reason to predict the impending destruction of America because it has already happened. No doubt it can and will get worse, but the moral collapse of American society is already here. A few days ago George Bush said that *America is a moral society*. Where does Mr. Bush live? He must have been spending too much time at Camp David, or too little time watching TV, because he has obviously lost track of the galloping degeneracy of the American Empire in its waning days. He only needs to take a walk around Washington D.C. to realize how silly his remark was. Take plenty of Secret Service along.

The attempt to impeach Bill Clinton revealed something basic about American society. When they interviewed people, they regularly turned up comments like *I think most people have done that kind of thing*. At least half of the American people could identify with Bill Clinton on the hot seat: (*how would I like to have to go in front of a grand jury and answer questions about some of the things I've done? I would have to lie too!*) They squirmed in sympathy. In short, they could identify with Presidential depravity. They did not want him punished because it made them feel like they were being punished.

A moral moslem who turns on a TV in America would at once turn it off and throw the TV in the dumpster. The moral depravity of American television shows what we have become. The Moslem hijackers who destroyed the World Trade Center lived in America for a year before they carried out their mission. These men had every opportunity to see for themselves what **AMERICAN VALUES** are. And everything they saw strengthened their conviction that it was an **EVIL SOCIETY**. Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the man who planned the attack on the World Trade Center, captured in Pakistan in March 2003, went to college in the United States. What he saw here confirmed him in his mission. The Moslems correctly identify America as the **GREAT SATAN**. But they have the same silly faith as the Secular Christians and the Pentagon that bombs destroy evil spirits. The truth is the exact opposite: **bombs multiply evil spirits**.

Mr. Bush and the other flag-waving orators talk like they were born yesterday or that, like Rip Van Winkle, they have slept through all the changes which have taken place in America in the last 50 years. The wholesale attack on sexual morality and family life has entirely eroded the pretence of morals which prevailed in an earlier America. America never was the moral nation of the American myth but there was at least hypocrisy--*the tribute which vice pays to virtue*. They didn't display plastic penises as art in the Boulder public library, as they did recently. Nor would the police have called on the man who removed the offensive display after he visited the library with his 4 year old daughter. They in effect told him that a public display of plastic penises at taxpayer expense is perfectly compatible with modern American values. And it is. The obscene depiction of Mary in a Brooklyn museum or the picture of **PISS CHRIST**--a crucifix immersed in a jar of urine--must not only be tolerated by Americans but paid for by them.

The goofy and indecent outfits which are high fashion in women's clothing seem invariably to have been designed by homosexuals to promote the **LIBERATED WOMAN** and to attack the traditional woman. The creepy and bizarre styles of both outer clothing and underwear display a fetichism which apparently appeals to bisexual males, to lesbians, and to jaded and kinky characters of all sorts. The mannish suits and close cropped hair, which effectively negate the femininity of the traditional woman, are the **LESBIAN LOOK** which all women are under pressure to follow if they wish to dress for success. These styles are part of the push for the new world order from which traditional women have been banished.

America potty mouth

The relentless raunchiness of American TV and American movies is reflected in the street level conversation of Americans. American women now use language that would make an old fashioned sailor blush. There is a national epidemic of **POTTY MOUTH**. And it isn't just talk. It grows out of that life style from which the decencies which protect family life have disappeared. Like sailors and soldiers, like the slaves, and servants and common laborers of the 19th century,

young men and women today are trapped in a situation which cuts them off from any good opportunity to get married and have children. Not surprisingly, their suppressed sexuality seeks whatever escape it can find. How else shall we measure what America is unless by the young people it produces ? And how else shall we measure them except by those bacchanals on the beaches of Florida or Mexico over spring break ? If they are a disgrace to themselves and a disgrace to us it points up one thing: American society is a disgrace. Along with a national day of repentance, we need a national day of washing our mouths out with soap.

The brothels of the American Empire are one measure of how much it destroyed family life. In Washington D.C. during the Civil War there were 450 brothels. The name *hooker* comes from the name for the prostitutes who served the union army while General Joe Hooker commanded it--*Hooker's Girls*. The laborers on the Transcontinental Railroad patronized the **HELL ON WHEELS** and **THE BIG TENT**. And most of them never got back to where they belonged. Today, we hardly need brothels because America itself is one big brothel. It is entirely appropriate that the Republican Party identifies with **THE BIG TENT**. It describes what they stand for, hypocrisy aside.

As if ordinary television was not indecent enough, America has a two billion dollar a year hard core pornography industry. A pornographic movie channel goes to 35 million American households. General Motors and Time Warner have divisions which produce pornographic movies and provide them via cable. The Hilton and Marriott hotel chains subscribe to pornographic movies on cable for their guests. At the video store you can buy either heterosexual or homosexual pornography. Hard core pornography that is. If you are satisfied with soft core pornography, you can find it at the supermarket.

the American kiss

Modern American movies relentlessly undermine decency and promote a pervasive anti family culture. Movie stars have forgotten how to kiss except as a brief preliminary to sex with a stranger--*let's do it quick before I find out any more about you and lose the desire*. Their technique seems to be modeled on piglets tucking into their mash. It is sensual rather than emotional. The Geese have a deeper feeling for their mates. When *George Bailey* kisses *Mary* in *It's a Wonderful Life*, it comes out of the deep love he feels for her, which he can no longer deny. It isn't the preliminary to a quickie in the back bedroom. Instead, it is the pledge of a life long commitment to her. It means he will give up his day dream of traveling around the world. He is going to spend the rest of his life in Bedford Falls and work to support Mary and their children. Imagine any movie presenting that today. The audience would be offended by the idea of anyone having to give up his or her trip around the world. The trip, like the new car, is an essential part of the American Dream. Why can't they travel together and shack up with the help of Planned Parenthood ? Why should anyone have to give up anything in modern America ? Sacrifice the baby, not the trip !

When *Charlie* gives *Rosie* a chaste and affectionate kiss in a moment of exuberance, it leads both of them to discover that they have *fallen in love*. It opens up a new life for them. *The African Queen* has brought two lonely people together into an enduring life and death relationship. I don't believe that most modern movie actors have ever fallen in love or know what it is. They do not understand the most basic fact about it, which is that premature and casual sexuality pushes you in the opposite direction from the one you have to go in to have any chance of ever finding love. Lust erodes love by making the other person an *object*, instead of a *subject*. The loss of the traditional standard of sexual morality has negated the very possibility of the growth of that durable bond between a man and a woman upon which traditional family life was built. Like many Americans, these actors have been raised in such a way that they are jaded by the time they turn 14. After that, they have no enthusiasm unless it is group sex with just the right amount of illegal substances. Hollywood has long led the way in setting the example of divorces and casual affairs. Which is nothing to wonder at when we belatedly learn how many stars have had abortions, how many have sacrificed their children to their careers. There is nothing so un sexy as abortion. The restless and desperate sexuality of aborted women and men who have ducked fatherhood inevitably follows. Americans in general now follow the

trail which they have blazed. They lead the way in the escape into fantasy. It becomes more and more necessary as the reality of life becomes more and more dismal in the aborted American empire. The epidemic of addictions in American life grows out of a desperate desire for the love which has disappeared as families have disappeared.

Much of contemporary American music is obviously demon possessed. There is an ancient demon who can be recognized by the twin marks of obscenity and violence. The *PUNK ROCK* music which the Columbine shooters listened to is relentlessly obscene and violent. *Marilyn Manson* is a man who dresses like a woman on stage. His lyrics celebrate a violent homosexuality which contrasts sharply with the routine portrait of homosexuals on television as funny and harmless. The media has long carried on a propaganda campaign to put an acceptable face on the homosexual under culture.

The true face of American homosexuality comes out in this music, the under culture of leather bars and bath houses where men find 200 anonymous partners a year. There are hundreds of clubs where this kind of music is combined with *crystal meth*, *ecstasy*, crack or cocaine. An article in the Times says that crystal methamphetamine is *prized as aphrodisiac and long-lasting stimulant . . . can be snorted, inhaled, swallowed or injected*. Drugs, like *ecstasy* have become epidemic among teenagers. The billions and billions of dollars which Americans spend on drugs, legal and illegal, and on alcohol, measure what sort of a society we are. The 480 billion a year we spend on gambling measures what kind of a society we are.

The media made a perpetual national headline story of the killing of a homosexual by two men he met in a bar. Then they buried the story of a boy who had been sodomized and suffocated by two homosexuals. The media routinely conceals the real character of the homosexual subculture. They report on violence against homosexuals without explaining that most of that violence is by other homosexuals. American culture today has a spiritual kinship with the rotten culture of the Wehrmacht Republic in its last days, when the Nazis were gaining strength. There was a major element of sexual liberation in the National Socialist Party as there was among the Bolsheviks, and it conspicuously included violent homosexuality. The drive towards a new world order which is found in both right wing and left wing socialism was rooted psychologically and historically in a radical sexual rebellion by those who are misfits in any decent society. That is why they are driven to attack the sexual morality upon which family life depends. The media is the ally of this attack. They have long refused to pursue the obvious question as to whether AIDS can be **transmitted by saliva**, that is, whether it can be transmitted by *casual contact*, because of the obvious implications for the discovery and quarantine of AIDS cases--most of them homosexuals, and many of whom work in the media--in the same way that tuberculosis cases are quarantined. In his recent address, Mr. Bush said that the Federal Government was doing everything it could to halt the spread of AIDS. In fact the Public Health Service long ago caved in to pressure from the media, and the homosexual lobby. Mr. Bush is too eager to get the money and the support of the Log Cabin Republicans to change anything, even if his party would let him.

Rap versus Soul

There was a time when the culture of American negroes was represented by gospel music, by jazz, by blues, and by *soul*. It was not an entirely truthful portrait but there is something to be said for hypocrisy as presenting a high standard. Today's *RAP* or *hip hop* music is arguably a truthful presentation of the real under culture of the Negro slums in which rampant crime, pervasive obscenity, constant violence, virulent black racism and drug addiction have always been epidemic. We never wanted to face the basic truth that slavery is a great crime of violence and that violence generates violence. It was devil's seed which has produced a hundred fold harvest. But Rap music actually **CELEBRATES** this degraded under culture of the prison and the slum. It gives bored bourgeoisie a voyeur's look at rape and murder from a safe distance, the way that TV let's them watch a war. The degradation is in the style of the music as much as the content. It is in fact a kind of Anti Music which conveys a set of Anti Values. Chanting displaces singing. There is no melody left. They are hate songs instead of love songs--a testament to the long hatred of America's relationship with its slaves.

Rap music is so deeply rooted in the drug culture that it would die out within days if the drug supply were cut off. The only element that would remain is upper class voyeurs feeding off the criminal license of the lower class at a safe remove. It is called *hip hop* because they suppose themselves to be *hip* and they are perennially *hopped up* on drugs. The values of this culture are 1. money 2. drugs 3. clothes 4. sex. Sex being the least regarded because it is the cheapest. It is astonishing how completely they have trashed all the spiritual, moral and emotional values that generated the Civil Rights movement. The fact that this has become the major cultural product of American Negroes and that listeners, most of them white, are willing to buy this music is an accurate indicator of how morally sick America is and of how morally sick Negro America is. Why do not Negroes themselves do something effective to oppose this obscene, violent, drug-addicted, and racist art form which disgraces all of them? The Jubilee Singers once moved audiences in America and Europe with the deep spirituality of black gospel hymns. Now those who *want to kill a cop* or rape a woman are inspired by the Rappers to do it in fantasy. Real Christians must boycott almost all of American culture and promote a counter culture to keep their children from being swept away in that American Cultural Sewer which has arrived at flood stage. **American Values** are only too well known in other countries. The drug gangs of Cape Town, South Africa, tattoo the names of American rappers on their chests and take the gangsters of Los Angeles for their models. One gang calls itself *The Americans*. The homicide rate for the gangsters and the kids who get in the line of fire is as high as it is in inner city Washington. The teenage soldiers riding around the Ivory Coast in confiscated cars, and shooting up the town, paint the names of their rebel platoons on the side, names taken from Hollywood and comic book heroes, like *Delta Force* and *Black Ninja*.

The conspicuously unwholesome musicians at the top of western pop culture are a revealing indicator of what sort of people we have become. Instead of being embarrassed for people who shave their heads and put rings through their noses we dutifully imitate them. When the entertainment community came together for a patriotic concert of sorts, it was as if they wished to provide overwhelming evidence for the radical Moslem contention as to the wholly depraved character of American society. It had to have been the creepiest collection of moral degenerates assembled under one roof since the last days of the Roman Empire. Popular western culture at its zenith is represented by aging rock stars whose faces, eroded by 40 years of drugs and debauchery, would frighten **THE PICTURE OF DORIAN GRAY**. The **POPULARITY** of these figures, like the popularity of Bill Clinton, shows us how much confidence we can place in the decency of the American people. Unlike the unchanging rock faces of Mount Rushmore, these faces accurately mirror the degradation which has accompanied 40 years of abortion in America. All by themselves, they constitute a sufficient proof of the terminal depravity of the American People. You can't really appreciate American pop music today unless you are using the same drug they are and even the same dosage. If you aren't high, it all sounds flat. Although you hardly have to listen to the music. The idea is antique. Instead there is continual yelling and jumping plus strobe lights and special effects to create a kind of sensory surround, which, added to the essential narcotics, creates the experience. At best, it is an unhealthy exercise class, at worst it is a Satanic revival service. The Beatles quit touring because they couldn't cope with the relentless screaming. They couldn't hear themselves. After that, they made studio albums. One young lady, asked if she liked the Beatles, said she wasn't sure, but *I like to scream*. American popular culture has become a **SCREAM**, that is the truth.

IV AMERICA'S STINKY SELF RIGHTEOUSNESS

Proverbs 6.17 says that the Lord hates **A PROUD LOOK, A LYING TONGUE, AND HANDS THAT SHED INNOCENT BLOOD**. That describes the United States of America. And our pride keeps us from seeing it. If you were to step on to the podium and begin speaking in this vein: *I am a courageous person, and a kind person, compassionate, generous, wise . . .* It wouldn't be long before what is left of your audience was opening the windows and rolling up their pant legs to protect themselves from this rising tide of manure. But all you have to do is change the "I" to "We"--*We Americans are courageous, kind, compassionate, generous, wise . . .* and this stinky self righteousness is transformed into divine incense. Your audience laps it up like it was caramel pudding. **Amen ! Preach It ! Ain't it the Truth ! Aren't we wonderful !**

When you *believe in yourself*, you join the largest, oldest and craziest of all cults. But so long as it is only yourself that you believe in, you have to stay in the closet where you keep your shrine of self worship. When you join in collective self worship you can come out of the closet. *Deutschland uber alles !!! America is the greatest country in the world !!!* (And, since I belong to it, it means that *I am the greatest !*)

The President's job, as the high priest of the American Cult, is to make these kinds of pronouncements, to remind us on every suitable occasion how wonderful we are. It is his job to lie to us, and he does: *We are a kind nation, a compassionate nation, and we value life.* (10-23-1) We value life. That is why there have only been 50 million abortions in America in the past 35 years. We value life. That is why we have been dropping bombs on people for the past 60 years--the past 225 years actually. That is why we gave smallpox infected blankets to the Indians. In fact, real kindness, compassion and courage are not often found in individuals, are rarely found in small groups and are never found in mobs. The basic truth of the Christian doctrine that **PEOPLE ARE NO DAMNED GOOD**, because man's nature is fallen, can be proven empirically by the events of the 20th century, or any other century. (cf. Exodus 32.22 *you know the people, that they are set on evil.*) It isn't that Americans are worse than other people. Americans ARE other people. They are a representative cross section of the human race. The false faith in the American people rests upon **the humanist faith** that **THE PEOPLE** in general are wonderful or **the patriot faith** that people are spiritually and morally transformed as soon as they set foot on American soil.

faith in **THE PEOPLE**

It is orthodox Christian belief that mankind has a fallen nature. It is the faith of the American Cult that, as soon as they step off the boat, men are somehow transformed. When they become Americans, they undergo a **baptism by patriotism** which endows them with all those virtues that belong to the **AMERICAN PEOPLE** who are compassionate, brave, generous, honest, hard-working, clean, reverent etc. They may have been run out of their home towns, like the two Russians who fed the bride and groom to the wolves to save themselves, (Willa Cather's novel), but once standing on American soil, they are counted among the collective saints.

Like other national cults and world empires, we believe in ourselves, identify with the Power of our Armed Forces, and worship the flag of empire. We celebrate **US** and our grand mission to **LIBERATE** the rest of the world. When the National Socialist Party held its annual rallies at Nuremberg in the 1930s, you could hardly see the houses for all the flags one observer noted. When those flags come out you can be sure that mass murder and mass suicide are on the way. That the lemmings are once again on the march towards a **NEW WORLD ORDER**. Along with the recent epidemic of flag-waving has come an epidemic of speeches by Mr. Bush and others, relentlessly setting forth how wonderful we are as *Americans*. Who are these noble Americans ?

Do they include Ted Kennedy, Barney Frank and Bill Clinton ? Do they include those who vote for Ted Kennedy, Barney Frank and Bill Clinton, despite their moral depravity or, more likely, because of their moral depravity ? The fans who threw beer bottles at the referee ? O.J. Simpson ? The Watts rioters ? Charles Manson and his **ALTERNATIVE FAMILY** of *femme fatales* ?

A day's worth of American television, presented as evidence in any sane court, would constitute sufficient evidence of the ignoble character of the American people, of their **TRULY DISGUSTING CHARACTER as seen on TV**. That false faith in **THE AMERICAN PEOPLE**, which derives from 18th century humanism and patriotic self-worship, is a dangerous delusion which can have severe practical consequences. For instance, Mr. Bush assured us that we were all dealing **BRAVELY** with the attack on the World Trade Center. When they opened the stock market, it plunged 700 points because of panic selling. Several air lines are near bankruptcy because of the precipitous decline in air travel the following year. False faith can kill you. It has killed millions. It is more to be feared than any epidemic of smallpox or anthrax. When you proceed on the opposite assumption--**THE PEOPLE are easily panicked**--it can produce a sensible strategy like stimulating the economy by stampeding everyone into buying duct tape and plastic sheeting. The absurd flattery of **THE AMERICAN PEOPLE** describes some idealized group which lives in some idealized country. They do not live here. They never did.

O say does that star-spangled banner yet wave,
O'er the Land of the Free, and the Home of the ~~Brave~~ ^{Slave} ^ ?

The poem which Francis Scott Key wrote in 1814 was an exercise in unreality. He supposedly expressed two Great Truths about America. In reality, they were two **BIG FAT LIES** then, and they are big fat lies now. The poem celebrated the fact that Fort McHenry, outside of Baltimore Maryland, had survived a shelling by the British Navy. But, like all patriotic American history, the poem ignores real American history.

Two weeks before, the British army and navy had captured the new American Capital of Washington D.C. British officers sat down to eat the dinner prepared by black servant slaves for President and Mrs. Madison, who were not there to entertain their guests, having precipitously left town along with the rest of the federal government. Then the British set fire to the White House, the Capitol and most of the other new government buildings, before departing for Baltimore. British poets may have found some inspiration in these events, but American poets didn't. Instead our attention is focused upon a flag which has survived a British shelling. Jeremiah lamented the fall of Jerusalem: *How doth the city sit solitary, that was full of people !* The prophet tells us the truth. But we prefer the patriotic poet. We don't have much use for the truth. It is **MAKE BELIEVE** we crave.

the free market in slaves

The capture and destruction of the American Capital, was not the only reality that the poem ignored. At the time that Francis Scott Key wrote his poem in celebration of *THE LAND OF THE FREE*, slaves were more than half the population of the southern states, and half the population of some Maryland counties. There were regular slave markets in Baltimore and in Washington. That was the real America behind the fantasy America celebrated in the poem. In 1776 the Declaration of Independence said that *all men are created equal and endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness*. The founding fathers spent some long evenings figuring out how to make this declaration without implying that they intended to free their slaves. At that time there were 500,000 slaves in America. Now, 38 years later, there were two million slaves in America. Thanks to the invention of the Cotton Gin and the acquisition of the Louisiana Purchase the plantation system had spread and slavery had spread along with it.

The False Pretence of that founding Declaration--*WE STAND FOR LIBERTY!*--had been compounded. The *ALIENATION* of the rights to *life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness* grew as America grew and would continue to grow until the time of the Civil War and far beyond. *ALIENATION* of the right to have a home and **raise a family** was the foundation upon which America was built. Americans drove the Indians from their homes and hauled Negro slaves in manacles to those slave cabins where they must live and die without ever acquiring any *liberty* or *right*, including the right to have a family. Their *pursuit of happiness* was limited to the relief they felt when the July sun finally went down on the cotton field. The slave's sons, if he had any, were sold off and his wife or daughter became the master's concubine. The easy access to slave women debauched the morals of the Southerners and created a race of half white, half black children sent to live in the shed out back, and later sent to live in the big city slums of the North. The systematic destruction of the Negro family can be traced from 1620 to the inner city slums of 2003. It is the enduring legacy which the founding fathers left to all of us.

A similar thing happened to the white indentured servants. There was no good possibility of them having families until the long years of servitude passed by which they paid for their passage to America. Free but poor whites were excluded from the process by which America's important men so easily acquired large tracts of land through their colleagues in the Virginia legislature, which could have given the British Parliament lessons in corruption. Patrick Henry got the Sheriff to expel the *squatters* from his new 10,000 acre plantation at Leatherwood. The Vandalia Land Company in which Benjamin Franklin and George Washington had shares got the Sheriff to evict settlers unless they paid the Company for land which it did not legally own.

George Mason, James Madison, Patrick Henry and the other lawyers of Virginia wrote and re-wrote the Virginia Declaration of Rights to get around the awkward fact that they wanted *all men to be free and equal*, but they also wanted to secure their own right of property in the slaves they owned. The first draft of May 27th 1776 said *all men are created equally free & independent & have certain inherent natural rights*. But by June 12th 1776 this was modified to say that *all men are free & independent & have certain inherent rights of which, when they enter into a state of society, they cannot by any compact deprive or divest their posterity*. Meaning that, "since the slaves were not part of the society to which the declaration applied, no promise could be inferred, and those already possessed of political power could control when the excluded might enter." (Mayer) That kind of legal doublespeak inspired George Orwell when he wrote *ANIMAL FARM: ALL ANIMALS ARE EQUAL. BUT SOME ARE MORE EQUAL THAN OTHERS*.

An *inherent natural right* mandates the freedom of the slave. A right which depends upon *society* can be withheld. It was withheld and it is still being withheld or *alienated*. Does the pre born child, the developing embryo, have a *natural* and *inherent* right to life ? In fact the various States of the world have in effect said that this right does not belong to the pre born child unless society grants it. What this does is to de-legitimize the state. It shows the falsity of that claim which justifies the state as the protector of those whom it governs. That is why a serious Christian has to make his own *DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE* from the United State of America.

Land of the Cowards

As to *THE HOME OF THE BRAVE*, Morison and Commager relate that, of 95,000 militia summoned to defend Washington in 1814, only 7000 showed up. Then they broke and ran after 66 casualties, leaving the way open for the British to occupy Washington. The truth is that we weren't *BRAVE* then and we aren't brave now. Whatever your reasons or your excuses, how *BRAVE* are you if you won't even stand up for the life of your own child ? In the movies, people heroically risk their lives to rescue strangers. In real life, our American anti heroes sacrifice the lives of their own sons and daughters, because their bank accounts and new cars are threatened. *KILL THIS KID OR WE'LL TAKE AWAY YOUR NEW CAR!* the villain snarls. *Okay, we'll do it*, they meekly reply. How *BRAVE* is this ? In his January 28th State of the Union speech, Mr. Bush says that *we sacrifice for the liberty of strangers*. Yes, we are willing to sacrifice your son and your wallet in the war which we can applaud on TV while we wave a little flag. But we can do nothing to save members of our own family from being dismembered and tossed in the trash.

Since 1967, 50 million American babies have been killed by abortion. Which means that there have been 50 million women who allowed their babies to be killed. Who walked into an abortion clinic and allowed it to be done. They had a good cry and then did it. Add 50 million men who fathered abortions. Maybe they tried to stop it, maybe they said something against it, but the fact is that they did nothing effective to prevent a son or daughter from being killed. Then add a couple of sets of parents who pushed for the abortion, or who looked the other way. Add a bunch of friends who said nothing.

Fifty million plus fifty million plus another 200 million--it adds up to 300 million people who did not have the courage to prevent their own children or grandchildren from being killed ! That is the reality of America, the *HOME OF THE COWARD*. We like to hear the President call us *BRAVE*. We bravely watch the video of the drone air craft, controlled by the computer nerd, as it fires a rocket at Moslems standing around in the desert and conspiring against America. (Satellite surveillance allows us to read their lips. That is how we know they are plotting against us. And, even if they aren't, we need to try out the new technology.)

You are ready to *LAY DOWN YOUR LIFE* for your country but you have to put your baby in the trash because it would interfere with *YOUR LIFE STYLE*. We will *Bear any Burden and Pay any Price for Freedom!* the President proclaims. Translation: we will pay \$ 400 to avoid any Burden upon our *FREEDOM* to live the easy American life style. The day after Krista had her abortion, her boy friend, enjoying his *FREEDOM*, drove his truck to the mountains and went bike riding. He needed to get away because he didn't want to hear about her nightmares.

The **MYTH** is that we stand up for the defenceless any where in the world. The **TRUTH** is that we won't protect **OUR OWN CHILDREN** from being dis membered this morning a few miles away. Even aside from morality, there is the standard which Nature sets. What mother any where in the animal kingdom refuses to protect her baby ? How do we regard an animal which abandons her young, which kills them even ? It is considered **A DISGRACE TO A HOG**. How much **PRIDE IN AMERICA** are we entitled to after 50 million of our own sons and daughters have been killed when we refused to defend them ? A nation of hogs would look down their noses at us. The **HOG WHICH DEVOURS ITS YOUNG** is the appropriate symbol for America. We should put it on the dollar bill so that we can have a daily reminder of who we are.

FALSE FAITH: There is a basic false faith which is epidemic among the Secular Christians of America, Catholic and Protestant alike, which teaches them to look to **AMERICAN VALUES** for the answers as to what is wrong with America. It is accompanied by a **FALSE HISTORY:** America was a moral society before *Roe v Wade*. Or before the Supreme Court banned school prayer. Or before the 1960s. Or before Franklin Roosevelt. Before some time in the not so distant past, America was a Christian nation, it was a moral society. It is the **BASIC BIG LIE** about America preached and believed by Secular Christians.

America was always an **ANTI-FAMILY SOCIETY**. From the beginning, its prosperity was built upon **THE WHOLESALE WASTE OF HUMAN LIFE**. The difference now is that what happened in the 1960s caused a lot of the hypocrisy to vanish. The curtains were pulled down which had long concealed the real America. The myth of gracious Southern ladies and gentlemen who were kind to their black dependents was literally exploded, along with the myth of how much **OPPORTUNITY** they were finding in the North. If the Civil Rights movement did nothing else it generated a billion dollars worth of free publicity as to the real situation of Negroes in America.

The resistance to racist America encouraged the resistance to militarist America. For the first time in American history--and probably the last time--the media told the truth about what goes on in a war. And people couldn't stand it. To the picture of G.I. Joe giving the candy bar to the kid was added the picture of G.I. Jim prostituting his mother with a carton of cigarettes. Behind the pulled back curtain, we got a glimpse of **Uncle Sinister**, Uncle Sam's evil twin. We saw the village *which had to be destroyed in order to save it*. The Mylai massacre wasn't the worst. In other places, *grannies and babies* were buried in a pit without the grace of a final bullet.

The homosexuals came out of the closet. Abortion became legal. Women's Liberation was publicized by their allies in the media. Black Power displaced the nonviolent Civil Rights movement, also with major help from the media. The New Left invaded the peace movement. And the revelations have continued. The criminal culture which energizes Rap music isn't new. What is new is the public surfacing of something which long lay hidden at the bottom of American society where the half white descendents of the founding fathers are trapped.

The All American Dumpster

We don't have abortion in America **DESPITE** American values. We have abortion in America **BECAUSE** of them. Abortion is as American as apple pie. Frank Sinatra's mother did abortions in Hoboken. Abortionists plied their trade in the Irish section of Boston. Small towns in rural America had abortionists. And abortion is only one of the ways in which America has engaged in human sacrifice because Mammon, our national god, demanded it. Abortion represents the full flowering of the American dream of wealth without work, of prosperity achieved at the expense of others. The pursuit of the founding fathers' vision of the **NEW EMPIRE OF THE WEST** always required putting people in the dumpster who were in the way of that imperial vision.

The original Constitution classified negro slaves as 3/5ths of a person and the Constitution we have now classifies embryo babies as 3/5ths of a person, as non citizens who have no rights we need to respect. Like Virginia's slaves, they do not belong to society until we say that they do,

until they are **WANTED**. As Planned Parenthood says: **EVERY CHILD A WANTED CHILD**. Translation: if you are **UNWANTED**, you are not a child. You may look like a child in the ultrasound photograph, but, by legal definition, you aren't one. Just as the slave looked like a person, but, by legal definition, he was not one, unless his owner said he was. **HIS BODY, YOUR CHOICE**.

The early American economy was built upon taking land from the natives, who were exterminated in New England as they were in Virginia. The founders of the American nation torched the homes of the Indians and took the land to establish tobacco plantations worked by African slaves. They lived like English gentry at the expense of those whose lives were **DEVOURED** by that life style. They are the true spiritual ancestors of those who now put their babies in the trash so that they can pursue the luxurious American lifestyle.

America was built upon the wholesale waste of human life, sometimes careless, often deliberate. By the time the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock, 30,000 Algonquins had disappeared because of European diseases, armed attacks, and slave raids. The Puritans settled into an abandoned Indian village where they were later joined by Squanto, a former resident, who had escaped the epidemic because he had been carried off as a slave. The **AMERICA, MY HOME SWEET HOME** of the Pilgrims had once been the **HOME SWEET HOME** of Squanto's folks. Now he was lucky that the new owners let him stay there. Because they were high-minded, the Pilgrims overlooked the fact that they had no Warranty Deed from the former owners. The Indians may have regarded them as *squatters*, but the Sheriff was on their side.

Smallpox as God's Providence

Many of the New England settlers looked upon the destruction of the natives by smallpox and other European diseases as God's Providence. Generations of Americans learned to read their bibles so as to justify negro slavery and the wars of extermination against the Indians. When Roger Williams was censured by the Massachusetts Bay Court in 1633 for saying that Massachusetts and New Plymouth did not have the right to just take the land of the Indians, Governor John Winthrop argued that *if God were not pleased with our inheriting these parts, why did he drive out the natives before us ? and why doth he still make roome for us by diminishing them as we increase ? why hath he planted his Churches here ?*

If there is a Happy Hunting Ground reserved for the Red Men, they must be having a chuckle up there when they read about the urgent American efforts to vaccinate the population against Smallpox. The 1616-1619 epidemic which almost eradicated the Algonquins of New England is believed to have been smallpox. It spread across the continent and it was a major reason for the reduction of the Indian population of North America to a tenth of what it had been before the Europeans brought in these diseases to which the Indians had no immunity. In the 1750s smallpox infected blankets were given to New England Indians to help Providence along. Was this **TERRORISM** ? What else ? Terrorism is as American as cherry pie.

It isn't that Americans did worse than other nations. But they have the false faith that they did better and they invoke this illusion as the vision which can lead us out of the baby-killing society that we have become. But there is no sense in group guilt either. I am not arguing white guilt or American guilt. If we are all guilty, none of us has any personal responsibility. We do become accessories after the fact as individuals, when we claim our share of the loot. All of the nations were involved in the slave trade, including black Africans themselves, who hauled their neighbors in home made ropes to the slave markets on the coast, and brought home casks of New England rum in exchange. Free American negroes bought Negro slaves. The Cherokees owned Negro slaves.

Since colonial times, the Indians have been idealized and romanticized by poets and sentimentalists. They weren't just the innocent victims of the American colonists. They carried out savage retaliations when they could. Like the settlers, they burned houses, murdered children and raped women. Like the Palestinians today, they carried on a campaign of terror against those who had driven them from their homes. But their retaliations were the excuse,

not the reason, for their expulsion. Even those like the Cherokees who became Christian farmers, who did everything they were supposed to do by way of adopting Christian Civilization, were dislodged by land hungry immigrants and gold seekers in violation of treaties.

The Indians were so easily conquered because they so readily made alliances with the whites against other Indians. Ancient tribal hatreds, militarism, political opportunism, alcoholism and greed pushed them to play a major role in their own eventual destruction. You might naively suppose that, having the whole of the North American continent in which to roam, and being so few in number, they could have lived at peace with one another. In fact they were as addicted to war as any empire. The early missionaries believed the Indians to be demon-possessed and they had good evidence. Satan was already in residence in the new world when the first Europeans arrived, even if they brought some demonic reinforcements along with them.

The Iroquois pursued what could fairly be described as a policy of extermination towards their traditional enemies. A period document printed in Parkman's history describes a war party of them traveling hundreds of miles on foot in 1641 through the frozen waste land of a northern winter for the joy of murdering a hunting party of the Algonquins. Three infants were roasted and eaten in front of their mothers, while the warriors mocked their agony. The whole village would participate in the torture of captives, with the children encouraged to join in, as a kind of communal entertainment which educated the children for future wars. Other captives, women especially, were kept as slaves. However, unlike the white settlers, the Iroquois did not pretend to be followers of Jesus Christ. cf Mark Twain: *There are many humorous things in this world, among them the white man's notion that he is less savage than the other savages.*

crowned thy good with brotherhood: exterminating the Pequots

Every American school child has heard the story of the Plymouth colonists sharing the first Thanksgiving with the local Indians. Few of them have heard of Captain Myles Standish putting the severed head of an Indian chief on a pike atop the Plymouth stockade, which is much more representative of their dealings with the Indians. Nor have they heard of the wars which brought the Indian lands into the hands of the colonists by the end of the century.

Not content with waiting on Providence, the New England settlers launched a war of extermination against the Pequots in 1637. After they had massacred several hundred Pequots at what later became Fort Mystic, Captain John Underhill declared that: *Sometimes the Scripture declareth women and children must perish with their parents. We had sufficient light from the word of God for our proceedings.* The united New England colonists burned the Indian villages, executed the captive warriors in cold blood, took what slaves they wanted from the women and children and shipped the rest to the slave markets in the West Indies. There was a Puritan settlement in the West Indies which had adapted itself to the slave trade. Captain Stoughton claimed one Indian woman and Lieutenant Davenport took another. (207 *The Gentle Radical: Roger Williams* Cyclone Covey)

A few years later it was the turn of the Narragansetts, who had been their allies in the war against the Pequots. By the end of the so-called *King Philip's War* of 1675-1676 the Narragansetts had been reduced to a remnant. The rest had been killed, sold as slaves, or driven into the wilderness where their traditional enemies awaited them. The Wampanoags vanished from their former lands, clearing the way for Plymouth Colony to sell Mount Hope to a group of purchasers who founded the town of Bristol.

The original Plymouth community disintegrated a few years after its founding when so many of its principal men left to take up large estates for themselves in the surrounding country from which the Indians had been expelled by the increasing military power of the colonists. Before one generation had passed, what was once a real Christian community was no more. A letter from John Robinson and William Brewster had said: *We are knit together as a body in the most strict and sacred bond and covenant of the Lord, of the violation whereof we make great conscience, and by virtue whereof we do hold ourselves straitly tied to all care of each other's good and of the whole, by every one and so mutually.* A sad and bitter note which William Bradford added to his journal many years later laments the erosion of the original Christian community which had jumped into the great colonial land rush: *But when this fidelity decayed, then*

their ruin approached . . . I have been happy, in my first times, to see, and with much comfort to enjoy, the blessed fruits of this sweet communion, but it is now a part of my misery in old age, to find and feel the decay and want thereof (in a great measure) and with grief and sorrow of heart to lament and bewail the same. And for others' warning and admonition, and my own humiliation, do I here note the same. The myth is that a Christian community grew into a Christian nation. The truth is that the early Christian communities of America were soon absorbed into a post Christian empire. The Christian values which had carried them through a time of poverty and persecution did not long survive in a new situation of prosperity and power. They could not resist the lure of great estates. (more about the Plymouth economy in Chapter XXIV.)

Like the *Freedom* proclaimed by the slave owners of 1776, the **RELIGIOUS FREEDOM** established in the Massachusetts Bay Colony required a few lawyers to hedge in the definition. It meant freedom for them, **from the Church of England**. Meanwhile, they forced dissenters like Roger Williams and Anne Hutchinson into exile in Rhode Island. Quaker women were publicly whipped. Quakers and Baptists were hung in Boston Common and banished from Plymouth. Massachusetts was a little totalitarian state like Calvin's Geneva, only mitigated by the fact that, with so much unsettled country all around, it was possible to escape its reach.

LAND THAT I LOVE

The Myth about the early colonists is that they sought only homes for themselves and freedom to practice their faith. They were soon seeking all the land they could get and working it with servants and slaves or holding it for speculation. Roger Williams described them: *They have a depraved appetite after . . . great portions of land, land in this wilderness, as if men were in as great necessity and danger for want of great portions of land, as poor, hungry, thirsty seamen . . . after a long and starving passage.* (letter to Major Mason, June 22nd 1670) The pursuit of Indian lands drove the wars of extermination against the Pequots and Narragansetts. A later writer testifies to the pursuit of land as a source of **wealth without work**: *This hunger after Land seems very early to have taken rise in this Province, & is become now a kind of Epidemical madness, every Body eager to accumulate vast Tracts without having an intention or taking measures to settle or improve it.* (Peter Wraaxall writing in 1754 in New York)

When Captain John Smith and the first group of colonists arrived at the mouth of the Chesapeake Bay in April of 1607, they assured the chief of the Powhatans that they intended to stay only long enough to repair their boats. By the end of the century the Indians who first greeted them were reduced to a tenth of their former population. They were confined to a few reservations while all the land they once farmed was in the hands of the invaders.

Those first colonists were standing on the edge of two and a quarter billion acres of real estate that, **ABSENT THE INDIANS**, was theirs for the taking. Not surprisingly, the permanent absence of the Indians soon became one of the primary goals of the American settlers. It is fair to describe the forcible expulsion of 1 million Indians from their homes (and the same thing happened in Hawaii and Alaska) as **THE PERMANENT POLICY OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE**, carried out over 300 years as settlement moved west. There were many who opposed it--as a matter of rhetoric. A few missionaries seriously opposed it and found themselves in prison. When the Chief Justice ruled in favor of the Cherokees of Georgia, President Andrew Jackson said *John Marshall has made his decision. Now let him enforce it.* William Penn and 100 Quakers signed an agreement with the Indians in 1682, the only treaty to which no oaths were sworn and the only one ever faithfully kept. But Penn's sons abandoned the Quaker faith and adopted the policy of taking and selling Indian lands. Benjamin Franklin was a member of the Pennsylvania legislature which passed a law in 1756 to pay bounties on Indian scalps--women's as well as men's.

Jamestown: tobacco and poisoned sherry

Every American school child has heard the story of the Indian Princess Pocahontas who married John Rolfe--*Speak for yourself, John*. Actually, she was being held prisoner at the time, and she was already married. Very few American schoolchildren have heard the story about the Jamestown settlers bringing a cask of poisoned sherry to what was supposed to be a peace parley with the Indians in 1623. They poisoned 200 of the Indians and then shot another 50. That is one of many episodes in a story that continued until all of the Indians of Virginia had

been displaced from their homes. By 1676 the remnant of the Powhatans had been forced onto reservations, most of which were later taken from them. On the land where they once raised corn to feed themselves, slaves raised tobacco to be shipped to England. By 1700, 1000 Powhatans remained of the 12,000 who lived there when Captain John Smith arrived in 1607. In *The Devil's Dictionary*, Ambrose Bierce satirized the attitude of the American colonists: *ABORIGINES* *n.* *Persons of little worth found encumbering the soil of a newly discovered country. They soon cease to cumber; now they fertilize.*

The Powhatans gave land to those first settlers, enough for them to settle on and raise food. There was good hunting and good fishing. Had they been content to farm a few acres they could have made homes for themselves. How much land can you farm by yourself? What do you need with more? But the colonists came to make their fortunes. They didn't want 10 acres, they wanted 10,000 acres. They didn't want to work the land themselves, they wanted slaves and servants to work the land for them. They didn't want to raise food to feed their families, they wanted to make money by catering to the new vice. Tobacco certificates became the major currency of Virginia. They could have had peace with the Powhatans, but they did not want it. They wanted war because only through war could they pursue the fortunes they came to find. They really are the founders of that **All American life style which trashes families in the pursuit of wealth**, which is addicted to the power and wealth which perennially leads to war. It is a way of life which has been with us ever since.

Those early Virginia settlers had no interest in a family farm. They despised agricultural labor as the task assigned to slaves and servants. Ten years after they arrived, they still got their food from England and traded for Indian corn or, more often, took it by force. The first bunch was looking for Sir Walter Raleigh's *CITIES OF GOLD* and a direct trade route to the Orient. When they found neither, they settled for tobacco plantations established on land taken from the Indians and worked by slaves brought from Africa. They were looking for ways to make money more than they were looking for a place to live. And this established the Virginia life style in which the Virginia aristocracy of 1776 was raised, which they inherited and passed on to their children, a life style which copied the English gentry in the attachment to luxury and leisure and which depended upon a lower class of indentured servants and slaves who were prevented by their circumstances from anything resembling a decent family life.

great estates

The founding grandfathers belonged to a class of men who acquired great estates through political connections. Lord Thomas Fairfax had 5 million acres. William Byrd II had 180,000 acres. After the Shenandoah Valley was opened, Benjamin Border acquired 600,000 acres from 1734 to 1749 through his friendship with Governor Gooch. An 800,000 acre grant to the Loyal Company is described as *a present that the leaders of the legislature, with the governor participating, made to themselves*. Peter Jefferson, Thomas Jefferson's father, was one of those who shared in this bounty. George Washington's father owned 6 plantations. His great grandfather, Colonel John Washington had been in the Virginia House of Burgesses. John Henry, Patrick Henry's father, who had married into the influential Winston family, obtained land grants from the Governor's Council.

The land owning system of America was the land owning system of England shipped overseas. When the Normans beat the Saxons, King William became the owner of all England, including the deer in the forest and the fish in the rivers. He then parceled it out to his dukes who parceled it out to the knights and bishops and abbots whose serfs and tenants worked on the land. They worked for a living, while those above them **OWNED FOR A LIVING**. In America, with two billion acres for the taking, common men had a much better chance of getting hold of some of it, but they often had to choose between paying rent to the big landlords or moving on. *The Quality* claimed the best lands, while *The Quantity* scrambled for a share of what was left. The broad bottom lands were appropriated by the gentry while the commoners wound up in the *dark hollows* of the mountains where all you could raise was moonshine whiskey. Then President Washington sent the soldiers after them, because, like the founding fathers, they resisted paying taxes. Mount Vernon produced whiskey, and he resented the competition.

King James gave Virginia to the Virginia Company and New England to the New England Company. William Penn was given Pennsylvania and Delaware to pay off a debt owed to his father. Maine and New Hampshire belonged to Sir Ferdinand Gorges and Captain John Mason. Sir William Alexander received Nova Scotia in its entirety. Sir George Calvert was given Maryland. The Carolinas were given to 8 titled Englishmen. Lord John Berkeley was given western New Jersey. Sir George Carteret was given eastern New Jersey. These gentlemen then parceled out what they supposedly owned although they often had trouble collecting their *quitrents*, especially after the Puritan Revolution led to the King losing his head. There was something of a free for all in which aristocrats and commoners both tended to become squatters.

A basic cause of the American Revolution was their fear of losing their land or having to pay up the arrears. Long before the American Revolution, a rumor that the official owner intended to collect *quitrents* led to civil disturbances. Some of these landlords also had grants in Ireland. The Earl of Clarendon received his main rents from Irish grants. Sir George Calvert had extensive land grants in Ireland. They were some of those responsible for the situation which forced so many *famine Irish* to leave Ireland to come to America.

In 1737, Henry McCullough, supervisor of the royal revenues in North Carolina, granted to himself and some associates a patent of 1.2 million acres. In 1752 Governor Dobbs of North Carolina gave out most of the good farming land to a few families who paid him. He wound up with 300,000 acres himself. Lord Granville, one of the 8 noblemen to whom the Carolinas had been given, took a 60 mile wide strip in North Carolina on the Virginia border as his share.

When the English took New York from the Dutch in 1664, it was already being parceled out into great estates. Henry Beekman got a tract 16 miles in length in Dutchess County. He also had a tract 20 miles along the Hudson by 8 miles inland. Governor Richard Coote, one of the few honest men of the time, tried to limit land grants to 100 acres. But Governor Fletcher was bribed to give the Dellius Patent of 620,000 acres to a group for a *quitrent* of one raccoon skin per year. This land was swindled from the Wapping Indians who had fought with the English against the French. When the British government finally ruled against the Dellius Patent, it became a cause of revolutionary bitterness among some of the important men of the colony.

V THE GREAT LAND HUNT

George Washington's letter to a friend in 1767 said that anyone who *neglects the present opportunity of hunting out good lands and in some measure marking and distinguishing them for their own will never regain it. I can never look upon that [1763] proclamation in any other light . . . than as a temporary expedient to quiet the minds of the Indians and [it] must fall of cours in a few years especially when those Indians are consenting to our occupying their lands.* (*Writings of George Washington* John Fitzpatrick 2:467-471) And the **GREAT LAND HUNT** continued all over the colonies. Perennial wars drove the Indians from their lands. If they did not resist they were pushed off. If they did resist or retaliate, it justified a war of extermination. Usually there was some semblance of legality. Drunk Indians were persuaded to make a mark on deeds granting vaguely described lands. An Indian would be made Chief for a Day to give him the authority to sign over the land belonging to his tribe. The Iroquois cheerfully signed over land occupied by their enemies. A land company paid lawyer Patrick Henry for a legal opinion that the transfer of land by Indians to private companies was valid even without the approval of the colonial legislature or the British government.

This land quest became a basic cause of the American Revolution after the British Government set the top of the Alleghenies as the limit for land hunting by the 1763 *proclamation* and then, in 1774, passed the Quebec Act, which made the land north of the Ohio River part of Quebec while giving Quebec Catholics equal rights. The land interests of the American speculators were endangered and they managed to stir up the farmers of New England to believe that their religious liberty was in danger by the grant of equal rights to Catholics. By *EQUAL RIGHTS* they meant their equal rights, not everybody's equal rights. The British government tried to curtail

the land hunt because, among other reasons, it stirred up war with the Indians and the British Empire was broke after fighting a series of wars on several continents. But now the colonists were much less dependent upon the British since the French had been ousted from the Mississippi valley. And the French empire was promising military support for an American rebellion against Britain. In the years leading up to the Revolution, French agents met secretly with the *patriots* of America and hatched the conspiracy which led to the war.

Benjamin Franklin participated in the great land hunt as a partner in several land companies. In 1769, while living in London, he became a partner in the Grand Ohio Company which included some of England's richest men, including London bankers like Thomas Walpole and his brother. By distributing stock to important government officials they got the Privy Council to approve their Ohio land grant in 1772. The outbreak of the war prevented them from realizing their windfall, but it is a good example of the corrupt dealings in American real estate which preoccupied the American patriots on the eve of the Revolutionary War.

nor yet by toil

Young Washington copied a poem into his journal, *True Happiness*, which stated his ideal: *A good estate on healthy soil, Not got by vice, nor yet by toil.* Obviously no amount of ordinary toil could lead to one of the great estates which went to those who were Assemblymen or those who could afford the price of an Assemblyman. We have the same *free enterprise* system today. It is our inheritance from the founding fathers. The City Council, or the State Legislature or the Congress or the various departments of the Administration, further the enterprises of those who can afford their services. And courteously escort those who cannot to the nearest exit.

All of the founding fathers participated in the Great Land Hunt. It was the major preoccupation of the men of their time, rich and poor. But only the well-connected and the prosperous had the access to the Virginia legislature and the money to invest in the private land companies which bought the influence they needed to successfully pursue real estate. The colony's royal charter described Virginia as extending 200 miles north and south from the entrance to Chesapeake Bay and within those bounds east and west *from sea to sea*. The first settlers had displaced the Powhatans from their coastal lands. The next generation took the piedmont from the Cherokees. Now the land hunters of 1760 pursued land beyond the Allegheny Mountains.

Before the Revolution, Washington spent a lot of time and energy in the pursuit of land. After the death of his brother Lawrence, he took a leading role in the Ohio Company and was appointed by Governor Dinwoodie, also a major stockholder, to accompany Braddock on a 1751 expedition to the Ohio Valley that was actually a private crusade to protect their land grant from the French. After they had failed to arouse any enthusiasm from other Virginians for a military venture in which they had no financial interest, volunteer soldiers were enticed by the promise of a share in 200,000 acres.

The Governor of Virginia, the very important 12 man Council and the legislature had, at least in legal theory, the right to hand out real estate stretching all the way from the Atlantic to the Mississippi River and even beyond to the Pacific. George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Benjamin Franklin were among those who pursued land in the Ohio Valley across the mountains. Washington eventually acquired 40,000 of the 200,000 acres given to volunteers of the 1754 regiment, even though it was originally supposed to go to compensate the volunteers, not the officers like Washington who had already been paid. At the time of his death, his Ohio land made up the most valuable part of his estate. In 1930, three of these tracts were appraised at 40 million dollars.

In settled tide water Virginia, Washington owned 5000 acres and 49 slaves when he married a wealthy widow in January 1759. Martha Dandridge Custis had 17,000 acres worked by 200 negroes plus 30,000 pounds. One British *pound sterling*, circa 1759, would have been worth at least \$ 150 in modern American money. Washington is truly *the father of his country* in that he

is the model for all Americans who devoutly believe that **THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS ENOUGH MONEY**. It is one of our fundamental **AMERICAN VALUES** and it comes down to us from the founding fathers. He is an inspiration to those star athletes who add millions of dollars in shoe endorsements to their multi-million dollar salaries, thus inspiring slum youth and the rest of us to adopt the All American motto: *Get all you can, any way you can*. He is written up for refusing a salary as Commander in Chief from the Continental Congress, but Continental dollars were worthless and the French bankrolled both his army and the Congress itself. He regularly over spent the salary he received as the nation's first President.

Like the other gentlemen of Virginia, Washington spent large sums on everything that was needed to make a proper appearance. The accouterments of a *gentleman* included *a scarlet cloak, black clothes, and a dressed wig*. His imported carriage cost 100 pounds. Washington showed up for a meeting of the Virginia assembly in a carriage drawn by the fancy horses he had purchased from the estate of the royal Governor, Lord Botetourt--*six cream white animals, their silvery harnesses gleaming in the brilliant sunshine*. Their equipages precluded the founding fathers from giving up any of the revenue they received from owning slaves. Maintaining the carriages, caring for the horses and polishing the harness required a small task force of drivers, grooms, stable boys, and footmen.

It is clear that, throughout his life, Washington persisted in regarding Negroes as disposable property. In a March 21 1781 letter to Benjamin Harrison, he complains of having to *sell negroes* to pay up the taxes on his Virginia estates. In a letter to his mother written February 15 1787, about her real and *imagined* financial needs, Washington advises her to *hire out the negroes*. *This would ease you of all care and trouble, make your income certain, and your support ample. . . . hire out all the rest of your servants except a man and a maid, and live with one of your children. This would relieve you entirely from the cares of this world, and leave your mind at ease to reflect undisturbedly on that which ought to come.* (Bellamy *Private Life of George Washington*)

LIBERTY for the cook

When President and Mrs. Washington were in residence in Philadelphia, *Martha Washington's personal slave, Oney Judge, escaped from the house in 1796 as the Washingtons were eating dinner. Washington's prized cook, Hercules, fled in 1797.* (NY Times 4-20-2) Incredible as it seems, belonging to President Washington's household and serving the great man himself and his international guests, wasn't enough to help these people resist the temptation to seek *freedom* as they defined it, spelled with a small personal *f*. Maybe they hadn't read the Declaration. The lawyers hadn't explained to them how **FREEDOM** and slavery work together. They apparently did not believe that the private platitudes of the founding fathers would ever do them any good. There are anti slavery statements in Washington's letters but he never made a public statement opposing slavery. By the time of his presidency it had long been the fashion in aristocratic society to have an anti slavery **OPINION**. You could own slaves and still be respectable, but it was as necessary to wear an anti slavery **OPINION**, as it was to wear a powdered wig. When he advertised in the county paper for the return of a runaway slave, offering a reward, he instructed the editor to leave his name out of the ad. As President he signed the *Fugitive Slave Act* of 1793 into law. Washington evaded the *Pennsylvania Gradual Abolition Act* of 1780 by rotating his household slaves back to Virginia within the 6 month limit.

It was his concern for his own **FAME** that pushed him to include a provision in his will that the 125 slaves (out of 317) which belonged entirely to him should be freed, not after he died in 1797, but **when Martha died**. But that put Martha in the position of living on the same plantation with 125 people who would be freed should she have a fatal accident or illness. The carriage horses bolting because of a burr under the harness or a dead snake on the bridge; too much of the wrong kind of medicine on her bedside table; the mansion catching fire; any of these things would cause 125 of her slaves to feel a certain jubilation through their tears for Old Missus. Martha, it is said, had a *growing fear of the slaves who lived at Mount Vernon--those who would become free upon her death*. So she went to court in 1800 and freed the 125.

Slavery was surrounded by a complicated politics, made more complex by the hypocrisy of the politicians. Virginia plantation owners wanted to end the African slave trade because it undercut the value of the slaves they raised. The high mortality rate of slaves in the mosquito-infested rice swamps of South Carolina and the demand for slaves among those establishing cotton plantations in the new territories created a demand for new supplies of slaves from Africa. Rhode Island had few black slaves, but vessels from there dominated the slave and rum trade from Africa and the West Indies, and they strongly resisted any interference with it. In 1729 Newport required a L 100 bond from anyone freeing a Negro, in case he became dependent upon town charity. Owners of old and worn out slaves were only too ready to free them--reap the moral credit and shed the financial burden. Small farmers opposed slavery because they could not compete with it, and free laborers opposed it because it undercut their wages. Those opposed to slavery often had no sympathy for blacks as such. The Free Soil party in Kansas wanted to exclude free negroes as well as slaves. Black slaves were essential to the great plantations of the semi tropical south but not much use in New England. Immigrant white labor could be cheaper than black slave labor and more expendable. You didn't risk losing the money you had invested in the slave. That was a basic reason for using immigrant labor on dangerous projects. The Southern delegates to the Constitutional Convention of 1787 wanted protection for their slave property and a continuation of the slave trade--they got both--but they also wanted to count slaves as people--as populace anyway--to give them greater representation in Congress. Northern *statesmen*, looking out for their interest, had to argue that slaves could not be counted as people, much less citizens, if they were still property, with no right to vote. So the Founding Freemasons, in their Wisdom, decided that a slave is both Property and 3/5ths of a person. Perhaps the pro life lawyers, looking for another clever stratagem, could argue that an embryo child is 1/3 of a person at 3 months gestation and 2/3ds of a person at 6 months, and has rights accordingly, in the spirit of the original Constitution.

GIVE ME LIBERTY . . . AND SLAVERY

Gentlemen may cry, peace, peace--but there is no peace. The war is actually begun ! The next gale that sweeps from the north will bring to our ears the clash of resounding arms ! Our brethren are already in the field ! Why stand we here idle ? What is it that gentlemen wish ? What would thy have ? Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery ? Forbid it, Almighty God ! I know not what course others may take; but as for me, . . . GIVE ME LIBERTY OR GIVE ME DEATH ! (Mayer) Patrick Henry March 23rd 1775 Reportedly, he made a gesture of plunging an ivory handled letter opener into his breast by way of illustration.

THEY'LL TAKE YOUR NIGGERS FROM YOU ! Patrick Henry June 17th 1788 Warning his fellow Virginians about the new Constitution. There is some argument among scholars as to whether Patrick Henry delivered the speech of 1775 as his early biographer William Wirt later reconstructed it from various sources. Like Parson Weems, he tended to romanticize. But there is no doubt that Henry said something of the sort or that he was a gifted orator. There is also some doubt about what he literally said in 1788, although this is what he said according to one listener. But there is no doubt that he had a major concern with insuring that the new Constitution would protect the property rights of the Virginia slave owners. Slavery had become unpopular in the North for economic reasons as much as for moral reasons. And Patrick Henry was alarmed with the degree to which the new Constitution took away the powers which he had wielded as Governor of Virginia. In fact the new Constitution eroded the self government of Virginia far more than any imposition by the British Parliament.

This is some of what Henry had to say about slavery in 1788: *As much as I deplore slavery, I see that prudence forbids its abolition. I deny that the general government ought to set them free, because a decided majority of the States have not the ties of sympathy and fellow-feeling for those whose interest would be affected by their emancipation. The majority of Congress is to the north, and the slaves are to the south. In this situation, I see a great deal of the property of the people of Virginia in jeopardy, and their peace and tranquillity gone away. I repeat it again, that it would rejoice my very soul, that every one of my fellow-beings was emancipated. As we ought with gratitude to admire that decree of heaven which has numbered us among the free, we ought to lament and deplore the necessity of holding our fellow men in bondage. But is it practicable, by any*

human means, to liberate them, without producing the most dreadful and ruinous consequences ? We ought to possess them in the manner we have inherited them from our ancestors, as their manumission is incompatible with the felicity of the country. But we ought to soften, as much as possible, the rigor of their unhappy fate.

So **THE FELICITY OF THE COUNTRY**--the **HAPPINESS** of the country--required the *unhappiness* of the slaves. Their *pursuit of Happiness* and their *Liberty* was not compatible with Henry's pursuit of these blessings. Like the soldiers and the embryo babies, they must lay down their lives for **THEIR COUNTRY**--someone's country anyway, it hardly belonged to them. It was the *decree of heaven* which gave freedom to Patrick Henry et al while the decree of the Virginia Assemblymen perpetuated the slavery of those who worked their plantations while they made grand speeches in the Assembly. They did not accept as a *decree of heaven* that America belonged to Britain, but it was the *decree of heaven* that their black slaves belonged to them.

77 years later

The 40 suggested amendments which the Virginia Assembly of 1788 pressed upon those who wrote the Constitution eventually led to the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, the Bill of Rights. But it was 1865 before an amendment to the Constitution was passed which outlawed slavery. Meanwhile, millions of Americans lived and died in slavery. It took 77 years of misery and a Civil War in which 600,000 were killed to finally put an end to the legal slavery which Patrick Henry and the other southerners insisted upon. He bears moral responsibility for the protection of Slavery and the assertion of States Rights, which were basic to the Southern position, and for tying a bad cause to a good cause. And the bitterness of the formal end of slavery brought about by a terrible war which devastated and impoverished the South, insured that Southern Negroes remained in poverty and bondage, perpetuated by Jim Crow laws and terrorism. There were an estimated 2500 lynchings in the last 16 years of the 19th century, 107 reported lynchings in 1899. Negroes were systematically disenfranchised and forced to go back to working on the plantations in a condition of semi slavery. The South was still segregated 100 years after the 13th amendment was passed. In the 1960s, Negroes still worked for \$ 3 a day when they could get it, and still were not citizens who could vote.

And for all that we have Patrick Henry to thank. His great virtues were great vices in their practical effects. He loved his country, which was Virginia, and he loved his family. He left them and us a legacy of a genteel life style based upon great estates worked by slaves. The fundamental contradiction of those men who proclaimed liberty while they practiced slavery is no where more evident than it is in the life of Patrick Henry.

He once tried to write a pamphlet on the subject but had to put it aside. In it he asked *Is there a man so degenerate as to wish to see his country the gloomy retreat of slaves ?* Henry realized what slavery was doing to Virginia. By the time he wrote, black slaves were half of Virginia's population of 500,000. After a slave revolt in which a number of whites were killed, Virginia passed a law prohibiting the education of Negro slaves. Free white settlers avoided Virginia rather than try to compete with the system of great plantations, owned by aristocrats and worked by slaves. The easy access to slave women by the young white men of Virginia debauched their morals and produced illegitimate and outcast children who had a second reason to hate the white Virginians, the fathers who had discarded them. The violence of slavery, the manacles, the whips, and the necessary intimidation degraded both slaves and masters. Crimes against Negroes went unpunished because a slave could not take his master to court. This situation of unreported and unpunished crime continued for 200 years.

the Quaker example

In January of 1773, Henry wrote a reply to Robert Pleasants, a Quaker and Virginia neighbor who had freed his slaves, hired them back as paid laborers, and set up schools to educate them. The reported cost was 3000 pounds--half a million in modern dollars. Pleasants had sent him an anti slavery book written by the French born Philadelphia Quaker Anthony Benezet--

I take this opp to acknowledge the receipt of A Benezet Book against the Slave Trade. I thank you for it. It is not a little surprising that Christianity, whose chief excellence consists in softening the human heart, in cherishing & improving its finer Feelings, should encourage a Practice so totally repugnant to the first Impression of right & wrong. What adds to the wonder is that the Abominable Practice has been introduced in ye most enlightened Ages, Times that seem to have pretensions to boast of high Improvements in the Arts, Sciences, & refined Morality, have brought into general use, & guarded by many Laws, a Species of Violence & Tyranny, which our more rude & barbarous, but more honest Ancestors detested. Is it not amazing that at a time, when ye Rights of Humanity are defined & understood with precision, in a Country above all others fond of Liberty, that in such an Age, & such a Country we find Men, professing a Religion ye most humane, mild, meek, gentle & generous; adopting a Principle as repugnant to humanity as it is inconsistant with the Bible and destructive to Liberty.

Every thinking honest Man rejects it in Speculation, how few in practice from consciencious Motives ? The World in general has denied ye People a share of its honours, but the Wise will ascribe to ye a just Tribute of virtuous Praise, for ye Practice of a train of Virtues among which yr disagreement to Slavery will be principally ranked.--I cannot but wish well to a people whose System imitates ye Example of him whose Life was perfect.--And believe me, I shall honour the Quakers for their noble Effort to abolish Slavery. It is equally calculated to promote moral & political Good.

Would any one believe that I am Master of Slaves of my own purchase ! I am drawn along by ye general inconvenience of living without them. I will not, I cannot justify it. However culpable my Conduct, I will so far pay my devoir to Virtue, as to own the excellence & rectitude of her Precepts, & to lament my want of conforming to them.--

I believe a time will come when an opposition will be offered to abolish this lamentable Evil. Every thing we can do is to improve it, if it happens in our day, if not, let us transmit to our descendants together with our Slaves, a pity for their unhappy Lot, & an abhorrence for Slavery. If we cannot reduce this wished for Reformation to practice, let us treat the unhappy victims with lenity, it is ye furthest advance we can make toward Justice. [We owe to the] purity of our Religion to shew that it is at variance with that Law which warrants Slavery.

Here is an instance that silent Meetings (ye scoff of reverend Doctors) have done that which learned & elaborate Preaching could not effect, so much preferable are the genuine dictates of Conscience & a steady attention to its feelings above ye teachings of those men who pretend to have found a better Guide. I exhort you to persevere in so worthy a resolution, Some of your People disagree, or at least are lukewarm in the abolition of Slavery. Many treat ye Resolution of your Meeting with redicule, & among those who throw Contempt on it, are Clergymen, whose surest Guard against both Redicule & Contempt is a certain Act of Assembly.--

I know not where to stop, I could say many things on this Subject; a serious review of which gives a gloomy perspective to future times. Excuse this Scrawl, and believe me with esteem,

Yr hbl Servt.

Patrick Henry jun

Every thinking honest Man rejects it in Speculation, how few in practice from consciencious Motives ? obviously describes Patrick Henry himself. No doubt he deserves some credit for stating that: *I will not, I cannot justify it.* Then he says that *I shall honour the Quakers for their noble Effort to abolish Slavery. It is equally calculated to promote moral & political Good. . . . I believe a time will come when an opposition will be offered to abolish this lamentable Evil.* Why was his own time not the time to do it ? Why did the opposition to slavery led by the Quakers not qualify as the necessary opposition movement ? The basic political reason is that abolition was a long way from being a popular cause, especially in Virginia. And Patrick Henry was a popular politician. So long as it remained an unpopular movement, he could not join it. He did not get himself elected governor by espousing unpopular causes.

Robert Pleasants and other Quakers had already abolished slavery from their own society. Without doing violence to anything except their own bank accounts. Patrick Henry, turning away from so obvious and simple a solution, looks forward to some future time. Which did come of course. The great violence of Bloody Kansas and the American Civil War was the only answer to the failure of Patrick Henry and the others to follow the Christian example which Pleasants and the Quakers had set for them. That is the central theme of American History as of all Imperial History. We pass by the road which led to Peace and Justice as if we couldn't see it and then find ourselves in a situation which demands war.

violence and nonviolence

The neglect of the nonviolent solution inevitably leads to the demand for the violent solution. How different the history of America would have been if other Christians had copied the Quakers in their abolition of slavery and in their refusal to go to war. If the entirely unnecessary and unjustified Revolutionary War had been avoided, the Civil War could have been avoided also. Slavery was ended in all British territories by 1833. And America would almost certainly have become independent of the British Empire without a war, the same way that Canada and Australia did. But that is not the way of embryo empires.

Henry says: *Is it not amazing that at a time, when ye Rights of Humanity are defined & understood with precision, in a Country above all others fond of Liberty, that in such an Age, & such a Country we find Men adopting a Principle as repugnant to humanity as it is inconsistant with the Bible and destructive to Liberty.* And amazing that Patrick Henry of *Give me Liberty or Give me Death* fame would go along with Slavery and fail to include the slaves in the 1777 Declaration of Rights. Two years later, Henry was calling for war as the only alternative to **chains and slavery**--that is, the only alternative to white Americans putting up with the tax on tea etc. Meanwhile, he sees no alternative to the *chains and slavery* that he and the other Virginians have imposed upon the black Africans who work on their plantations. They had more to complain about than a tax on tea. He says that Slavery is *inconsistant with the Bible*. But, even though he believes in the Bible, he will not do what he has to do to follow what he pretends to believe.

Love of Country

a serious review of which gives a gloomy perspective to future times echoes his earlier question: *Is there a man so degenerate as to wish to see his country the gloomy retreat of slaves ?* And shows his recognition of what slavery would do to American society. What it had already done to Virginia society. Yet, Virginia's patriarch had no answer, even when Robert Pleasants handed him the answer. He ignores the answer he has in his hand and shades his eyes, peering into the future for an answer. There are many such Statesmen. There is no doubt that, in his way, he loved Virginia. And he saw what slavery was doing to Virginia. And, along with George

Washington and Thomas Jefferson, he was the most influential and important Virginian. He had the most prominent position in the State. He had a great gift of speaking. And none of it added up to a *Declaration* that **WE MUST GIVE THEM THEIR LIBERTY!**

He describes slavery as *Violence & Tyranny* and *destructive to Liberty*. But he can do nothing about it even while he calls for rebellion against King George III. Who was hardly either a tyrant or a despot. Since King Charles I had his head cut off in 1649, the English King had become something of a Constitutional Monarch who was careful about how much tyrannizing he attempted over his subjects. The British government could fairly be described as a corrupt plutocracy, much like the government of colonial Virginia. But there was as much freedom for the common man in England as there was in America and England was far closer to being a democracy than the France of Louis XVI which instigated the American colonists to rebel against England and then bankrolled and supported the Rebellion. And England had abolished slavery in 1772, freeing some 11,000 slaves in England itself.

Robert Pleasants wrote Governor Patrick Henry again in March 1777: *Some of us from a full conviction of the injustice, and an apprehension of duty, have been induced to embrace the present favorable juncture, when the representatives of the people have nobly declared ALL MEN EQUALLY FREE to manumit divers of our negroes; and propose, without any desire to offend or thereby to injure any person, to invest more of them with the same inestimable privilege. This I conceive was necessary to inform the Governor of, especially as I have been told there hath not been wanting some busie meddling people, who have threatened to put in force the former most unjust and unreasonable law--which empowered the church wardens to take and sell such manumitted negroes back into slavery--and that application has actually been made to thee for this very purpose; altho' from a knowledge of thy sentiments on this subject, I am far from thinking, such application would meet with any encouragement from thee.*

wash your own hands first

He acknowledges the Virginia Declaration of Rights as *Noble* but suggests that the Virginia legislature should act *to establish a general, uniform and constant liberty*, that is, include the slaves in the Declaration, *for if less injury offered to ourselves from the mother Country, can justify the expense of so much Blood and Treasure, how can we impose with propriety absolute slavery on others? It hath often appeared to me as if this very matter was one, if not the principal cause of our present troubles, and that we ought first to have cleansed our own hands, before we could consistently oppose the measures of others, tending to the same purpose.* In short, why not first give **liberty** to the slaves living in Virginia, before embarking upon a war which is supposedly on behalf of **LIBERTY** somehow defined so that it continues to include slavery? Take the beam out of your own eye first. Then Pleasants asks: *But if on the contrary we seek our own glory, and present interest, by forbidden means, how can we expect peace there, or happiness hereafter? . . . the present struggle for liberty, if successful, would be but partial, and instead of abolishing, might lay the foundation of greater imposition and Tiranny to our posterity than any we have yet known.* Like Patrick Henry he sees the terrible consequences of failing to put an end to slavery. Unlike Henry, he seriously set out to accomplish it and did accomplish it so far as it lay in his power.

Henry says: *if it happens in our day, if not, let us transmit to our descendants together with our Slaves, a pity for their unhappy Lot.* What is the excuse for such fatalism ? He was eager, rhetorically at least, to jump into a war for **FREEDOM NOW !** in respect to breaking the chains of the tea tax on himself and his fellow plantation owners. He didn't accept fatalistically the prospect that perhaps some day the American colonies would be independent of Great Britain. But he is philosophically resigned to the prospect that his slaves are not going to be freed in his life time. He is pretty sure of that because he does not intend to free them. Instead he is going to leave them to his children. Which is just what he did. But why ? Patrick Henry was a very successful lawyer and a very successful politician, several times elected Governor of Virginia. Why could he not live without slaves ? Why could he not free them in his will ? If he believes that slavery is a curse, why does he intend to leave this curse to his children, instead of protecting them from it ? *ye general inconvenience of living without them* is somehow sufficient reason for Henry to continue in a life style which puts a curse upon his family and his country and which entirely discredits his pretence that he is ready to die for **LIBERTY**. He is ready to die for **LIBERTY** but he has to hold on to **SLAVERY** because it would be inconvenient to quit it. It sounds familiar doesn't it ? He is indeed the spiritual father of all those modern Americans who are rhetorically ready to die for **LIBERTY** but can't face the *inconvenience* of forgoing abortion.

MY HOME SWEET HOME

The personal reason why Henry could not join the abolitionists is that he had spent his whole life acquiring those plantations which required slaves to work them. And he meant to leave them to the children he had brought up in the plantation life style. For Patrick Henry, **AMERICA, MY HOME SWEET HOME**, meant my mansion house on my estate. For his slaves, it meant the cabins out back, and chains, if necessary, to keep them from escaping. And, because he loved his children, he intended to leave them sufficient property so that they could continue to live in the way he had brought them up. Patrick Henry perhaps deserves the title of **FATHER OF HIS COUNTRY** more than George Washington. Henry had 16 children by two wives, having married again in October 1777 after the death of his first wife. He was devoted to his many children and left them all plantations and slaves. He gave his beloved daughters slaves for their dowries. He bequeathed to all of them a life style in which fine houses and fancy dresses were purchased by the hard labor of those who lived in shacks and worked in the tobacco fields in the July sun.

When Patrick Henry gave one of his daughters a dozen negroes for a wedding present so she could continue to enjoy that leisurely and luxurious lifestyle which depended upon slavery, he perpetuated the situation which systematically undermined and destroyed the black family. He is the model for those indulgent and self-indulgent parents who share a luxurious life style with their children, because they love their children but also because that is the way they wish to live. And, once you get caught up in it, you can't see how else to live, just as the Henry family could not see how else they might live. The price of that life style in his time was slavery. The price of that life style in our time is abortion. Had Patrick Henry loved Virginia better, he would never have left it a legacy of slavery. Had he loved his children better, he would never have left them a life style which depended upon slavery. He left his country and his children a terrible curse in the guise of a blessing.

Virginia lifestyle circa 1800

Traveling through Pennsylvania about 1800, Robert Sutcliffe saw prosperous farmers driving sturdy wagons pulled by good 4 horse teams. In Virginia he typically saw *a ragged black boy or girl driving a team consisting of a lean cow and a mule; sometimes a lean bull or an ox and a mule; and I have seen a mule, a bull, and a cow each miserable in its appearance, composing one team, with a half-naked black slave or two riding or driving as occasion suited.* He saw a "hoghead of

tobacco *with a pivot or axle driven into each end* being rolled along the road pulled by a team. . . . In the middle of these primitive sights, Sutcliffe was startled by a contrast such as Virginia could always show. Between Richmond and Fredericksburg,--*In the afternoon, as our road lay through the woods, I was surprised to meet a family party travelling along in as elegant a coach as is usually met with in the neighborhood of London, and attended by several gayly dressed footmen.* (page 26 of volume I of Henry Adams History) Luxury based upon Slavery was the basic economy of Virginia in the time of Patrick Henry, George Washington and Thomas Jefferson. It is the Real Legacy of the Founding Fathers and Mothers who had to have those *elegant coaches* and fancy dresses and *gayly dressed footmen*.

If Patrick Henry had really cared about real LIBERTY, instead of freeing lawyers from taxes, planters from trade restrictions, land speculators from limits on what they could grab, and ambitious politicians from being subordinate to the English government, he could have done something to benefit his country instead of leaving it with a legacy of slavery, racial segregation and degraded humanity stuck in slums. He also sympathized with the religious dissenters of his time and sometimes took their cases, especially if they could pay him, but his own ambitions caused him to stick with the Anglican establishment his whole life--in public, and to go along with the Freemasons in private. Just as he could agree fully with Pleasants while refusing to change his own behavior. He is the archetype of so many men of natural ability and remarkable character who hold on to the wealth and power of this world and thereby compromise whatever pretended devotion they have to essential moral and spiritual ideals. They are those that the gospel describes--they receive the word but let it be *choked by riches*, like the seed which falls among thorns. Henry had a wonderful eloquence. And deceived himself and others into believing that he had done something because he had said something. Our words condemn us when we do not live up to them. They were better left unsaid.

VI THE FOUNDING SLAVE OWNER

In 1788 Thomas Jefferson declined to join an international anti slavery organization started by Brissot: *Those whom I serve have never been in a position to lift up their voices against slavery. I am an American and a Virginian and, although I esteem your aims, I cannot affiliate myself with your association.* As he indicates, Jefferson was bound by his political position to protect slavery. *Those whom I serve* would never have elected him President in 1800 and again in 1804 had he not been a reliable defender of the plantation and slavery system to which he and they belonged. In 1820 he spoke out against the provision in the Missouri Compromise which restricted slavery in the new territories, even though he had proposed such a restriction himself back in 1784. Whatever grand and fuzzy sentiments he put into the Declaration of Independence, as an ambitious political man he stuck to the Virginia formula which said in effect that **SOME ARE MORE EQUAL THAN OTHERS**. He is really telling Brissot that *I have never been in a position to lift up my voice against slavery*. That is, any serious opposition to slavery was incompatible with the **POSITION** of wealth and power he occupied. In this respect he is the father of all those who can never stand up for what they know to be right, because they cannot let go of the wealth they have or give up the pursuit of the power they seek. They see what is right and they even say so. But they never go beyond the limits which **POSITION** sets. Those who live the same kind of compromised life understand and sympathize.

tremble for yourself

And his personal life style throughout his entire life was tied to the perpetuation of slavery. Whatever private opinion he might have held, or pretended that he held, Jefferson continued to buy slaves while he was President. In his *Notes on the State of Virginia* he wrote: *I tremble for my Country when I reflect that God is Just; that his justice cannot sleep forever.* Which is a queer sort of theology, even for a half Christian. Why did he not rather tremble for himself, since he lived and died a slave owner ? Why did he assume that, when God woke up, He would not specially punish those, like Tom Jefferson, who made and spent large fortunes which came from slavery ? God, as He is presented in the Christian New Testament, punishes the guilty

individual, rather than blasting the whole group indiscriminately. And Thomas Jefferson, prominent lawyer, soon to be President and a very smart fellow, could surely have figured out a way to make a living which did not perpetuate slavery, if he was afraid of God's Justice.

When he had his *Notes on the State of Virginia* privately printed in Paris in 1785, Jefferson sent all of **two copies** to America, to his two friends and political comrades, James Madison and James Monroe. He asked Madison's advice as to circulating it any further because *there are sentiments on some subjects which I apprehend might be displeasing to the country perhaps to the assembly or to some who lead it. I do not wish to be exposed to their censure* And he expresses a fear that there might even be *a misapplication of law to such a publication were it made. . . . in no event do I propose to admit them to go to the public at large.* (TJ in Paris to JM in Virginia May 11th 1785, p. 372 of Volume I of James Morton Smith ed. *The Republic of Letters*) Eventually he passed out a dozen more copies to people he trusted, but it **WAS NOT** a PUBLIC *publication* aimed at pushing American opinion in the direction of abolition--which is how his later hagiographers like to present it. No more than a handful of Americans ever had the chance to read it until Jefferson was long gone and safe from any *CENSURE. I tremble etc.* is now inscribed in the Jefferson Memorial in Washington D.C., as if it were the **PUBLIC POSITION** which he took **IN HIS LIFETIME**. The truth is the exact opposite. But thus is perpetuated the Big Lie about Jefferson which is essential to the Big Lie about America.

(*Psst. Slavery is Wrong ! Pass it on !*)

What sort of a Fearless Crusade against Slavery can you mount via a Private Opinion communicated to a few friends and carefully withheld from the public ? And, unlike the Quakers, who were doing everything they could, as openly as they could, to abolish slavery by deeds as well as by words, Jefferson could command the public platform. He defied the British Empire supposedly but then was afraid to risk offending the prejudices of his fellow Virginia slave owners. Of course he never would have become President if he had openly opposed slavery. Especially if he had shown that he meant it by first liberating his own slaves. He would have lost the support of the Southern plantation owners who counted him as one of their own. Which is just what he was, for all practical and political purposes. His pious anti slavery sentiments were passed on to posterity but concealed from his contemporaries. In the battle over slavery, as it was actually being fought out in his own time, Jefferson was entirely on the side of the slave owners.

The *Notes* contain a condemnation of *the whole commerce between master and slave as a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions, the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submission on the other. . . . Can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are of the gift of God ? That they are not to be violated but with his wrath ? Indeed I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just: that his justice cannot sleep for ever.* Jefferson apparently hoped that the American Revolution would somehow lead to *a total emancipation . . . with the consent of the masters.* As if men who believe in wealth and spend their lives acquiring it can just give it up. As if Jefferson himself could or would do it. Nothing but a violent rebellion can get rid of the Tyranny of George III, but the *despotism* of slavery will somehow be ended via the confidential opinions of Tom Jefferson which he is too chicken to publish. Since it wasn't published when it mattered. Why should anyone be bothered with it afterwards ? Since he did not have the courage to declare it while he held center stage, what use is there in his private *Notes* which leaked out long afterwards ?

It's the King's fault

In fact the American Revolution perpetuated Slavery and led to a major expansion of Slavery into the new lands of the Louisiana Purchase. Why would Jefferson ever assume that men would voluntarily forego the opportunity to make their fortunes via the Plantation system ? He was supposed to have been a political realist, but, in respect to slavery, he was a self-deluded dreamer and a Wishful Thinker. Jefferson was in the morally anomalous position of believing that *liberty* was *the gift of God*, having to recognize that he was withholding that liberty from his slaves, and failing to do anything about it, aside from rhetorical pretenses. Circa 1774, he blamed King George III for slavery, while giving his father and himself and his fellow plantation

owners a pass. If there was any truth to that indictment, who was to blame 10 years later, 20 years later, 30 years later and 40 years later, when George III was long gone and Thomas Jefferson had in effect replaced him? When he died **50 YEARS LATER**, in 1826, his slaves were still slaves. And, in all these ways, he truly deserves his title as America's Founding Father. Which is why it is important to have an accurate moral portrait of him. By seeing him clearly we begin to see ourselves clearly. **The phoniness of his pretensions underlines the phoniness of ours.** The false claim made for America is tied to the false claim made for Thomas Jefferson.

It is important to notice how much of a conformist Jefferson was and how much of a conformist and even hypocrite he had to be in his position. It explains how he could ostensibly support the Christian religion even while he did what he could to undermine it. This same hypocrisy was characteristic of all the Virginia Freemasons who had long been in the habit of publicly attending the Anglican Church, as they were required to do by law, while secretly adhering to a creed which was seeking to subvert and replace Christianity with the religion of the New World Order. This hypocrisy can be observed in the lives of George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, James Madison, James Monroe and all of the other Freemasons who played important roles in the American Revolution.

Freedom Some Day

When he was in the Congress in 1784, Jefferson supported a provision in the Ordinance regulating the new territories, which would *prohibit slavery and involuntary servitude after 1800*. When it was voted down, by one vote, he gave it up. When the issue came up again in 1820 in respect to the Missouri Compromise he took the opposite position. Which raises the obvious question as to whether he was ever serious about it. He would hardly have given up the struggle for the rest of his political career and the rest of his life, after losing the provision by one committee vote in 1784, if he had really cared about it. And what was his *position* worth anyway? He made no proposal to **End Slavery Now**, Where I Live, in the State of Virginia. Rather he made an ineffectual gesture towards keeping other men from making money the way he did. Some Day the Slaves Will Be Free, Some Where Beyond the Mountains. Some Day We Will All Get Pie in the Sky.

A letter to Jefferson in Paris from James Madison, dated January 22nd 1786, which summarized the actions of the Virginia legislature, said that: *Several petitions (from Methodists chiefly) appeared in favor of a gradual abolition of slavery . . . were not thrown under the table, but were treated with all the indignity short of it.* (Smith, Letters I 401) It shows where any real opposition to slavery was coming from at that time. The politicians were probably right in seeing the cause of abolition in Virginia as hopeless, but then why pretend they were statesmen or moral visionaries? Clearly, they gave no serious support to abolition. And how could they while they held on to their own slaves and to their political careers? In this same session, Madison, with Jefferson's support, worked energetically and successfully to defeat a Bill for the support of Christian schools in Virginia. Jefferson and Madison were both secretly Freemasons, and their *Freedom of Religion Act* was really aimed at freedom **FROM** the Christian Religion. It shows the kind of effort they could make for something they really believed in. Their actions, their lack of actions and their token gestures clearly show that they did not have any real belief in the effort to abolish slavery.

Jefferson and Madison both liked to think of themselves as opposed to slavery but **their actions speak louder than their words**. And even their words were muted at the time when it counted. When they seriously considered the prospect of freeing the negro slaves, they tied it to the condition that the freed slaves should then be removed from America and returned to Africa. And some steps were taken in that direction when *Liberia* was founded. Look at the contrast with the Quakers who not only freed their slaves but educated them and hired them and accepted them as fellow citizens. To that conspicuous real time and contemporary example Thomas Jefferson and James Madison had a one word answer: NEVER. They were willfully blind to Robert Pleasants example of freeing his slaves AT HIS OWN EXPENSE and then hiring them as free labor. The conditions they put upon their supposed abolition of slavery show plainly that they were never serious about it. Their Position was: We'll do it some day, **if the government pays us, and then pays to ship the blacks back to Africa.**

A Man of His Time

The excuse for Jefferson is that he was *a man of his time*. But he was supposed to be a man who was far ahead of his time. And many other men of his time, like Robert Pleasants, had already led the way in freeing their slaves. If he sincerely deplored slavery, why could he not have followed the example of Pleasants? Nor can he find any excuse in the politics of **his own time**. Slave owning was abolished in England in 1772. America supposedly broke away from England to establish **FREEDOM** contra England. Actually, it established Slavery contra England. In the *Summary View* of 1774 Jefferson excoriates King George III for tolerating the slave trade and thereby promoting slavery in America. He drew upon this document for his first draft of the 1776 Declaration of Independence and blamed the tyranny of George III for that *assemblage of horrors . . . slavery in another hemisphere*. It was nixed by the other patriotic plantation owners, who saw the problem with blaming the King for the plantation system that they intended to cherish and preserve, in defiance of the Quakers and anyone else. And, 50 years after the Revolution, Jefferson still hung on to his slaves.

Jefferson's pretended brief for Liberty for All through Revolution raises the obvious question as to why America, freed from the tyranny of George III, lagged so far behind England in eliminating both the slave trade and slavery. France, America's ally and Jefferson's second home, had abolished slavery in all French territories by 1787. What kept an American Statesman and President, who was supposedly the great visionary of his time, the great father of **LIBERTY** with a capital **L**, and the great champion of **THE RIGHTS OF MAN**, from leading the way to abolish slavery in America? If any man ever had freedom of action and the necessary vision and understanding to lead the way towards **LIBERTY**, it was Thomas Jefferson. It is his shame that he only pretended to do it. The **big lie** that **AMERICA STANDS FOR FREEDOM** begins with the falsehood that Thomas Jefferson stood for freedom. He wouldn't even sit up for it. He lay with slavery, that is the truth. That was his shame. It is the shame of his biographers--his hagiographers--that they have falsified their history to perpetuate this falsehood.

And Jefferson did not have to look to Europe for a good example. Other American States had already abolished slavery. Pennsylvania passed a law in 1780 providing for gradual emancipation. New York, New Jersey, Connecticut and Rhode Island followed before the end of the century. Vermont wrote a ban on slavery into its first Constitution. Slavery in Massachusetts came to an end in 1781 after a lawsuit based upon the declaration in the state constitution that *All men are born free and equal*. New Hampshire had a similar case. It illustrates why the *patriot* lawyers of Virginia, like Patrick Henry and George Mason, had to so carefully hedge in the *free and equal* clause of the **Declaration of Rights** so that you could be *created* free and equal but *born* into slavery, if you were born black in Revolutionary Virginia. Slavery was not important to the economy of the northern states. Families which kept a few black slaves as servants, like that of Benjamin Franklin, found it a doubtful economy and there was not much resistance to abolition. The number of black slaves in Pennsylvania decreased from 6000 to 3000 between 1776 and 1790. The number of slaves in Virginia increased from 200,000 to 300,000 in the same period. (Morison & Commager I 244)

Sell Out in Rhode Island

Like other states, Virginia passed a law against the foreign slave trade in 1778 because it was a monopoly of the British traders which brought them no revenue and because it undercut the price Virginia plantation owners could get for the slaves they raised and sold. But the slave trade to America continued for many years, legal or not, especially after the Rhode Island skippers got hold of it after the War. And Jefferson, as President, effectively negated any enforcement of the federal law against the slave trade as Jay Coughtry relates in *The Notorious Triangle Rhode Island and the African Slave Trade 1700-1807* pp. 228-229: "in February of 1804, Jefferson caved in and fired Collector Russel. His replacement at the Bristol Customhouse was Charles Collins. . . . From 1804 to 1807, prosecutions of slave traders ceased, and African clearances from Rhode Island ports soared. Occasional directives from the Treasury or State Departments, including a personal order from Secretary Madison to prosecute four known Rhode Island slavers, were simply ignored. The President of the United States had been a party to the slave traders' triumph, although most assumed that he had been duped. Nevertheless, he did nothing to remedy the effects of his appointment when apprised of its consequences, and was savagely burlesqued in the Federalist press. . . . On December 2,

1806, Jefferson urged Congress to begin drafting the legislation that would eventually become the Anti-Slave Trade Act of 1807. Whether he realized it or not, he had already nullified that act, as well as its predecessor, by a petty political appointment made nearly three years before. Politics had triumphed over law." In fact the slave trade persisted until the Civil War, despite the law. A lot of true believers like to assume that the founding fathers were *duped* about this or that--Jefferson by the slave traders, Washington by the Freemasons. They were supposedly far sighted statesmen who couldn't see what was going on under their noses.

Their worshippers persist in giving the founding fathers a pass which they do not deserve in respect to slavery. Suppose you make your living from several taverns that you own. And, sitting on the City Council, you regularly do what you can to protect the tavern owners from those who want to close the taverns or seriously restrict them. But, in private letters, you deplore the evils of alcohol and express the pious hope that some day there will be national Prohibition. Should any one take these protestations seriously ? Should you be given moral credit for being a closet Prohibitionist when you live and die a tavern owner, when your political career depends upon your remaining the defender of the tavern owners ? As private men, the founding fathers made their fortunes from slavery. As public men, they defended slavery and insured that it would continue. So what are their other protestations worth ?

Benjamin Franklin is given credit for delivering the petition of the Abolition Society to Congress in 1790. That supposedly cancels the fact that he refused to oppose slavery while he attended the Constitutional Convention in 1787 as a delegate from Pennsylvania, and one of the most influential men there. Having allowed slavery to be written into the American Constitution, he supposedly made up for it by a belated token gesture. When he wrote to the Quaker abolitionist Anthony Benezet in 1772, Franklin said *I hope in time it will be taken into consideration and suppressed by the legislature.* But when he participated in the first great national American legislature, 15 years later, he had nothing to say against the perpetuation of slavery in America in its Founding Document. *IN TIME* had still not arrived, even though *Liberty* had now supposedly arrived in *America*. Franklin had a major role in writing the foundational legislation of America and shrugged off the fact that the FREEDOMS written into the Constitution did not include any Freedom for the slaves of America. When the 1790 petition was denounced by the slave owners in Congress, Franklin responded with an *ANONYMOUS* letter in the newspaper. Two months before he died, he was still unwilling to stand up and be counted in defense of what he supposedly believed.

Saying and Doing

Those who opposed slavery as a matter of private opinion or who reserved any public expression of that opinion for a more convenient time and a more receptive audience, are like all those who are opposed to abortion, **AS A MATTER OF OPINION**. What, besides **nothing**, is it worth ? How can you tell the cowards from the hypocrites ? Planned Parenthood opposes abortion. Read their literature. Bill Clinton was opposed to abortion. Some years ago I had a conversation with a man who emphatically stated his **OPINION** that abortion is murder. And that is what he had told his niece when he drove her to the abortion clinic, he righteously declared. It seems not to have occurred to him that he could have refused to drive her there. He obviously felt that he was **JUSTIFIED BY HIS OPINION**. What more could you ask ? But a person is judged by what he does, not by what he says. God looks at our actions and gives us no credit for our idle opinions. In Matthew 21.28-31 Jesus points to the son who *did the will of his father* in contrast to the one who said something but did nothing. In Luke 6.46 He asks: *why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say ?*

Regardless of his fine feelings, if he actually had them, it was necessary for Jefferson's aristocratic life style that he squeeze every dollar he could from his labor force. Big plantation owners had trouble making ends meet. Tobacco soon depleted the fertility of the land and surpluses caused the price to fall. Other crops paid much less. He might have gotten by had he been content to live in a modest house with a modest life style. But the enormous expense of maintaining the luxurious life style of Monticello precluded him from ever seriously attempting to escape from his position as the Master of large plantations worked by many slaves. He did not allow his slaves to be beaten. What that meant in practice was that, if a slave would not work without the whip, he would dispose of the slave to some owner who did not have his sensitivity, the way you would sell off a balky mule, at a knocked down price.

No doubt he was a gentleman of fine sentiments. Obviously he did not like being surrounded by slaves all the time. His solution was to put in shrubbery and tunnels so that he saw as little of his slaves as possible. He spent a lot of money to remodel Monticello. But it remained a prison with him as the warden. For all his cleverness, he couldn't figure out that his own road to Freedom required giving freedom to his slaves.

drinking up their lives

However much *MY COUNTRY* might be to blame, it was Tom Jefferson in person who spent the revenues of his estates on trips to Paris and a lavish life style which left him bankrupt by the time of his death. He spent large sums of money over 50 years to make Monticello the grand mansion of the American Dream. Like others who have no real faith in a life beyond this one, he tried to build a personal paradise on earth. He constantly entertained and he had as many as 50 house guests at a time. They brought their horses and their servants with them and they all had to be fed. He served the best French wine to his guests at a time when it took 6 weeks to bring it across the Atlantic, and he ordered hundreds of bottles at a time. The \$1 a bottle he paid circa 1800 was a day's wage for a common laborer, the equivalent of \$ 50 in American money circa 2000.

After he died, his 200 slaves had to be sold on the auction block to pay off the debts he had incurred living as a country gentleman. The auctioned slaves wound up on the cotton plantations of the territories acquired in the Louisiana Purchase, which is often cited as Jefferson's major accomplishment. Their lives may have passed away far from Monticello, but, in a very real sense, Thomas Jefferson and his guests drank up their lives in the wine they poured. Revelation 17.6 describes the Roman Empire as a Great Harlot who drinks up the blood of the saints. Indeed, the Great Empire and those who belong to it do drink the blood of their slaves and servants and low paid laborers. The *DEVOURING EMPIRE* has eaten up the lives of many and it does it still.

The Worst One

In *Judgment at Nuremberg*, the American judge gives the harshest penalty to a defendant of noble character who had been a Nazi Judge. Because, he tells him, you are the worst one. If only hooligans and low life ruffians had gone along with the Nazis, they could never have done what they did. The fact that so many Germans of good character also went along with the Nazis is what made it seem all right. Similarly, instead of excusing Jefferson because of his noble character, he is all the more to be condemned. Someone without his fine personal qualities, a man of average character and intelligence who inherited plantations worked by slaves from his father and grandfather, has some excuse for shrugging off the obvious moral issue arising from his position. What else would you expect of such a man except that he live the life he had inherited and take his standards from those around him ? But Tom Jefferson has no such excuse. He knew better, he could have done better. He claimed the position of a moral leader of men. And then would not lead them away from the most conspicuous evil of the time. He is still presented as the leader of a *GREAT MORAL REVOLUTION* in the affairs of men. But he neglected to make the obvious moral change in his own affairs.

He was a well read man who knew the French philosophers, all those who inspired the call for *Liberty Equality Fraternity* upon which the intellectual and moral ferment of the American and French Revolutions were based. Jefferson himself was in Paris when the Revolution broke out and he played an important role in helping to launch it and justify it, head chopping and all. He could not have been ignorant of those Quakers who wrote about slavery from the real life perspective of men who had actually abolished it from their own lives. Instead of spinning some fine philosopher's theory, they took the chains off and then told about it to encourage others to do the same. That is what a *REAL OPINION* looks like. It's got two feet. It gets up and goes somewhere. Otherwise, an opinion is just hot air. All it does is stress the air conditioning in the banquet hall.

Jefferson was a visionary who could not or would not see what was right in front of him. He proclaimed *LIBERTY* and lived and died a slave owner. That is his epitaph. And it is the inheritance which America has received from him: a pretence of *LIBERTY* which conceals

slavery behind the shrubbery. For another three generations, hooligans and low life ruffians bought black men and women and did whatever they wanted with them. And they could point to the example of the author of the Declaration of Independence as their justification. They could wave the Flag of Freedom over the crimes they committed against black men and women who had no recourse because the Constitution written by James Madison and Thomas Jefferson did not recognize them as persons with rights. Jefferson is the true father of the modern Constitution which does not recognize embryo children as persons with rights.

Let it Spread

Jefferson justified his support for extending slavery into the new territories in a statement he made to Lafayette Dec 26 1820 : *All know that permitting the slaves of the South to spread into the West will not add one being to that unfortunate condition, that it will increase the happiness of those existing, and by spreading them over a larger surface, will dilute the evil every where, and facilitate the means of finally getting rid of it, an event more anxiously wished by those on whom it presses than by the noisy pretenders to exclusive humanity.* This statement illustrates the final flowering of Jefferson's self-defensive moral senility. He surely knows better than to assume that the foreign slave trade has really ended, or that slaves won't be bred to meet an increased demand for slave labor. How can he possibly believe that continuing to go along with slavery will somehow lead to its decrease and disappearance ? Give them enough rope and the slave owners will tie themselves up while untying their slaves ? What a cool strategy, and so easy for everyone ! Just let the weeds grow and they will eventually eradicate themselves. As Ashleigh Brilliant once said: *the solution to the problems created by apathy is: More Apathy !*

Jefferson's fundamental faith is the basic American belief that you can arrive at moral goals by mechanical means--by some historical process which makes a moral struggle unnecessary. The clever theory of the amoral intellectual takes the place of morality. The dreadful deficiency of this false faith is measured by the 600,000 killed in the terrible blood letting of the Civil War. And they died in vain, as measured by the 100 years of semi-slavery for American Negroes which followed, and as measured by the abominable situation in which so many American Negroes still live out their lives in the slums of our big cities.

There have been a few hundred Americans, even a few thousand perhaps--not more--who really did do what Tom Jefferson only pretended to do--what believers in the American Cult still pretend that he did. He does not deserve to be mentioned in the same breath with those who sacrificed their property, who went to jail, who even lost their lives to help the black slaves of America escape from that condition in which the Founding Slave Owners left them. The Quakers and the Abolitionists said out loud what Jefferson confided to his *Notes* and they **ACTED** in keeping with what he claimed to believe, thereby showing that they really did believe it. Unlike the Founding Slave Owners, they Paid the Price for Freedom. They **ACTED** from **CONVICTION**.

The followers of the American Cult give Jefferson a pass because they give themselves a pass in respect to ever living up to what they pretend to believe. They believe as Jefferson did that if you write it in your diary, or confide it to a friend, it is the same as saying it out loud in the place where people don't want to hear it. They use *the issue* to further their political ambitions while presenting themselves as devoted to the cause. They have to believe that saying something in a safe place is equivalent to doing something in a dangerous place, and that the paper money of an *opinion* is as good as the gold coin of **passionate conviction** which pushes people to Do Something. They have to believe it, because they don't have the Courage to do anything effective, no more than Tom Jefferson did.

Blame the King

Thomas Jefferson is the real founding father of America in the way that he pretended to himself and to others that he believed in **LIBERTY** even while, in all of his effective actions, he furthered **SLAVERY**. In his *Summary View of the Rights of British America*, written in 1774, (and published anonymously, like most of what he wrote) he adopted the pose of someone who was Really, Really, Opposed to Slavery, contra that old debbil King of England who had somehow forced Jefferson's grandfather to acquire plantations and slaves. And, 46 years later, still hanging on to his own slaves, despite the King being long gone, and having neglected all his

opportunities to do Something Effective to end slavery, he was still stuck in the same self-deluded pose, explaining to Lafayette how all the sophisticated people like himself knew that Slavery could be ended by just going along with it and letting it expand to the new territories. He is the spiritual father of those millions of Americans who have submitted to slavery and inflicted coercion of all kinds upon others while deluding themselves that they really believed in Freedom, and knew what it meant, and had the Courage to stand up for it.

Thomas Jefferson is the Founding Father of the Great American Self Deception. He is the model for those who strike a pose for others and deceive themselves until it pushes them into moral madness. What else was Jefferson's absurd notion that **slavery could be eradicated by letting it spread** ? That **NOT ONE** more slave will result ? That it can only *increase the happiness* of his auctioned slaves when they are marched off to Arkansas ? This is the Great Political Thinker of the Age ? This is another **Crazy Old Cracker**, still pretending to be the *Negro's Best Friend* on the verge of selling them to pay his liquor bill ! This is a man with a terminal moral blindness as to who he is and what he is and what he has done with his life--what he has failed to do. And, in that way especially, he is truly the Father of his Country.

My Idea Will Save the World !

This isn't the only instance of Jefferson's wacko political theories. Look at his absurd theory of *generations* presented in his September 6th 1789 letter to James Madison which leads him to the conclusion that: *Every constitution then, and every law, naturally expires at the end of 19 years.* Like other Great Thinkers, his vanity made him believe that a cranky intellectual principle, discovered by him, was **The Answer** to all the Moral problems of society: the Generations of Society can be treated as if they were discontinuous, even if they aren't, and this determines Rights, will prevent war etc. It is a fantasy on paper, at odds with reality, which he presents as The Fundamental Political Principle. Of course it is nonsense to suppose that any Intellectual Principle can make a moral and spiritual struggle unnecessary--that some Great Thinker's Intellectual Discovery will resolve all moral and political problems. It is one of the perennial illusions of those who turn away from the moral struggle as Jefferson did. There has to be some easier way. It must be this **Great Notion** which just came to Me. This gratuitous **Faith in Myself and My Ideas** was a basic character defect in Thomas Jefferson, as it is in many others. By the end of his life it had become a form of madness, a severe self-delusion. Since he did not believe that Jesus Christ had Saved the World by his Great Sacrifice, he had to believe that it was up to Tom Jefferson to save it by some Great Notion. The same delusion is central to the American Cult--*America has the keys to the Salvation of the World.* The local harm that Jefferson's madness caused has grown into Harm on a world wide scale. The delusion that America is Saving the World while destroying it has become the national madness.

He is a few years away from dying bankrupt which means that all of his black slaves will be sold off to the cotton plantations of the Louisiana Territory to pay up his wine bills. As President, he abandoned the cause of abolition. But he still believes himself to be 1. the Negro's Best Friend 2. the Visionary Statesman who sees how slavery will peacefully peter out as it spreads to the new territories. There may be some pardon and excuse for him, considering all the circumstances of his life. What excuse can there be for those who perpetuate the lies he taught himself to believe ? For those silly scholars who count his private words and ignore his public words, who give him credit for idle opinions which are belied by all the real political acts of his life ? If Jefferson somehow avoided the fiery pit, they surely won't. The lowest level of hell is reserved for all false teachers. The latrines of all the upper levels dump on that one. It is only justice for what they dumped on others.

Jefferson and Madison did have a sort of Practical Plan to end slavery, even if they never seriously promoted it. The plan was not abolition of slavery but *conditional termination*: the government would free the slaves by using the revenue from federal land sales to compensate the slave owners. So the sale of the lands forcibly taken from the Indians would provide the money to pay the Masters to let their slaves go. Then the government would pay to transport the freed blacks back to Africa and re-settle them there--would displace a few African tribes to make room for them. The founding of Liberia in 1822 was a step in the direction of this plan. Like most do good schemes, it is based on the assumption that **THE GOVERNMENT WILL PAY**. Being a noble character of the modern type, the founding father stood ready to free his blacks so long as the government **paid him** and **got rid of them**.

And it is understandable that they would have looked at it this way. The family fortunes of the founding fathers came from government favors--royal grants of land to their grandfathers, or the largesse of the colonial legislature. Their captive labor force belonged to them because The Law said it did and the Sheriff was ready to run down any escapees. Why should they have to sacrifice their private fortunes for the sake of some moral principle? Why shouldn't the government pay? If they were to lose the slaves which were necessary to work those great estates, they must have some state compensation, lest they drop out of that privileged class which had been their birth right.

As young idealists, Jefferson and Madison saw the evil of slavery and sincerely deplored it. But they were also young gentlemen of fortune, born into the privileged elite of Virginia. How could they disentangle those two things? Or ever do anything serious to end slavery while they continued? Because the law required it, they regularly attended the Anglican Church service where they heard the long established *readings* of the imperial state church on topics such as money and slavery. Augustine had long ago adapted Christian teaching to his congregation of owners of large plantations worked by slaves. So the teaching that *You cannot serve two masters, you cannot serve God and money* had long before been explained away. It didn't mean that you had to choose between being a wealthy slave owner and living the Christian life. So there was nothing in the doctrine of the establishment church to put them on the right course, nor any cure for it in the doctrines of Freemasonry which they secretly held. They had to hold on to their wealth and they had to pursue political power. So how could they free their own slaves or join the Quaker abolitionists, without giving up any hope of ever becoming President?

And so the young idealists became old practical politicians who watched slavery grow. Who watched their own slaves live and die as slaves. And yet, as a matter of occasional rhetoric or pious pretence, they still wanted to abolish slavery. They wanted to do it in a way which would not devalue the property they owned or undermine the political positions they held. Since there was no way to do that, there was no way to do anything. As old men, they held on to the illusion that they really had done something. They had put forth IDEAS. In lieu of EXAMPLES they left us IDEAS. *Here is something you should do--of course I can't do it.* As if others couldn't see that slavery was evil. Or that it was incompatible with Liberty. As if the **real abolitionist** had not long since gone ahead and done the thing that the founding father only pretended that he wished to do some day--a day that never came if he lived to be 80, or if he lived to be 100.

The Wisdom of the Age

Thomas Jefferson had the greatest reputation of his time for visionary political wisdom. He had read all the English and French philosophers who inspired the Age of Revolution. He was the Architect of the *New World Order* and one of the founders of a new faith, which centered upon AMERICA and LIBERTY, and HUMANITY, SCIENCE and REASON. In the history of Jefferson's Presidency which he published in 1890, Henry Adams refers to *the sunlight of the 19th century bursting upon the recalcitrant New England Puritans, these resolute sons of granite and ice who turned their faces from the sight.* (I 61-62) Adams shared the faith of millions who believed that a New Age of Humanity began with Jefferson and his companions, a New Age of Reason and Science and Liberty--Liberty above all, including especially sexual liberty, in the tolerant sun beams of the God of Nature that the Freemasons acknowledged.

Then look at the political wisdom of Thomas Jefferson in 1820 when he was 77 years old. Just let slavery expand and it will bring freedom to the slaves, and, meanwhile, it won't lead to an increase in the number of slaves, and, meanwhile, *it will increase the happiness of those who are already slaves.* This is **The Answer** which the Great Father of America and Liberty came up with, in the maturity of his wisdom, to the great challenge of Slavery.

How did the Wisest Man of his Age turn into the Biggest Moral and Political Nitwit of his Age? Because, while he made himself the Architect of the New World Order, he never took any personal moral responsibility for being the Architect of his own life. He never faced up to the reality of his captive work force out in the fields in the July heat of Virginia while he was making fine speeches in Congress or dining in Paris with the other gentlemen revolutionaries. He never recognized that it was not the King of England nor My Country that had an obligation to Do Something to Abolish Slavery, but the fellow he saw in the mirror every morning. Did he really

believe he had The Answer to Slavery ? He came to where he had to believe it, even though it was Make Believe. He had to believe that somehow he was leading his Country to Freedom despite the obvious evidence that he had led it much deeper into slavery.

Like so many other intellectuals and pretended idealists, he stayed on the road of wealth and power and convinced himself that it was also the road of Freedom for All. Put wealth first, put political power second, put personal fame third, and, somehow, when these things were attained, all other good things would be attained. So there he is at the end of his life still believing that he has found The Answer to Slavery. Like the old moth who had the illusion that he really had reached the star. And he is now quite blind to the truth that the road he has followed his whole life has taken him and the Nation he led further and further from real Liberty. Under the head of LIBERTY, he has helped build The Great Slave Empire of the West. He is the Founder of the American Illusion.

the real legacy of the founding fathers

In 1820, Jefferson wrote *We have the wolf by the ears: and we can neither hold him, nor safely let him go. Justice is in one scale, and self-preservation in the other.* The founding slave owners put themselves and the nation in the same predicament. Slaves were half the population of Virginia and more than half further south. After a slave revolt, Virginia passed laws forbidding slaves to be educated. To the degradation of slavery was added the permanent grievance of those whose white fathers stuck them out back and refused to acknowledge them. These illegitimate and *UNWANTED* children are still taking their revenge for a double injury. They have absorbed all the violence that was done to them and many of them have preserved it and multiplied it, the way men will. The long, long *Violence & Tyranny* of America predictably produces a violent and crime-ridden society and half of that crime is concentrated in the inner city slums where the great grandchildren of the founding fathers live. Our prisons are stuffed with those men who can rightfully claim the names of their former owners, America's founding fathers.

The Henry Adams history quotes verses about Jefferson by Thomas Moore: (p. 114 of 1986 edition, volume I)

*The Weary statesman for repose hath fled
From halls of council to his negro's shed;
Where, blest, he woos some black Aspasia's grace
And dreams of freedom in his slave's embrace*

Adams says that Moore "embalmed in his lines the slanders which the Scotch libeller Calender invented against Jefferson." But why does Adams quote it, if he really believed it a libel ? In fact, modern DNA testing shows it was no libel. [Calender was found drowned in 3 feet of water.]

Alex Haley once told an interviewer that he could just as easily have traced his *ROOTS* back to the British Isles as well as tracing them to Africa. It might not have led to a best selling book and a popular TV series, but it would have made people recognize the basic identity of American negroes. They are descended from the outcast and illegitimate children of the founding fathers and of all the other whites who took advantage of their situation over 3 centuries of slavery and semi slavery. Haley was pointing to the basic fact that American Negroes are at least half white in their racial inheritance. Jefferson's slave wife, Sally Hemmings, was 3/4ths white, and so their children were 7/8ths white.

In the time of the founding fathers, concubinage, prostitution and rape which was no crime because it could not be legally punished had already begun to create a population whose right to a share of their patrimony was denied them along with the denial of their *right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness*. When I was on the Freedom Rides in 1961, I met some of those who had a deep rooted personal grievance against their American founding fathers, who had made them live out back in the shed. One of my companions had whiter skin than mine plus Negro features. Another had Caucasian features with dark skin. If they used the old *octoroon* legal standard in reverse--1/8th is enough to classify you--there would be no such thing as a *colored* person in America.

The slums of our big cities are filled with the half white / half black descendents of the gentlemen who wrote the Constitution, and the un gentlemen who were excluded from that secret Masonic conclave. Imagine that the child you threw in the trash stood before you accusingly. Not many of them want to talk about it, but it happens all the time in the nightmares of aborted women. But it is also happening to us in the persons of those direct descendents of the founding fathers who have incorporated into their lives and into their families the violent history of American slavery and segregation. The life style which we so willingly inherited from the founding fathers, that life style of wealth and luxury obtained by devouring the lives of others, presents us with a bill we cannot afford to pay. The wealth they consumed is now owed by us plus about 1000 per cent interest. And, one way or another, we are going to pay it, in the form of crimes we suffer or more prisons or higher insurance rates or enormous bills for social services to those who come from this subculture of devastated families. Those who get dewy-eyed over George Washington and Patrick Henry and Thomas Jefferson and James Madison should volunteer to pay the bill for the lawsuit brought against white America by the descendents of the slaves of the Founding Fathers. It is the price of American Greatness.

fear and despair

Slavery was spiritual poison, not just a physical condition. In 1802 Gouverneur Morris warned the Congress of the danger that slave revolts might be encouraged by foreign states *stimulating with a prospect of freedom the miserable men who now toil without hope*. Slaves must believe *that it is impossible for them to become free. Men in their unhappy condition must be impelled by fear and discouraged by despair. Yes. The impulsion of fear must be strengthened by the hand of despair.* (Sparks III 417 414 as quoted in Richard Brookhiser *Gentleman Revolutionary* 170) Morris had a habit of being offensively blunt. But he was perfectly right in arguing that slaves must not only be deprived of liberty but of the very hope of liberty, lest they be tempted to revolt. **FEAR STRENGTHENED BY DESPAIR** was the necessary antidote to slave revolts. The slaves of Haiti revolted successfully in 1791. In 1802 President Thomas Jefferson assisted the French expeditionary force which failed to re-capture the island. Slave rebellions were a real danger then and now. We are still suffering from the mindless violence of black riots and even more from the epidemic violence of that crime which is rampant in the black slums of America, which victimizes blacks far more often than it does whites. It is the Legacy of the Founding Fathers.

The gross sexual immorality which was encouraged and forced upon black Americans by their white masters continues to destroy black families. The black Christian Church provided the moral foundation upon which families could be built. But the same moral corrosion which pervades affluent white American families has begun to infect successful black American families.

A Better Home

If there is a positive side to the experience of Africans brought to America in bondage, it owes nothing to the Founding Slave Owners and their false promise of Freedom in America. It is entirely due to those real Christians who helped Negroes escape from slavery and to those Christian missionaries who brought true spiritual freedom to those who were still in bondage. The Quakers freed their own slaves and helped others escape from Slavery through the Underground Railway. The *Anabaptist* missionaries, who were jailed in Virginia as they were in New England, persisted in bringing the true light of the gospel to those dark places where the proclaimers of **LIBERTY** kept their slaves. They never made fine speeches about **LIBERTY** while wearing powdered wigs. They merely risked their lives to bring it about. There is an authentic and passionate Christianity which grows best among those who suffer persecution and poverty. The black Church helped the slaves survive. They found no **HOME SWEET HOME** in the slave cabins of America, but they found the hope of a better Home than Tom Jefferson's mansion--*Steal Away Home to Jesus . . . Swing Low, Sweet Chariot, Coming For to Carry Me Home*. In His Father's house there are many mansions. And slave huts, in the other place, for those who lived in luxury at the expense of their slaves. Like Lazarus and the rich man, they will both receive the reward they have earned.

During the Revolutionary War, Governor Patrick Henry dispatched George Rogers Clark to fight Indians and scout for land as far west as the Mississippi. In his public proclamations as Governor of Virginia, Patrick Henry often expressed a benevolent attitude towards the Indians, especially during the War, when he was trying to avoid having to fight another war on a second front. But a confidential letter written on January 1st 1779 to George Rogers Clark, who commanded a Virginia military force in what is now Indiana and Illinois--part of the territory claimed by Virginia under its royal charter--shows his *realpolitik* attitude towards the *FINAL SOLUTION* of the Indian problem: *the Shawanese, Mingoies, Munsies and the nearer Wiandots, are troublesome thorns in our sides. However we must leave it to yourself to decide on the object of the campaign; if against the Indians, the end proposed should be their extermination, or their removal beyond the lakes or Illinois river. The same world will scarcely do for them and us.*

By contrast with other documents in which Governor Henry--for obvious diplomatic reasons--encourages fair treatment of the Indians and attempts to conciliate them, this letter bluntly expresses the view that it is *THEM OR US*. The territory which Henry sought to secure was hundreds of miles west of any Virginia settlements at the time he wrote. From his other letters, such as those to the Spanish governor of New Orleans, it is apparent that he wished to secure the territory of Virginia all the way to the Mississippi and to thereby secure a trade route down the Ohio and the Mississippi to the Gulf. His ambitions for the empire of Virginia were only curtailed by the establishment of the empire of the United States to which Virginia eventually had to cede its western territory.

Henry was also pursuing his own interests in speculative land holdings. In 1767 he had invested in Thomas Walker's venture involving lands lying on the Mississippi near its junction with the Ohio. This land, at the western edge of what is now Kentucky, was 700 miles as the crow flies from where Henry lived. The only way to get there in his time was by horseback on wilderness trails or by constructing a barge and floating it down the Ohio once you had crossed the mountains. Henry, in addition to his Virginia estates, in addition to being a successful lawyer, in addition to being elected governor, was still ready to send soldiers to slaughter the Indians so as to secure this land. His real motto was: **GIVE ME REAL ESTATE, AND GIVE THEM DEATH!** He illustrates that *Epidemical madness* for land and empire which possessed all the men of his time, that **IMPERIAL MADNESS** which still possesses Americans.

The perennial war to push the Indians off their lands continued throughout the period of the Revolutionary War and men continued to volunteer for this relatively easy and profitable service when Virginia could no longer raise troops to fight the British. South Carolina and Virginia launched a major military operation against the Cherokees in the summer of 1776 while Washington's army suffered defeat and continued to retreat in New England. This warfare was against the Indian towns. They couldn't catch the elusive warriors but the towns where the women and children and the old men lived were easy targets.

destroy their towns

A letter from Patrick Henry to General Stephen, written March 31st 1777, says: *The Cherokees are likely to plague us again. Those whose Towns are destroyed lay out & war on our people.* A letter Henry wrote to the Virginia Delegates in Congress May 16th 1786 says: *Experience clearly proves that attacking their towns is the only mode of effectual defence against hostile Indians.* We always pretend that women and kids and old folks are off limits, that we maintain a warrior code. But whether it is Virginia in 1776-1786, or Vietnam in 1966 or Palestine and Afghanistan in 2003, the truth is that women and kids and old folks are fair game in any serious military operation. We don't mean to hit them, of course. We only mean to do that which will inevitably result in their being hit. Our intentions are good. And pave the road to Hell. Is it surprising that those whose towns are destroyed, whose wives and children, and old folks are murdered, become *terrorists*? As Henry points out, *Those whose Towns are destroyed lay out & war on our people.* The terrorists of September 11th murdered 3000 people. Every year, our home grown terrorists murder 30,000. When you destroy the homes of others, when you go along with those who do it, how safe will you ever be in your own home?

Send Them to Oklahoma

In 1803, President Thomas Jefferson advocated that the Indians be removed to the regions west of the Mississippi. At the insistence of the State of Georgia, the remaining Cherokees were finally marched west to Oklahoma in 1838 by the American army. Later, the Indian Territory of Oklahoma was opened to white settlers. The same story was repeated over and over. Abraham Lincoln enlisted for the Black Hawk War of 1832, to force the Sauk and the Fox out of Illinois and Wisconsin and push them beyond the Mississippi River. Like a lot of volunteers then and since, he needed the job. *I was out of work and there being no danger of more fighting, I could do nothing better than enlist again.* (quoted on page 155n, of *That Disgraceful Affair, the Black Hawk War* by Cecil Eby) After Black Hawk's surrender, Lieutenant Jefferson Davis was put in charge of escorting him to St. Louis. (Eby 268-269)

When Black Hawk's band returned from their winter hunt in April 1829 they found that white squatters had moved into their Illinois village and were dividing up their corn fields. One had opened a store to sell whiskey to the Indians. When the Sauks tried to recover their homes and their corn fields, the American army backed the white squatters. (Eby 74-75) Imagine coming home to find people camping on your farm. And then discovering that you can't do anything about it--that the police will arrest you if you try. Eventually, the Sauk and the Fox were forced to move across the river to Iowa and into a confrontation with the Sioux. Their attempt to move back to their old homes on the Illinois side of the river precipitated the one-sided war.

nits make lice

The war ended with the brutal *Bad Axe* slaughter of the Sauk Indians August 2nd 1832 on the Mississippi River a few miles north of Prairie du Chien Wisconsin. (Eby 250-252.) The Navy gunboat, *The Warrior*, joined the regular army and the militia in exterminating the Indian band. The militia systematically killed old men, women and babies. Militiaman John House, after shooting a baby whose mother had put him in a little raft at the edge of the river to try and save him, said: *Kill the nits, and you'll have no lice.* (Eby 253) In the ensuing treaty, the Sauk Indians were forced to sell 6 million acres of prime Iowa farm land to the government, at 10c an acre. Sauk Indians who had stayed out of the war lost their land regardless. Most of the money was paid to the Indian agents, not the Indians. (Eby 272) Like other militia volunteers, Abraham Lincoln was paid in land as well as cash. He eventually received a land warrant for 40 acres in Iowa and another for 120 acres in Illinois. (Eby 101)

The *Indian Territory* in what is now Oklahoma became the internment camp for all American Indians, although many of them resisted going there as best they could. The Seminoles of Florida, led by Osceola, hid out for years in the vast everglades but by 1842 the American army had almost exterminated them. In 1874-1878 the army marched the Indians of Nebraska and South Dakota to Oklahoma. In May 1877, after Crazy Horse was murdered, 1000 Cheyennes were removed to Oklahoma. When 300 of them escaped and returned in 1878, led by Little Wolf and Dull Knife, they were rounded up by the army and imprisoned at Fort Robinson. They were denied food and water when they refused to return to Oklahoma. In desperation they broke out. But they were killed or recaptured. The Poncas and the Sioux were deported the same year. Also in 1877, the Nez Perce, led by Chief Joseph, were captured 40 miles short of Canada and a rendezvous with Sitting Bull, to which they were fleeing after even their Reservation lands were taken from them. In British ruled Canada they hoped to find the Freedom and the Opportunity which had been taken from them in America. You can follow the **INDIAN REMOVAL POLICY** from Jamestown in 1607 to Nebraska in 1877. And beyond. In 1906 the first black cavalry regiment was sent from Fort Robinson to round up 300 Ute Indians who had made an *unauthorized departure* from their reservation.

By 1890 the Indian population of the continental United States was 100,000, down from one million in 1607. The same precipitous decline of native population took place in Hawaii and Alaska. For them, America was the land of steadily shrinking opportunities, of the loss of their way of life and their chance at life. All the lands of the Indians which had any value in the eyes of Americans, had been taken from them. (Now they have finally found Opportunity--catering to our gambling vice.) American fake history describes Americans as *carving a new nation out of the wilderness*. They carved it out of the Indians, just as the Zionists have carved a nation out of the Palestinians under the Title of *carving a nation out of the desert*.

In his *annual message* of December 6th 1830, President Andrew Jackson said: *It gives me pleasure to announce to Congress that **the benevolent policy of the Government, steadily pursued for nearly 30 years**, in relation to the removal of the Indians beyond the white settlements is approaching . . . a happy consummation. Two important tribes [the Choctaws and the Chickasaws] have accepted the provision made for their removal at the last session of Congress, and it is believed that their example will induce the remaining tribes also to seek the same obvious advantages. [The Creeks and the Cherokees were still refusing.]*

Humanity has often wept over the fate of the aborigines of this country, and philanthropy has been long busily employed in devising means to avert it, but its progress has never for a moment been arrested, and one by one have many powerful tribes disappeared from the earth. To follow to the tomb the last of his race and to tread on the graves of extinct nations excite melancholy reflections. But true philanthropy reconciles the mind to these vicissitudes as it does to the extinction of one generation to make room for another. . . . Philanthropy could not wish to see this continent restored to the condition in which it was found by our forefathers. What good man would prefer a country covered with forests and ranged by a few thousand savages to our extensive Republic, studded with cities, towns, and prosperous farms, embellished with all the improvements which art can devise or industry execute, occupied by more than 12,000,000 happy people, and filled with all the blessings of liberty, civilization and religion ? The present policy of the Government is but a continuation of the same progressive change by a milder process. The tribes which occupied the Eastern States were annihilated or have melted away to make room for the whites. The waves of population and civilization are rolling to the westward, and we now propose to acquire the countries occupied by the red men of the South and West by a fair exchange, and, at the expense of the United States, to send them to a land where their existence may be prolonged and perhaps made perpetual.

Note that they were being marched to the Indian territory of Oklahoma *at the expense of the United States*. Uncle Sam has often stood treat in the same way. Why are they so ungrateful ? President Jackson, who was a slave owner himself, was counting three million slaves among the 12 million *happy people* who were enjoying the **BLESSINGS OF LIBERTY**. Fifty four years after the Declaration of Independence, the definition of **LIBERTY** still included Slavery. The myth that slaves were happy in their work, that they **SANG WHILE THEY SLAVED**, persisted long after the time of Andrew Jackson. In the 1950s it was still common for white southerners to summon a Negro maid or field hand on the carpet to testify to a guest from the North as to how happy they were with their lot in life. No doubt they were happier than those whose services were dispensed with entirely, who were given a bus ticket to Chicago or Detroit by way of a Southern welfare system. Who crowded into the slums of the northern cities and found what jobs they could in a segregated city.

the American character circa 1832

In *Domestic Manners of the Americans*, written in 1832, Mrs. Frances Trollope (mother of Anthony) gives a crisp portrait of the American character as shown by how they dealt with the Cherokees: *We were at Washington at the time that the measure for chasing the last of several tribes of Indians from their forest homes, was canvassed in Congress, and finally decided upon by the fiat of the president. If the American character may be judged by their conduct in this matter, they are most lamentably deficient in every feeling of honour and integrity. It is among themselves, and from themselves, that I have heard the statements which represent them as treacherous and false almost beyond belief, in their intercourse with the Unhappy Indians. Had I, during my residence in the United States, observed any single feature in their national character that could justify their eternal boast of liberality and the love of freedom, I might have respected them, however much my taste might have been offended by what was peculiar in their manners and customs. But it is impossible for any mind of common honesty not to be revolted by the contradictions in their principles and practice. They inveigh against the governments of Europe, because, as they say, they favour the powerful and oppress the weak. You may hear this declaimed upon in Congress, roared out in taverns, discussed in every drawing-room, satirized upon the stage, nay, even anathematized from the pulpit: listen to it, and then look at them at home: you will see them with one hand hoisting the cap of liberty, and with the other flogging their slaves. You will see them one hour lecturing their mob on the indefeasible rights of man, and the next driving from their homes the children of the soil, whom they have bound themselves to protect by the most solemn treaties.*

it will be yours forever

When he published *Democracy in America* in 1835, Alexis de Tocqueville described the policy which the States and the Federal government pursued: *The Union treats the Indians with less cupidity and violence than the several States, but the two governments are alike deficient in good faith. The States extend what they call the benefits of their laws to the Indians, believing that the tribes will recede rather than submit to them; and the central government, which promises a permanent refuge to these unhappy beings in the West, is well aware of its inability to secure it to them.* ⁷ *Thus the tyranny of the States obliges the savages to retire; the Union, by its promises and resources, facilitates their retreat; and these measures tend to precisely the same end.* [cf. nasty cop and nice cop working in tandem]

⁷ *This does not prevent them from promising in the most solemn manner to do so. See the letter addressed to the Creek Indians, 23rd March, 1829: BEYOND THE GREAT RIVER MISSISSIPPI, WHERE A PART OF YOUR NATION HAS GONE, YOUR FATHER HAS PROVIDED A COUNTRY LARGE ENOUGH FOR ALL OF YOU, AND HE ADVISES YOU TO REMOVE TO IT. THERE YOUR WHITE BROTHERS WILL NOT TROUBLE YOU; THEY WILL HAVE NO CLAIM TO THE LAND, AND YOU CAN LIVE UPON IT, YOU AND ALL YOUR CHILDREN, AS LONG AS THE GRASS GROWS, OR THE WATERS RUN, IN PEACE AND PLENTY. IT WILL BE YOURS FOREVER. The Secretary of War, in a letter written to the Cherokees, April 18th, 1829, declares to them that they cannot expect to retain possession of the lands at that time occupied by them, but gives them the most positive assurance of uninterrupted peace if they would remove beyond the Mississippi; as if the power which could not grant them protection then, would be able to afford it them hereafter !*

Note YOUR FATHER--the Great White Father, who adds blasphemy to genocide. Who is this Person ? Do we not know him still ? Is He not still at the center of the American Cult ? As we shall see.

The Faithless Empire

De Tocqueville notes that: *The fifth article of the treaty made with the Creeks in August 1790, is in the following words: THE UNITED STATES SOLEMNLY GUARANTEE TO THE CREEK NATION ALL THEIR LAND WITHIN THE LIMIT OF THE UNITED STATES. The seventh article of the treaty concluded in 1791 with the Cherokees says: THE UNITED STATES SOLEMNLY GUARANTEE TO THE CHEROKEE NATION ALL THEIR LANDS NOT HEREBY CEDED.* De Tocqueville is pointing to the faithless character of the American government and its false promises to those who did not have the power to make them keep their promise. That same point can be made over and over as one solemn treaty after another was junked. It is still the character of the American empire as many people have learned the hard way. (Kurds and Shia Moslems 1991) There is no honor among thieves or among empires.

De Tocqueville adds: *The United States pledge themselves to maintain them there; but the territory which they now occupy was formerly secured to them by the most solemn oaths. The American government does not indeed now rob them of their lands, but it allows perpetual encroachments on them. In a few years, the same white population which now flocks around them will doubtless track them anew to the solitudes of the Arkansas; they will then be exposed to the same evils, without the same remedies; and as the limits of the earth will at last fail them, their only refuge is the grave.* As he predicted, the Indian Territory to which they were removed in what is now Oklahoma and Arkansas was opened to white settlement in 1889. Then De Tocqueville notes how their settlements were attacked: *See in the Legislative Documents (21st Congress, No 89) instances of excesses of every kind committed by the whites upon the territory of the Indians, either in taking possession of a part of their lands, until compelled to retire by the troops of Congress, or carrying off their cattle, burning their houses, cutting down their corn, and doing violence to their persons.* The American People were worse than their government.

The Lust for Land

Is America the **LAND THAT I LOVE** ? It looks more like lust than love. It clearly is a destructive appetite that devours those who get in the way. It is an *Epidemical madness* and *depraved appetite* which possesses the Americans. De Tocqueville points out that *The Georgians, who are so much troubled by the proximity of the Indians, inhabit a territory which does not at present contain more than seven inhabitants to the square mile.* He concludes that *If we consider the*

tyrannical measures which have been adopted by the legislatures of the Southern States, the conduct of their Governors, and the decrees of their courts of justice, we shall be convinced that the entire expulsion of the Indians is the final result to which all the efforts of that part of the Union look with jealousy upon the lands which the natives still possess. And he is singling out the Southern States only because they were belatedly doing what the Northern States had already done.

There were those, few in number, who did what they could to help the Indians, like the missionaries who were imprisoned for trying to help the Cherokees of Georgia. When Nicholas Cresswell made his trip to the Ohio Country in 1775, the only place he found with a claim to *civilization* was the *Dellawar* Indian town built by Moravian Brethren missionaries on the banks of the Muskingham river: (105-106 Sunday, August 27th 1775) *a pretty town consisting of about sixty houses, and is built of logs and covered with Clapboards. It is regularly laid out in three spacious streets which meet in the centre, where there is a large meeting house built of logs sixty foot square covered with Shingles, Glass in the windows and a Bell, a good plank floor with two rows of forms. . . . In the evening went to the meeting. But never was I more astonished in my life. I expected to have seen nothing but anarchy and confusion, as I have been taught to look upon these beings with contempt. Instead of that, here is the greatest regularity, order, and decorum, I ever saw in any place of Worship, in my life. With that solemnity of behaviour and modest, religious deportment would do honour to the first religious society on earth, and put a bigot or enthusiast out of countenance.* Back in Virginia, Cresswell had often encountered an absence of Sunday services in the decaying state-supported Anglican Church: 52 Sunday, January 1st, 1775. *The Parson is drunk and can't perform the duties of his office.* 59 Sunday, March 19th, 1775. *The Parson is too lazy to preach.* 60 Sunday, April 2nd, 1775. *But no Parson. It is a shame to suffer these people to neglect their duty in the manner they do.* The Moravians did not allow the sexual exploitation of Indian women which was common among the frontiersmen. Cresswell himself had a temporary squaw that he left behind when he returned to Virginia. In 1782, these peaceful Christian Indians were martyred by an American militia from Pennsylvania, which executed 96 of them in cold blood, after they had spent the night in prayer.

VIII THE COMPOST PATRIOT

THE PATRIOT movie is a good illustration of how fake history is used to prop up the false faith of the American Cult. This *composite* portrayal of a real historical figure can be accurately described as **COMPOSTED HISTORY**. Big fibs dressed up as Great Truths. Like the compost pile, it has several layers of lies. The original partisan history was made into a patriotic fiction by Parson Weems. Then the script writers layered in more patriotic propaganda plus the usual Hollywood cliches. The movie is *based upon a true story*--which they turned into a false story.

The real *PATRIOT*, Lieutenant Colonel Francis Marion of South Carolina, never met General Cornwallis, never captured his hounds, never fooled him with straw men, never blew up a ship in the harbor in full view of a dinner party. He won no battles and was not present at either Cowpens or Yorktown. Contra the movie, he never had a hand to hand combat with *Colonel Tavington* (= Colonel Tarleton). *THE PATRIOT* was a bachelor who **had no children** and defending or avenging his sons had nothing to do with his motives for participating in the war, contra the movie, where **the entire plot hinges on this fabrication**. He did marry his cousin Mary Videau after the war was over and he used her fortune to rebuild his plantation. But she was almost 50 by then and they never did have any children.

In 1759, Marion accompanied Governor William Lyttleton on a trip into Cherokee Indian country to survey the prospects. In 1760 he joined a military expedition in which a British and colonial army spent 30 days systematically burning the Cherokee villages. The Cherokees were not able to put up any effective resistance as their towns and crops were burned and their livestock driven off. His membership in the plantation aristocracy and the South Carolina legislature allowed him to get in on the land grants which required **INDIAN REMOVAL**. In the summer and fall of 1776, while Washington's army retreated across New England, the **PATRIOTS** of South Carolina launched another war against the Cherokees. The departure of the British had freed them to pursue the lands they coveted. That is how they defined **LIBERTY**: freedom to take the Indian lands where they could establish their slave plantations.

The war against the Indians was energetically pursued even while the war against the British was almost abandoned for lack of soldiers. The American militia, which had proven to be no match for the British regulars, found war against the poorly armed Indians much safer. Colonel Evan Shelby burned the towns of the *Cherokees and Chuccamogga* in western Virginia while Colonel John Bowman destroyed the Shawnee towns in the Ohio River Valley. These American military commanders systematically burned the Indian towns and allowed the soldiers to loot everything they had. Shelby's men took 25,000 pounds worth of goods from the Indians--four million dollars worth in modern money. The excuse for the war against the Indians is that they had accepted military aid from the British, but they were only trying to hang on to the home land from which the rapacious Americans obviously intended to expel them. The Patriots used the Revolutionary War to accelerate the policy of Indian Extermination and Removal which was apparent long before the War began. Despite the critical setbacks to the American cause in the Carolinas and the threat to Virginia itself, 300 new recruits were sent to join the Virginia Regiment at Pittsburgh instead of to reinforce the Southern front. [Letter from Thomas Jefferson, James Madison and the Virginia Executive Council to General George Washington, June 19th 1779 in Smith, *Republic of Letters*, I 78-79] Very likely, they would have mutinied and dispersed had they been sent to fight the British. Without the French, and until they finally arrived in late 1781, the American cause was all but abandoned by rank and file recruits whose morale had vanished. Recruiters who attempted to raise more soldiers in Virginia to fight the British were violently mistreated and forced to give it up.

In 1778, even while his army continue to retreat, Washington sent an expedition commanded by (Masonic *Brother*) General John Sullivan against the Six Nations in western New York. [Senecas, Cayugas, Onondagas et al] They marched across the state, destroying the Indian villages as they went. Forty towns, with their gardens and fruit trees were devastated and over 100,000 bushels of corn destroyed. General Sullivan was called by the Indians the *Town Destroyer*. At the close of the Revolution, these Indians moved to Canada leaving their old homes forever--leaving the land open for the white settlers. They fought against the Americans because they had no real choice, because it was their last hope for holding on to their homes. After the war, James Madison and James Monroe were among those who invested in land on the Mohawk River. In a letter to Thomas Jefferson in Paris, dated August 12th 1786, Madison invites him to join with them and says that Washington would invest if he had the money to spare. (*Republic of Letters* I 428 James Morton Smith) The sale of land taken from the Indians paid the debts of the new federal government of the United States (cf. letters from Madison to Jefferson 3-19-87 and 4-23-87 and Jefferson to Madison 6-20-1787 and 12-20-1787) which was thereby founded upon the perpetuation of a great injustice.

land speculators

It wasn't just that the settlers took land from the Indians or that some of them took huge estates. The rapacious and destructive character of the Great Land Hunt was greatly aggravated by the fact that so many were involved in it as speculators. Men with money in America and England and France and the rest of Europe sought to get hold of tracts of land in America with the help of Americans and through influence with the legislatures. So Jefferson in Paris sends a letter of recommendation to Madison along with Monsieur de Warville and then tells him in code: *I do not know Warville's business in America. I suspect him to be agent of a company on some speculation of lands. Perhaps you might connect him usefully in what yourself and Monroe had proposed.* (letter of 5-3-1788). Because the speculators got hold of large tracts and held onto it indefinitely while waiting for a rise in price, the poorer class of land seeking settlers had to go well beyond the still vacant tracts held by the speculators to find land they could afford out on the frontier. The speculators of Europe and America greatly magnified the situation in which Indians were forced off their tribal lands far beyond the boundaries of existing settlements, and far beyond the real needs of any of those who intended to settle there. And it got worse. In the 19th century, huge tracts of western land were given to Railroad and Timber Companies which bribed the legislators who passed the bills. The new governments of the United States seamlessly incorporated the old corruption of the pre Revolution State Assemblies and the gross corruption of the British Parliament and the French aristocracy. Of

course the speculator needed political influence as well as money to speculate successfully in land, but one bought the other. The land wasn't worth much until the army cleared it of the *ABORIGINES* who *ENCUMBERED* it. Then the sheriff had to clear it of the poor white squatters.

These *patriot* land speculators were supposedly the architects of a new and better social order. How will it be better when it is based upon the old, old principles of *making money off money* and *owning for a living*, while taking advantage of all those who have been forcibly expelled or defrauded or excluded? The New World was already deeply corrupted by the principles and practices of the Old, and the patriot land speculators perpetuated that corruption.

land, lots of land

There is one reference to the great land hunt in *THE PATRIOT* movie: *the new aristocracy will be landowners* Cornwallis tells *Tavington*. He responds: *tell me about Ohio*. This is a sop thrown to historical accuracy and implies that the British officers were interested in the land there. No doubt they were, just like the *PATRIOTS*, who were already a land and slave owning aristocracy supposedly motivated by some sort of idealism--a love for **Freedom-combined-with-Slavery**, and a **LOVE OF COUNTRY** which meant *land, lots of tobacco land, under starry skies above, Don't Fence Me In!* (But make sure of those *hobbles* on my work force.) The pursuit of western real estate was a primary cause of the War. The British officers must have been aware of the fortunes to be made, but there is no doubt that it was a major motivation of the *PATRIOTS*.

In the north also, the pursuit of large tracts of land played a major role in the War. The *Green Mountain Boys* of Vermont were land speculators first and patriots second or third. As Morison and Commager relate: "Although the Allen brothers [Ethan, Ira and Levi] used the vocabulary of patriotism and spoke glibly of oppression, tyranny and sacred liberties, they and their numerous followers were primarily interested in land. The Allen family controlled a land company which claimed title to over 300,000 acres in central Vermont, and Ethan himself thus stated their position: *He and his family have large fortunes which they do not intend to lose, if there is a possibility of saving them. At all risks, he is determined that Congress shall not have the parcelling of his Lands to their avaricious Minions.* That this event should not come to pass they carried on intrigues with Governor Haldimand of Canada, looking to a guarantee of independence in return for neutrality during the war, or even a return to the British Empire after the war. Like true Vermonters, they acted with such silent shrewdness that only recently [= 1942] have the archives revealed their doings. In 1789 Levi Allen went to London to obtain a commercial treaty, and offered *to raise a regiment of Green Mountain boys for His Majesty's service.*" (I 251-252) Their basic problem was that New York and New Hampshire both claimed Vermont and refused to recognize it as an independent state. The Allens finally got the deal they wanted from the Congress and became the 14th state in 1791. But the *patriotism* of the *Green Mountain Boys* was tied to what they needed for their success in the Great Land Hunt. Like *true Vermonters* and *true Patriots* everywhere, their bottom line was the bottom line.

THE PATRIOT, Colonel Francis Marion, was a slave owner first to last and the blacks on his plantation were slaves, not freed men working for wages, contra the movie script where they say: *we're not slaves we're freedmen*. He was no Quaker and he never freed his slaves. The black who accompanied him during the war was a slave, his personal servant and cook, and he remained a slave after the war was over, contra the movie version that he is there as a volunteer and that he is earning his freedom by fighting against the British. He wasn't and he didn't. That is simply **DISHONEST PATRIOTIC PROPAGANDA** and the movie is full of it. Slaves were a major part of the wealth of men like Marion and necessary to working the plantations they owned. How could they work those huge plantations by themselves in an age of mule drawn plows? How could they afford hired labor, when they had to compete with those who used unpaid slave labor? In the movie, the fictional negro fighter is shown cheering the new American flag along with the others. If he did, he was an idiot. That flag stood for the continuation of his slavery.

Governor Dunmore, the last British governor of Virginia, issued a declaration of martial law on November 7th 1775 which included a provision that all slaves belonging to rebels would be freed if they fought for the king. In response, Patrick Henry immediately sent messengers to warn the plantation owners to mount patrols lest their slaves hear of the declaration and attempt to take advantage of the offer, as many of them did during the ensuing war. There is an obvious irony in the fact that those who were rebelling in the name of *LIBERTY* were at the same time so anxious to thwart any attempt by their slaves to liberate themselves.

In his first draft of the *Declaration of Independence* Jefferson included an indictment of King George III for somehow or other being responsible for negro slavery in the American colonies. But the other plantation owners nixed it. He did substitute *Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness* for *Life, Liberty, and Property*, which had been used by George Mason in the Virginia Declaration of Rights, and which meant their right to ALL their property, which was mainly large plantations and the slaves needed to work them. That was the reality, contra Jefferson's idealistic pretence, which he didn't really believe himself, as the rest of his life illustrates. The real attitude of all the Virginians is shown by the energy with which they did everything in their power to prevent their slaves from being freed. On December 10th 1779, Governor Thomas Jefferson and Councillor James Madison, along with the rest of the Virginia Executive Council, sent out a *resolution for purchasing Slaves to carry on the West Ham Foundary*. They were building a munitions factory near Richmond with French help. (Smith *Letters* I 119) These slaves would be the property of the State of Virginia and take the place of free labor at the munitions factory. Why couldn't they employ free labor, if they were serious about moving away from slavery? Three years after the Declaration of Independence and the writing of a new Constitution for Virginia and in the middle of the War for "Freedom" they thought nothing of making their State an Owner of Slaves.

No Black Soldiers

George Washington flatly rejected the idea of negro soldiers, whether slave or free, until near the end of the war, when the situation was desperate. He agreed to the formation of one regiment in Rhode Island of already freed blacks, now conscripted as soldiers. But the black slaves of the South had no chance at receiving personal liberty from their masters by fighting on the patriot side. As far as the patriots of Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina and Virginia were concerned, the Revolutionary War was being fought to protect slavery--their property in slaves--not to abolish it.

Even when they were desperate for soldiers, South Carolina **REJECTED WITH CONTEMPT** the proposal to put negroes into the army. In fact they did not dare give arms to the slaves, who outnumbered the whites of South Carolina 2 to 1 and who were joining the British, if they could escape from their Masters. They may have been illiterate, but they weren't stupid enough to fight for the Patriotic Plantation Owners who kept them in chains. Thousands of Carolina slaves fled to the British lines where they were promised freedom. Sometimes the promise was kept. Like the rest of the Continental army, Marion used confiscated slaves to pay his militia men in lieu of the almost worthless Continental dollars. (In 1781, a blanket sold for 2100 Continental dollars, a coat sold for 6210 Continentals.) Volunteers were promised one grown negro slave as an inducement to enlist, the slaves being taken from the plantations of those who remained loyal to Britain. After the war the Assembly passed a bill to protect Patriot officers from claims against them for property they confiscated during the war.

no property was safe

In fact, no one's property was safe. If you were a loyalist it was forfeit, if you were a patriot you couldn't begrudge it. A letter from Frances Marion to Major John Postell, written December 30th 1780, instructs him to: *proceed with a party down Black River, from Black Mingo to the Mouth of the Pee Dee, and come up to this place; you will take all the boats and canoes from Euhaney up, and impress negroes to bring them to camp; put some men to see them safe; you will take every horse, to whomsoever he may belong, whether friend or foe. You will take all arms and ammunition for the use of our service. You will forbid all persons from carrying any grains, stock or any sort of provision for Georgetown, or where the enemy may get them, on the pain of being held as traitors and enemies to the Americans. All persons who will not join you, you will take prisoners and bring to me. You will return as soon as possible. Let me know any intelligence you may gain of the enemy's strength or movements. . . . N.B. You will bring up as much rice and salt in the boats as possible.* A Jan 29th 1781 letter from Marion to Postell tells him to go after the stores at Wadboo bridge and Monck's Corner and to *Take care that your men do not get at liquor, or clog themselves with plunder so as to endanger their retreat.* Postell and his men "surrounded a guarded supply train . . . seized eleven wagons loaded with clothing, blankets and other equipment. Some of the captured loot was used to replenish the tattered wardrobes of Marion's men. The rest was sold and the proceeds divided among the raiders." (Williams & Epstein biography) Frances Marion and his brigade have been glamorized as the bane of the British army in South Carolina. The truth seems to be that the patriot raiders rarely bothered the British army, preferring easier targets. They were the bane of the farms and plantations. They took food, slaves and livestock, and burned the homes of those that refused to join them. It was characteristic of the Revolutionary War, as of all wars, that armed robbery was in effect decriminalized, on land and sea. *Letters of marque* from the Congress allowed *privateers* to operate against British commercial shipping, and the British and French did the same. **Piracy was now patriotism.** Piracy may seem picturesque from the distance of two centuries but up close it was armed robbery usually accompanied by rape and murder.

The British captured Charleston, South Carolina May 12th 1780 without meeting any serious resistance. There is a peculiar story about Marion spraining an ankle when he jumped from a locked room in which his companions were forcing him to drink brandy. That was supposedly the reason that he left Charleston along with the other government officials before the British occupied the town. Like most of the true stories about Marion, it didn't make the movie. And that was the end of the war in South Carolina and Georgia, except for a few bands of partisans, like Marion's. His small band of irregulars were looters rather than fighters and nearly all of them had switched sides more than once. They had no interest in serious battles. Marion, who was always short of men, allowed all sorts to join him without questioning their motives. They were not the Motivated Patriots who show up in the movie. Marion was famous for his escapes rather than for his fighting, but he was the only thing resembling a patriotic hero in the Carolinas, which is why Weems produced a *romance* about him--to have something to sell the southerners.

'tis your romance.

Mason L. Weems, an itinerant book peddler, writer and sometimes preacher, wrote the account of *The Life of General Francis Marion* published in 1809 upon which the movie is based--which the movie uses as a point of departure for its own creation of a patriotic fantasy. (Marion was a Lieutenant Colonel, not a General.) Weems account was loosely based upon a history by Peter Horry who had been one of Marion's companions. And Weems put Horry's name on the title page along with his own. But after Horry read the book he remarked: *Most certainly 'tis not my history, but your romance.* Even Weems would have blushed for the fictions put into the

movie based upon his book. Weems was also the author of an original hagiography of George Washington. It is authentic history like Washington's teeth and hair and Christian faith were authentic. But this movie surpasses Weems in its shameless disregard for true history. He might well exclaim: *I may be a liar but this stuff is ridiculous !* No doubt they assumed that the American public wouldn't know the difference and wouldn't want to know the difference. Indeed, it is your Patriotic Duty to refuse to learn any real American History. Carefully protected ignorance is necessary to maintain the faith of a true believer in the American Cult.

The patriotic falsehoods of the *PATRIOT* movie are typical of the cult piety found in patriotic comic books, pious tracts and sermons, and even many pseudo-scholarly books that pretend to be history. A current *e-mail*, widely reprinted, called **THE PRICE THEY PAID** gives false information about the Signers of the **Declaration of Independence**: *nine of the 56 signers of the Declaration died for the cause; five were captured; many were ruined by the war.* In fact, no signers were killed by the British. Two signers were injured by British troops. One, Richard Stockton of New Jersey, was imprisoned for having signed the Declaration of Independence. Most prominent Patriots achieved wealth and power because of the War. Members of Congress received a salary from the French, as did Thomas Paine for producing his patriotic propaganda. Meanwhile, thousands of common men were killed in a War which brought them no profit. Their pay in Continental dollars, \$ 6.67 a month, was worth 16c by 1779.

the price they paid

Thousands of people were imprisoned by the Patriots as loyalists, or forced into exile, losing their homes and their businesses, which were taken by the *patriots*. To take just one example, Peter Oliver, the former Chief Justice of Massachusetts, as described in Volume II of the *Diary and Letters of Thomas Hutchinson* page 46: *had toiled through life in an honourable profession, not to his personal emolument, for he was yearly out of pocket by the mean and miserable acknowledgement he got for his labours where "even the Door-keeper had a larger stipend;" he had been driven from the bench "for receiving his salary from the King;" his estate soon to be confiscated and his house burnt--his only crime being his fidelity to the King and to the laws he had sworn to obey. Lastly, he was driven out of America.* The Quakers were arrested for circulating anti war tracts and imprisoned for refusing military conscription and several of them died in prison. Their businesses were shut down when they refused to accept the new Continental currency. Thomas Nelson Jr. was financially ruined by the war but so were thousands of people, loyalists and patriots alike, whose property was confiscated by the American government or taken by *patriot* raiders. Any honest reckoning of **THE PRICE THEY PAID** has to begin with the Cherokees who were permanently driven from their homes by the **PATRIOTS** and the slaves of the **PATRIOTS**, whose life long bondage was insured by this War for **LIBERTY**.

The fact is that most of the prominent patriots of the time fought the war from a safe distance, made money off the war, and built political careers out of the war, just like they do today. **The further from the front line, the hotter the fire of patriotism.** The war profiteer always pretends to be a great patriot. Jefferson lost some slaves when the British freed them, but the war launched him into a political career at the highest level. Both Thomas Jefferson and James Madison were appointed Colonels of the new patriot regiments in their counties in 1775, by the so-called *Committee of Safety*, but neither one saw any combat. Patrick Henry was another commander of militia who never fought a battle--he had too much else to do. Fortyish widower and Governor Patrick Henry married the young woman his son John was in love with while John was fighting the battle of Saratoga. John left the army when he got the news. It is one of the most under-reported stories in the biographies of Patrick Henry. It must have inspired the classic American **DEAR JOHN LETTER**: *Dear John: Could not wait for you so have married your father. Love, Mother.*

Filmgoers who saw *THE PATRIOT* stick a bayonet into *Colonel Tavington* in the final reel might be surprised to learn that Colonel Tarleton (his real name) survived the war and wrote an account of it: Lieutenant Colonel Banastre Tarleton *History of the Campaign of 1780-1781 in the Southern Province of America*, published in London in 1787, and re-printed in 1968. It is partisan history, of course, but it is an actual history and a far more truthful account than anything produced by Parson Weems or Hollywood. He admits to being defeated by Colonel Dan Morgan at the battle of *COWPENS* in North Carolina. The American commander persuaded the militia to fire a second volley before they took off. Since it took a minute to re-load their muskets, their usual habit was to fire once and then get out of there. Tarleton's dragoons charged the militia, whom they despised, but ran into an ambush of regular Continental troops.

the devil couldn't catch him

Colonel Tarleton's closest personal encounter with the real *PATRIOT* took place when Marion once eluded him by escaping on horseback at night 40 miles through a South Carolina swamp whose trails he knew. That was the time that Tarleton gave him the moniker by which he is known to history: *as for this Swamp Fox, the devil himself could not catch him !* It was a tribute to his fleeing ability rather than to his fighting ability.

Marion commanded his brigade from the rear, like any commander who intends to survive the war-- ***forward ! they cried from the rear, and the front line died.*** A general who capers around on a snow white horse out in front of the enemy, as George Washington, Napoleon et al are pictured as doing, makes a hard to miss target for the sharpshooters on the other side, unless, like Weems' George Washington, he is miraculously bullet proof. Not only will he not survive the war, he won't survive the battle if he behaves that way. The general saves his white horse for parade days. In 1814 the British General Robert Ross told his host: *I shall sup in Baltimore tonight, or in hell* and rode off on his white charger. The Baltimore riflemen got word of it and Ross did not survive the day. (Morgan biography of Monroe)

Marion was once challenged to a personal duel by the British commander McLeroth. But, as Williams and Epstein relate: *The unusual suggestion could hardly have appealed to Marion. He had never been a warrior of the swashbuckling type, eager to display his own prowess.* He made a counter proposal, 20 of his men against 20 of the British, but nothing came of that either. He is described as *a small, thin, quiet man with a narrow, thoughtful face.* He was 44 in 1776 when the war began. His specialty was hit and run raids to capture the supplies they needed. Judging from his surviving letters he took them wherever he found them, from raiding towns and plantations as well as from British supply depots.

As for Colonel Banastre Tarleton, by all accounts including his own he was a somewhat reckless cavalry officer who commanded a troop of *rangers* recruited from loyalists in New York and the Carolinas. New York furnished more volunteers to George III than to George Washington. Some 30,000 volunteers from Georgia and the Carolinas are said to have joined the British. Tarleton's book gives an *Extract of a letter from Earl Cornwallis to Sir Henry Clinton, dated Camp at Wynnesborough, December 3, 1780* which reads: *Colonel Marion had so wrought on the minds of the people, partly by the terror of his threats and cruelty of his punishments, and partly by the promise of plunder, that there was scarcely an inhabitant between the Santee and Pedee, that was not in arms against us. Some parties had even crossed the Santee, and carried terror to the gates of Charles town. My first object was to reinstate matters in the quarter, without which Camden could receive no supplies. I therefore sent Tarleton, who pursued Marion for several days, obliged his corps to take to the swamps, and by convincing the inhabitants that there was a power*

superior to Marion, who could likewise reward and punish, so far checked the insurrection, that the greatest part of them have not dared to appear in arms against us since his expedition. Whether a man is a **TERRORIST** looter or a **FREEDOM FIGHTER** depends upon who is telling the story.

the real Colonel

The *Colonel Tavington* of the movie is depicted as a cold blooded killer who burns down a church full of civilians. That is a slander on the real Colonel Tarleton whose descendents should sue the movie makers. The worst thing his contemporaries accused him of was responsibility for a slaughter of 100 Virginia militia men, for which they gave him the nickname of *Butcher Tarleton*. His own explanation of the *Action at Wacsaw* against Colonel Buford is that his horse was shot out from under him early in the engagement and his rangers, thinking him killed, were taking a merciless revenge upon the fleeing Virginians, before he was able to find another mount and restrain the slaughter. In his book, Tarleton claims that he did all he could to stop the slaughter and obtain medical care for the survivors. He later relates an incident in which two British soldiers were called from the ranks and shot when they were accused of a rape. Whether that was typical or not, it does appear that the British regulars had a better discipline than the American irregulars, who were often the worst ruffians in the colonies and almost entirely lacking in discipline. On several occasions, Marion's partisans hung captured prisoners--supposedly behind his back. The movie shows three men hung by the British, which probably happened, but the patriots did the same or worse. Contra official pretensions, the cold blooded killing of disarmed prisoners was common in this war as in every war. America's war lord allies are doing it right now in Afghanistan, while Americans pretend to be looking the other way. It was common American practice in Vietnam. (*Vietnam section*)

No one wanted to fight Tarleton. In Virginia, in May 1781, Patrick Henry and the other Virginia Assemblymen fled from Charlottesville when they got word of Tarleton's Raiders approaching. He captured seven of the slowest ones. Governor Thomas Jefferson was forced to leave his breakfast half finished when they arrived at the outskirts of Monticello. The Raiders burned his crops and freed 30 of his slaves. Tarleton's account says: *Seven members of assembly were secured: The attempt to secure Mr. Jefferson was ineffectual; he discovered the British dragoons from his house, which stands on the point of a mountain, before they could approach him, and he provided for his personal liberty by a precipitate retreat.* Jefferson spent the remainder of the war out of office and far from the front. The Virginia Legislature, instigated by Patrick Henry, subsequently investigated his conduct, but he was belatedly acquitted. In fact, he didn't do anything the rest hadn't. He never forgave Henry.

Edmund Pendleton prevented the treasurer from leaving until he had accepted a large bag of soon to be worthless Virginia currency to discharge a lien on an estate. *Such terror & confusion you have no idea of . . . Governor, Council, everybody scampering* the state treasurer's daughter, Betsy Ambler, wrote. An old woman accosted some of the Assemblymen who were fleeing over the mountains to Staunton: *Ride on, you cowardly knaves!* Her husband and sons had gone to Charlottesville to fight, and she would feed no deserters until she learned that Patrick Henry was one of them. (Mayer) He wasn't interested in either **LIBERTY OR DEATH** on that particular day. Earlier, he had resigned the governorship and moved his family to his Leatherwood plantation, 200 miles away from the Virginia coast which was now at the mercy of the British. It must have appeared to many Virginians that the war was lost, before the French finally arrived in force in late 1781. They had launched the attempt at Revolution in the first place only because they had the secret assurance of all out support from the French Empire. But fulfillment of the promise was a long time coming. At last, two French navies and two French armies carried Washington's French-financed American army over the finish line at Yorktown in October 1781. But earlier in the same year, Virginia had lost the ability to even pretend to try and defend its capital. Or capitals--they had to move it several times. Those who attempted to recruit more soldiers in Virginia were violently repulsed. Before Yorktown, it had been 4 years and 9 months since Washington's army had anything even resembling a success--the attack on a reserve force at Princeton January 3rd 1777 after they dodged the main British

army. His army was still in the field only because of French money to pay his regulars and a whole French army of reinforcements which accompanied his army on the march from Pennsylvania to Yorktown, Virginia, when he was summoned there by the French Admiral.

defending our children

The basic **BIG LIE** in the movie is that *THE PATRIOT* had to go to war in defense of his children and / or to avenge his children. At first, the movie patriot, *Benjamin Martin*, declines a military commission because he is a widower with 7 children. But then, when the British raid his farm, kill one of his sons and take another son prisoner, he is forced to fight. That is always the **BASIC BIG LIE** about war: we only do it because it is necessary to defend our children. This part of the *composite* or **COMPOST PATRIOT** is based upon George Mason, a widower with nine children, who declined for that reason to become a delegate to the Continental Congress in 1775. He made a *heartrending* speech to the Virginia convention, declining the appointment, and that was the end of it. He went home and nobody bothered him. Unless maybe his nine children were some bother. He probably wished at times that he had enlisted. Frances Marion had no children. He was a member of the South Carolina legislature and, when the war broke out, he immediately accepted an officer's commission in the Continental Army. Whatever his motivations, they had nothing to do with taking care of his children, protecting them from the war, protecting them from the British, avenging their deaths etc. That is, *Benjamin Martin's* basic motives did not exist for the real *PATRIOT*. It is a **BIG PATRIOTIC PRETENSE**.

DEFENDING OUR CHILDREN is always the excuse for those wars in which so many children are killed. *Why are our soldiers fighting on the other side of the world, father? Why, to protect the children of America, Popsy. They have to drop bombs on the children there to protect the children here. That is always why we go to war--to protect our children.* Patriotic lies conceal the **CHILD MURDER** which is the fundamental character of war. It defines war.

IX Child Sacrifice to the Goddess Of Liberty

When the American army surrounded Boston in 1776 they began shelling the town to drive the British out. The *Journal* of one of Washington's staff officers, Colonel Samuel Webb, describes the effect on the civilians trapped in the town: page 132 entry for Saturday March 2nd 1776 *from my window have a most pleasing and yet dismal View of the firey Ministers of Death flying thro the Air, poor inhabitants our friends we pity most sincerely, but particularly the Women & Children.* page 134 entry for Tuesday, March 5th 1776 *Last night at 7 oClock we began a heavy Cannonade on the Town of Boston, from our Forts on Cobble-Hill, Lechmore's Point, & Lamb's Dam on Roxbury side . . . Our Shell rak'd the houses terribly and the Crys of poor Women and Children frequently reach'd our Ears,--we would that they were out of the Devoted Capital, but tis not in our power.* Of course they couldn't call off the shelling just because kids were getting hit. The cause was too **NOBLE**. They *pitied them most sincerely* but not sincerely enough to stop firing shells into the houses. In fact the British had already decided to quit Boston because they thought it unsuitable as a base for the war. But the civilians killed and crippled in the shelling, if they were **PATRIOTS**, could take comfort in the fact that their involuntary sacrifice had helped push the British to do it a few weeks sooner than they otherwise would have, thus allowing the patriot army to claim a victory.

Colonel Webb quotes an exhortation from General Washington given to the soldiers a few days earlier: *On our present conduct depends the Salvation of America. It is a noble Cause we are engaged in, it is the cause of virtue and mankind; every temporal advantage and comfort to us, and our posterity depends upon the vigor of our exertions; in short, Freedom or Slavery must be the result of our conduct.* This from a slave owner. Quote from Dr. Samuel Johnson: *How is it that we hear the loudest yelps for liberty among the drivers of Negroes?* But never mind slavery, it is the terrible evil of a tax on tea which must be immediately ended for the sake of **THE SALVATION OF AMERICA**. If kids get killed as a result of *the vigor of our exertions* it is a Necessary Evil. The *cause of virtue and mankind* is such a *noble Cause* that we must accept it. That is how statesmen

reason and the people love and admire them for their noble ideals. Can't you see the **GOLDEN GRANDEUR** of our vision ? If your smelly brats get in the way of it, too bad, but our eyes remain fixed upon the glory of the *noble Cause*. *THE SALVATION OF AMERICA* still depends upon child murder, upon sacrificing children to Moloch. The **PATRIOT** sheds crocodile tears over the murdered children and then keeps on with it.

That was one of the few opportunities that the Patriots had to fire cannons into a city in the Revolutionary War. But it shows the spirit in which that war was fought. Two months earlier, the rebels burned and looted Norfolk, Virginia, and then blamed it on the British. The same spirit appears in all of America's wars, patriotic pretences to the contrary. In respect to the Korean War, the *Battle Report* put out by the Pentagon bluntly states: *We killed civilians, friendly civilians, and bombed their homes; fired whole villages with their occupants--women and children and 10 times as many hidden communist soldiers--under showers of napalm.* (quoted in John Omicinski column 6-14-00) I don't suppose they dug down to verify that *communist soldiers* had been hiding among the *friendly civilians* in a 10 to 1 ratio, but so long as you can reasonably assume that you are killing enemy soldiers along with the kids, what else can you do ? Even a 1 to 10 ratio would still be justified in this kind of logic, wouldn't it ? The *noble Cause* calls for child sacrifice as usual. War is heck, after all. Don't hesitate to drop the *napalm* on the women and kids if there is a chance to get the enemy that way.

tackling the bully

In a 1983 address, the prominent Christian author Dr. Francis Schaeffer gave his version of the popular justification for war: *The morality of war comes down to this: Suppose you were walking down the right side of a street one night, and coming toward you on the other side was a cute little 6-year-old girl. She was skipping along alone. Just as you were parallel to her, a big, burly six-foot man jumped out of the bushes and grabbed her. He began assaulting and abusing her. What would be your obligation to that child ? I submit that you should cross that street and put your life in jeopardy, if necessary, to save that little girl. That would be your moral responsibility. That is what we were doing by our military involvement in World War II. We were trying to save the defenseless little girls--the Jews, the Gypsies, the Poles and the others who were being killed, and to rescue those who were living in tyranny.*

This is the oldest, tiredest and sleaziest of all justifications for war. It is a prime example of how via **HYPOTHETICAL MORALITY** we erase the reality of war and replace it with a fantasy that justifies any atrocity. Why did American and British planes systematically bomb the civilian populations of Berlin, Hamburg, Dresden and other German cities ? Why to keep harm from coming to 6 year old girls of course ! That is how you do it. You kill 500,000 people and cripple another 500,000 so as to rescue this 6 year old girl ! You blow the limbs off thousands of little girls and bury them in the rubble of their homes because that is the Only Realistic Choice. But, **morally**, it all came about because of the **moral imperative** to protect this one little six year old girl. We can see her clearly can't we ? Even though she is imaginary. But we can't see all the little girls buried in the rubble of Berlin, Hamburg, Dresden etc., who were once real little girls, because of course we don't want to see them and we do not want to see what we really did to them with our bombs. Well, perhaps they weren't *cute*. And it is much easier to picture the one little girl, whom we saved, in our fantasy, than to picture those thousands of real little girls, killed and crippled by American bombs, who are asking us why we did that to them.

On the trail of the terrorist

In his *Memoirs 1925-1950*, page 435, American ambassador George F. Kennan describes a March 1949 visit to the city of Hamburg where *more than 3000 bodies were estimated to be still in the rubble.* Some 70,000 people had been killed and half of the houses destroyed by allied bombing raids July 25th to 28th 1943. And Kennan remarks: *Here, for the first time, I felt an unshakable conviction that no momentary military advantage--even if such could have been calculated to exist--could have justified this stupendous, careless destruction of civilian life and of material values, built up laboriously by human hands over the course of centuries for purposes*

having nothing to do with war. Least of all could it have been justified by the screaming non sequitur: THEY DID IT TO US. Well, perhaps he never met the cute little hypothetical 6 year old girl who was saved by America doing this. In fact, the Germans did not do it to us, no doubt because they did not have the means. They did bomb London and other British cities, killing 60,000 civilians in the 1941 *Blitz*. Perhaps they have no complaint against us, but have we no complaint against ourselves, especially those of us who pretend to be *CHRISTIAN* ? What was the worst thing that Hitler did, if not the deliberate killing of children ? And what did we do in response except prove that our own standard of morality was identical to his ? We execrate the memory of the *terrorists* who *murdered* 3000 people when they destroyed two buildings in New York City. If that was *TERRORISM*, what is this ? If that was *MURDER*, what is this ? If destroying buildings full of people is *TERRORISM*, Uncle Sam is the worst *TERRORIST* the world has ever seen.

There is this further consideration: we pretend to be a democracy. Which means that we are responsible for what our government does in our name much more than those who live under a totalitarian regime over which they have no control. So the average German was much less to blame for what his government did than we are to blame for what our government did. And yet America inflicted capital punishment upon average Germans of both sexes and whatever age, without a trial, quite as if we could take it for granted that they unanimously and enthusiastically supported all the actions of Hitler's government. Which leads us to recognize that no reasonable moral case could be made against the population of Germany indiscriminately. The mass slaughter was driven, not by any moral judgment, but by that nationalistic hatred which is the back side of patriotism. We killed them in bunches because that is what you do in war. Any moral pretence is just that--a pretence. At Nuremberg, individuals were put on trial and evidence presented against them as to what they had done when they belonged to Hitler's government. They had the right to a lawyer and to present counter evidence. In Hamburg all were presumed guilty, given no chance to prove their innocence and punished accordingly. Judgment by war plane. If the bomb hits your house, it proves that you were guilty. (contra what Jesus says in Luke 13.1-5)

In Berlin, 40 percent of the housing was destroyed and 25 percent of the population was killed. When President Harry Truman drove through Berlin in late 1945, he said: *I never saw such destruction.* Multiply what happened to the World Trade Center by 10,000, and you get some idea of what it looked like. How would we classify someone who did that to one of our largest cities ? What REASON, short of criminal madness, could there be for doing it ? Those are only numbers of course. Publishing little obituaries of all those people, like the New York Times did for the World Trade Center victims, would take years. In Germany the bombing attacks were described as *terror raids from the air on our homes and so on our wives and children.* Is that not an accurate description ? Have the *TERRORISTS* done anything to us that we did not do to others ? And the killing wasn't the end of it. By the end of the war there were 50,000 orphans living like animals in holes in the rubble of the bombed out buildings of Berlin. The red army, America's ally, raped 100,000 women in occupied Berlin. The American occupation systematically starved captive Germans in the P.O.W. camps. (see below: *Eisenhower's Vendetta.*)

Doctor Dementia

In the mind of the Doctor of Secular Christian Ethics, the imaginary situation of the hypothetical little girl is the justification for vast military operations all over the world which killed 60 million people, two thirds of them civilians--women, children and old men. Her imaginary rescue becomes an absolute moral imperative which justifies anything and everything including dropping an atomic bomb on the Catholic primary school which was at *ground zero* in Hiroshima. And, to deal with that, we switch to a relative moral standard in which what happened to those real little boys and girls is swallowed in a theory of military necessity or lesser evil--we had to kill them in order to shorten the war and save the lives of American soldiers. In this calculus, instead of Americans laying down their lives to save little girls, our Hero burned up the lives of little girls to save the lives of Americans. **Instead of soldiers having to die to save little girls, little girls have to die to save soldiers.** Is this the same thing ? Well, perhaps the

Americans were *cuter* than the kids. What a murky moral mess patriotic Christians wander into when they set out to justify war ! Do you really need a *DOCTORATE* for this ? In Satanic Studies perhaps. A PhD in Patriotic Psychosis or Demented Demonism.

There was that same unheroic side to all the heroic battles in the Pacific. Of the 200,000 Japanese killed, when the Americans took Okinawa, most were women and children killed by the relentless bombing of the civilian population. The official line is that civilians were accidentally or unintentionally hit. It is one of the regular lies in war. The fact is that civilians are purposely targeted, for whatever reason--to destroy enemy morale, erode popular support for the war, and encourage rebellion, or because they have left over bombs to drop before they head back to base. Even when we insist that the population does not support the autocratic government, we treat them as if they did. In fact, it does not matter. Since they provide a bombing target, they are going to be bombed. We *LIBERATE* these oppressed people by incinerating them. Sometimes you have to incinerate people in order to liberate them.

The fall back position is that it is necessary to do this to shorten the war and save the lives of soldiers. If that is true, why pretend that war is anything except what it obviously is--an indiscriminate massacre of defenceless people trapped in a situation from which they have no escape. They may love their government or hate it. It doesn't matter. Whether that baby believes in his leader or not, he is fair game. When the Gallant Hero fights against the Evil Empire in the movies, he precisely targets the evil ones who staff it. The aim of the Lone Ranger is so precise that he shoots the gun out of the hand of the bandit. The *hero* of our wars doesn't have very good aim. He drops bombs on women and kids, whether they are friends or foes, because he is ordered to do it. Then he vomits in the cockpit afterwards and lies to himself and others the rest of his life. We help him do it. We insist upon him lying to us. If he won't, we seal his mouth and do our own lying.

destroy their towns

The destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were unique events only because of the use of atomic bombs for the first time in history. But the deliberate targeting of children and women and civilian men was typical of the war from first to last. General Doolittle's raid on Tokyo early in the war managed to drop bombs on the city of Tokyo, that is, on whoever was down there. By the time the atomic bombs were dropped in August of 1945, the cities of Japan had already been systematically bombed by American B 29s dropping conventional bombs and napalm. Half a million Japanese civilians had died in American air raids. In a March 10th 1945 raid, 1500 tons of napalm were dropped on Tokyo, incinerating 16 square miles, killing 83,000, injuring 41,000 and leaving a million homeless.

That is how wars are fought, contra official propaganda. It is essentially the policy that Governor Patrick Henry stated in respect to the Cherokees: **DESTROY THEIR TOWNS**. It is difficult and dangerous to track down the warrior. But his home, his family and his old folks, are easy targets. And *military necessity* dictates the attack on civilians despite the presumption that they are on our side. To prepare the way for the Normandy invasion, American and British planes systematically bombed railway lines, killing some 12,000 Belgian and French civilians whose death sentence was passed upon them because they lived near the railroad tracks. Such things are commonly done in war. They display the same **military mind set** that General Washington and Colonel Webb displayed in the shelling of Boston.

The Bully with the Bomb

Isn't a real man with a plane load of bombs suddenly appearing over a city analogous to the hypothetical *big, burly six-foot man who jumped out of the bushes* ? Aren't the little girls of Hiroshima, Nagasaki, Berlin, Frankfurt, Hamburg and Dresden etc. in the real position of the hypothetical little girl who is in terrible jeopardy, who is in need of rescuing ? And they could be rescued if those who pretend to be Christians did in fact have this absolute moral standard which they pretend to have, if they put down the flags they are waving and put down the hypothetical argument which grows out of the faith of a moral moron, that is, of a secular

Christian who is blinded by patriotism. If people who pretend to be Christians really did have an absolute moral standard in respect to killing kids they could never sanction war. And it isn't just that we stood by and did nothing while those kids were killed. WE DID THE KILLING ! WE ARE THE BULLY ! That is the one sure fact of this situation. The killing was real, it is an historical fact. The justifications for it are hypothetical, if they deserve to be called anything except stupid patriot lies.

The hypothetical justification for that war is that America thereby saved one or more little girls. The historical truth about that war is that America killed tens of thousands of little girls and boys who got in the way of our enormous fire power, who were sacrificed in a great crusade to make the world safe for Joe Stalin and the expansion of his Communist empire. America had to ignore the Red army raping a million women and girls all over Europe, because that was only incidental to the Big Fantasy Moral Picture in which America Rushed to the Rescue of one *CUTE* little girl. In Berlin alone, more than 100,000 women were raped by the Russian soldiers who occupied it. What did America do about it ? It concealed the fact from the American public. Just as it concealed rapes by American soldiers.

The careless or even deliberate killing of kids is in the very nature of war. A thousand civilians, half of them children, were killed by American bombs in the recent short war in Afghanistan. Was this a necessary part of the rescue ? What a clumsy knight who kills those he is supposed to be rescuing. Our American Hero does not want to take the risk of crossing the street to confront the bully in person, so he fires a super weapon from a safe distance and takes out the bully and the little girl both. It is called modern war.

Precision Weapons

The boast about the latest satellite guided missile is: *what window do you want it in ?* Supposedly it can hit within 40 feet of its target. In the latest Iraq war several of them came within 50 feet of the house in which Saddam Hussein and his son were hiding on April 8th 2003. They missed him but they destroyed 4 neighboring houses and killed 4 families, about 17 people in all. If the police destroyed four houses in your neighborhood, killing four families, including your own, while aiming at a crack house, would you give them credit for good intentions ? *Nice try fellows ! It's the thought that counts !* The complacent attitude towards this casual and carefree mayhem and murder, which happened ten thousand times in Vietnam, which happened hundreds of times in Afghanistan and Iraq, which happens every week in Israel, shows how quickly and easily all of the pretended moral limitations on killing get discarded even in minor wars or military police actions. Like Colonel Webb, we *pity most sincerely* those who unluckily built their houses in the middle of **Our Firing Range**. *Gee ! Sorry ! My Mistake ! Boy, Is My Face Red ! How did those little girls get into that house ? The enemy is up to his old tricks !*

There is a perennial illusion that some new weapon will change the character of war and fundamentally alter the moral issue. World War II propaganda boasted about the *Precision Bombing* made possible by the new bomb sight which could supposedly hit a 25 foot circle from 20,000 feet. So the air crews could drop their bombs in safety. In 1941 only 1 in 10 of the bombers found its way to within five miles of the assigned target. Most of the bombs wound up making craters in farm fields. By war's end 22,000 of the B-17 Flying Fortress had been shot down, killing 110,000 airmen. And they had long since adopted the policy of *area bombing* designed to *dehouse* the enemy--dropping bombs on cities, where you couldn't miss hitting something down there. (Paul Fussell *Wartime*.) Bad aim is aggravated by bad intelligence--that is why the Chinese embassy was bombed in Yugoslavia in 1999. And bad intentions. The old Roman sword was a precision weapon. You could only kill one person at a time and you had to get up close to do it. So you had to consider whom you were killing and why. It was nonetheless an age of indiscriminate slaughter and mass murder. Emperor Theodosius punished the residents of a Roman City in which a riot had occurred by tricking the populace into attending a show in the amphitheater. Then the gates were locked and the soldiers slaughtered those trapped inside the amphitheater systematically and indiscriminately. The Emperor displayed his power for the benefit of any who might venture to defy it. It is just the way people think when they wield the power of the sword. It explains what happened in Waco.

It isn't a question of sorting out the guilty from the innocent. **Let Them All Fear My Wrath ! That's for Nothing, So Watch Out ! Mess With America Will You ? !** How can you tell who is for you and who is against you when they all look alike ? Instead, you terrify all of them with a wanton display of murderous power. That was the conspicuous feature of the Vietnam War, the indiscriminate attack on the entire population. In Vietnam the indiscriminate killing of civilians was carried out, not just by air strikes, but by soldiers up close and personal who saw the faces of those they killed. Some of them still see those faces in their nightmares. (see the *Vietnam* section) The group hatred which always accompanies war, whether it is racial or tribal or national or ideological always leads to indiscriminate slaughter and the criminal cruelty which shows that depraved indifference to the lives of others and that pleasure in inflicting pain. It is characteristic of men caught up in war, contra the lying patriotic propaganda which pretends that they maintain a warrior code. They do on paper, and leave the paper in the barracks.

Fearless Fosdick regularly shot up the populace in his hapless pursuit of the criminal he was after. Which led to his heartfelt apology: *Whoops ! My Mistake ! I fear the joke is on me !* Thousands of innocent people were killed by American and NATO bombs in the 78 day bombing campaign against Yugoslavia in the spring of 1999. The Pentagon bragged about its pinpoint bombing strikes even while they *accidentally* hit buses and apartment buildings, the Chinese embassy and a refugee column. In May 1999, NATO bombers killed the priest and part of the congregation of a church in a small Serbian town while taking out a bridge.

4 year olds don't count

The killing of kids is the daily feature of the Israeli reprisals against the Palestinians. It is supposedly *unintentional*. The helicopter pilot who fired a rocket at a car in a crowded street did not intend to hit any children. What else did he expect to happen ? He killed two. The soldiers who fired heavy machine guns into houses intended to kill only terrorists. They are not morally responsible for the kids who got hit. How were they supposed to know that there were kids in those houses ? Do kids live in houses ? Is it their fault that the enemy left kids in those houses ? Colonel Webb was at least honest about it, if only to his diary. March 17th 2003, American woman protestor killed by Israeli bulldozer; footnote to the news on the TV screen: *One of the Palestinian victims was a 4 year old girl*. So at least her death was mentioned on the news, because of the connection to the story about the American protestor being killed. Otherwise, the killing of a 4 year old girl in Palestine isn't news. Israel *accidentally* killed 100 Lebanese who had taken refuge in a U.N. shelter during their 1996 incursion into Lebanon. Well, accidents will happen. In war, you can count on it.

When a dog bites a man it isn't news and when the Israelis kill another Palestinian kid it isn't news. [AP Count: 514 from 2000-2005] Unlike Dr. Schaeffer's hypothetical little girl, the death of this real 4 year old girl has no moral significance for us, even though her death results from American weapons and from Israeli policies for which America is 100 % responsible. Because of that actually. Since America rescues little girls, by official definition, America cannot be blamed for the death of that little girl. If God has the same blindness we do, we'll get away with it. But not everyone is blind. In the past year, a substantial number of Israeli soldiers have refused to serve in the West Bank and Gaza Strip and condemned the military actions taken against the Palestinians. A number of them signed a statement pointing to *patently illegal orders* which have *included demolition of homes, and firing heavy machine guns into civilian neighborhoods*. In September 2003, 27 Israeli pilots issued a joint statement that they would not fly further missions against Palestinian towns because they invariably kill civilians. The justification for what the Israelis do is that the Palestinians also kill kids. So they do. [AP Count: 97] And that is what always happens in war. We immediately adopt the lowest standard of moral behavior while pretending to have the highest. How are we different from the *terrorists* we hate ? What honest answer can we give when we are called *terrorists* ? What crime did any of them ever do that we haven't done 10 times over ? As if numbers mattered. As if you are a decent person compared to your enemy because you have only murdered a dozen or so kids.

Over a period of several months, The New York Times ran daily pages of obituaries of all those who were killed in the attacks of September 11th 2001. Each one was remembered in a family photograph with a couple of paragraphs which described the life of this person. It had the effect of turning an anonymous or even vanished corpse, buried in the rubble of the World Trade Center, into a person who loved others and who was loved by them. A person with a face and a smile and a name and a personal history. But the people buried in the rubble of buildings destroyed by American bombs must remain anonymous corpses. Like the embryo children killed by abortion, the less we know of them the better. We argue about the numbers and then forget it. In one interview, Mr. Rumsfeld acknowledged *four killed* in one Afghanistan incident. His attitude was: *Well that's war. What can you do ?* Here lie 4. There lie 40. What does it matter ? It's just a number. If they were real persons we could not have killed them. That is why they must remain numbers and corpses without names.

her name is *Samina*

Washington has expressed regret for any civilian victims in its air-strikes, saying it does not target non-combatants. It has acknowledged that a stray bomb hit homes outside Kabul last week but said it cannot be sure whether an attack hit Karam. In the hospital in Jalabad, 25 miles to the east, doctors treated what they said were 23 victims of bombing at Karam, one a child barely two months old, swathed in bloody bandages. Another child, Samina, played with two apples on her hospital bed. Neighbors brought the 5-year-old to the hospital after the Thursday [October 11th 2001] bombing raid, which they said, killed her entire family. When she recovers from her injuries Dr. Hashok Ullah said, hospital workers will send the girl to an orphanage. Unsmiling and silent, Samina stared out at strangers on Sunday from under a cap of head bandages. "She just doesn't speak," Dr. Ullah said. "She hasn't spoken since she came in." A father, Ahmanzai lay in one bed hugging his wailing 1-year old son, Azizullah. Both wore bandages for burns and wounds from what villagers said was a second bombing run in the area of Karam on Saturday. Female victims lay behind the locked door of the women's ward. Inside, doctors folded back one woman's enveloping shawl to show her wound--a head injury, sustained in the same attack that they said killed her two children on Thursday. At least 18 fresh graves were scattered about the village, marked with jagged pieces of gray slate. Two were tiny, freshly dug for what residents said were children. Villagers said more bodies were buried in the mountains, taken there by residents as they fled the now mostly deserted community. From a story in the October 15th 2001 New York Times.

Like the obituaries which the Times ran for the World Trade Center victims, this story goes at least part of the way in the direction of putting a human face, a little person's face, on those that America bombed by way of rescuing them from the evil Taliban government. The Taliban is SO EVIL ! They **kill kids** and just shrug it off ! Much of the news media either ignored the civilian casualties or they adopted a policy of mentioning them only in the context of the civilian casualties in the World Trade Center attack. Which in effect makes the argument that Americans are no worse than the people who destroyed the World Trade Center. There is a basic and timeless truth in that argument. But there is this much to be said for the terrorists: they sacrificed their own lives along with the lives of their victims. They didn't just drop bombs from 10 miles up and then go on their way like they were heroes. Dropping bombs on kids is a truly chicken thing to do. It is a truly American thing to do. The chicken should replace the eagle as the American national symbol. **The bomber is the true hallmark of the American Empire.** So is the chicken.

Bombing gives the lie to any pretence of justice. It isn't incidental to the war, as they pretend, it shows the basic character of war. It shows that all the moral pretensions are fraudulent. It displays the true Spirit of America: the American-sponsored new society in Afghanistan will be built upon child murder, just like America itself. Doctor Schaeffer's 6 year old girl was

imaginary and her rescue was imaginary. This little girl is real and the bully who killed her family while Americans shrugged and looked away is also real. In fact they identify with the bully. They should. It shows that they recognize who they are.

Military Necessity and Collateral Damage

There wasn't anything really new in the way that the wars of the 20th century classified the policy of deliberately targeting children under the head of *Military Necessity* or *Collateral Damage*, the phrase that Timothy McVeigh used to explain away the killing of the children in the day care center inside the Oklahoma City Federal Building. It is characteristic of war, whether modern or primitive. If McVeigh had been wearing a proper uniform, if he had dropped his bomb from a government plane, if the building he destroyed had been on foreign soil, he would have been decorated as a war hero instead of being executed as a criminal. People would have deeply sympathized with the anguish he supposedly must have felt when he learned about the children killed in the bombing. The TV would have been switched off of the tears of those who lost family members in the blast.

conscripts are fair game

And that is only to look at young children. And to accept the assumption that the teenage conscripts who are most of the soldiers in every army are fair game once they have put on a uniform and picked up a rifle--once they have been forced to put on a uniform and pick up a rifle. Once they are brainwashed in the usual way by patriotic propaganda, and trained by the drill sergeant to march in lock step wherever they are told to go, even if it is over a cliff, they belong to a military machine which is a fair target. Thousands of them were slaughtered by American super weapons in the 1991 Persian Gulf War even while America let Saddam Hussein stay in power because of political pressure from Arab allies. When Hussein offered to withdraw his forces from Kuwait, on the eve of the battle, America said no, it was too late. He had to be taught a lesson and his army had to be destroyed. An estimated 100,000 Iraqi soldiers were killed. Air strikes they could not see coming killed them by the thousands. Armored bulldozers buried the teenage conscripts in the trenches they had dug, buried them alive and left them to suffocate. **LET THAT BE A LESSON TO YOU, MR. EVIL !**

Hussein himself was let off the hook, because America's Arab allies didn't want him ousted. So Mr. Evil was given a political pass, while the teenagers he forced into his army were destroyed without mercy. They are pawns in the game of war. We massacre the children of Hamburg and Dresden by way of discomfiting Mr. Evil. And bury alive the teenage conscripts of another Mr. Evil to teach him a political lesson. Then we cut a deal with him. We weren't interested in making a deal at the level of those common conscripts. That is why we need Mr. Evil, so we don't have to look at the kids we killed. Never mind them, stay focused on Mr. Evil ! What an ugly guy ! The sort that would kill kids without mercy ! You can see it in his face ! It is **Mister Evil versus the cute little girl** we are rescuing from his clutches and never mind the pile of bodies over there. *Turn off that camera or I'll shoot.*

They were teen aged boys, forced into the army or hard up for a job and brainwashed into volunteering, just like our soldiers. First they were his victims and then they were our victims. We had to do that in order to punish Mr. Evil who came through it without a scratch. We had mercy on him--that is, we cut another cynical political deal. We had no mercy on the others who were the pawns in the game. Besides the soldiers, some 25,000 civilians were killed. They were trapped in their situation, prisoners of the dictator. So we bombed them. Many more died after the war because of the conditions created by the bombing, the severe shortages of food and medicine. The destruction of electric power plants shut down water and sewage. The lack of clean water produced epidemics of water borne diseases like dysentery and cholera. That is how you liberate people from oppression. You have to destroy people in order to save them. The federal agents had to rush in and destroy the building in Waco because of rumors that the children were being abused. So the children wound up dead. That was the government excuse for terminating an embarrassing stand off. Sometimes you have to kill children because of the unproven possibility that they are being abused. It avoids expensive trials.

The Shia Moslems in the south of Iraq were encouraged to rebel by America and then abandoned to their fate when the political calculus changed. At least 20,000 of them were slaughtered while the Americans watched. After destroying Hussein's army, America let the Republican Guard escape so that they could crush the rebellion in the south and keep Hussein in power. The same thing happened to the Kurds in the north. Despite President Bush's promise to help them in a radio broadcast. In north and south Iraq thousands of civilians were slaughtered and dozens of villages were destroyed. American forces within ear shot of the carnage in the south, pulled back because they were being overwhelmed by refugees. Saddam Hussein was at the mercy of the American forces at the end of the 1991 Gulf War. But they let him go, after all the rhetoric about him being in the line of Hitler and Stalin. They let him go and betrayed those they had encouraged to rebel. Now Mr. Bush junior is taking us back there because he needs *chapter two* in his *War on Terrorism*.

When the Hungarians rebelled against the Soviet Union in 1956, they counted on help from America because the Voice of America had encouraged them to rebel. America stood by while Soviet tanks crushed the rebellion. America and Great Britain did nothing to help the Warsaw Uprising in 1944 and ignored the fact that their Russian ally was executing thousands of anti Communist Poles. The same thing has happened in many places. People never seem to learn what the Cherokees learned the hard way 170 years ago, which is that the promises of the Empire are kept only if the Empire hasn't made a new calculation. There is no honor among empires or those who run them. You don't achieve the highest positions of empire without learning to **COMPROMISE**. If you have any sense of honor left, you are unfit for the position.

the refusal to rescue

The Schaeffer fantasy implies that America entered World War II to rescue the Jews. America had no such interest, regardless of any official pretence. America and Britain could have saved all of the Jews of Germany just by allowing them to emigrate. Before the war started, the Nazi policy was to force the Jews into exile. It was the failure of this policy that led to the *final solution*. The policy failed because other countries would not accept the Jewish refugees and forced them to return to Germany. During the early period, thousands of Jews lined up daily at the American embassy in Berlin to try and get one of the few available visas. America did not want a flood of Jewish refugees. Hitler taunted the western nations with their pretended concern for the Jews and offered to ship them all to the West. He got no takers. The severe restrictions on immigration which America had passed in 1924 remained in place, despite the emergency. Those restrictions had been especially designed to curtail Jewish immigration to the United States, and they effectively cancelled the promise of *world-wide welcome* set forth in the 1883 Statue of Liberty poem by Emma Lazarus: *Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me*.

They tried to get out anyway. One boat load of unauthorized German Jewish refugees made it to within a few miles of the coast of Florida before the United States Coast Guard turned them back. They were forced to return to Europe where two thirds of them later died in the Nazi death camps. A dilapidated ship carrying Jewish refugees sank off the coast of Palestine after the British navy turned them back--a British policy to placate the Arabs. Of course they weren't wanted in Britain, that was out of the question. The little girl is being chased by the bully. She runs to your house and you close the door on her. Later, you indignantly testify as to what a horrible person the bully is.

moral pretensions

Having refused to rescue the Jews, America then used the killing of the Jews in Germany as a moral justification for the war, as people still do. And that is typical of what nations do and of what organizations and individuals do. They neglect doing the obvious and simple things to achieve the moral aim, and then use the **pretense of that moral aim** as the ideological disguise for the pursuit of power. People neglect to do all the obvious and simple things they could do to prevent abortion. And then use *the issue* to run for political office and to raise money for their organizations. Having refused to *bear witness*, they disguise their pursuit of power and money with the flags of a moral crusade.

There is always the pretence that the war is fought for some **Great Moral Purpose**. It is only a pretence. Only a patriot believes it. General Sherman once bluntly stated a basic reason for the Civil War: *All the niggers in the South aren't worth the blood of one Union soldier. This is about control of the Mississippi River.* But it is always necessary to keep up the pretence, especially by those who have no interest in that moral purpose except to use it as camouflage for what they do care about. There are those who Really Believe in the War, who have to believe in it after so much blood has been shed. True Patriots are True Believers in that Imperial Cult which requires Big Lies to conceal the Child Sacrifice which is demanded by the god of this world in exchange for that temporary *Blessing* of Victory which he confers upon the Empire. What kind of *Blessing* requires the sacrifice of even one child? How many children can be sacrificed before a *Just War* becomes an *Unjust War*? Correct Answer: *not even one.*

Dr. Schaeffer's little 6 year old girl was imaginary, her rescue was imaginary, and the motive was imaginary. What really happened was that America and the rest of the world let all those little Jewish girls go to the death camps while they neglected to do the things they could have done to rescue them. Then they proceeded to systematically kill the little girls of Germany and Japan, of Hamburg and Hiroshima, along with the rest of the civilian population, by a policy of bombing which went on until the end of the war. And they did that in partnership with the Soviet Union which emerged triumphant from the rubble of World War II. The result of which was that the little girls of Eastern Europe and China and Vietnam and Cambodia continued to die for the rest of the century in all those places where the Communists came to power. That is the real morality of war. The allies would not even bomb the rail lines leading to the death camps to slow down the holocaust when urgent appeals were made to them, even when they were bombing industrial targets in the same area. They cared about rescuing Jews like they cared about sparing the lives of civilians. Their actions give the lie to their pretences. In 1945 the American Army captured the *Hungarian Gold Train*, a train full of valuables which the Germans had taken from Hungarian Jews. The contents were looted by American army officers and restitution has yet to be made, 60 years later. (NYT 8-9-2004 p. A18)

Yes, America Loves You

In war especially there is always this pretence that *AMERICA* is a kind of super person who really cares about things that Americans as individuals obviously do not care about, whether they are civilians or soldiers. Their own relatives did not much care about the ragged refugees, unless they were immediate family, especially if they had to sponsor them out of their own pockets. The Zionists wanted population in Israel, but they cared nothing about saving them otherwise, and they despised the orthodox Jews. No pressure was put on America to admit the refugees. But America, like God--instead of God--Officially Loves Everyone, and ***I SUPPORT THAT***, so long as it is done with someone else's tax money, so long as they don't bother me. The Irish lynched blacks in the New York draft riots because they blamed them for the Civil War and the draft, because, in the pecking order, there was no one else below them. But officially, once they had been forced into the Union army, they laid down their lives to liberate the Negro. And got posthumous medals for it. Like all of our soldiers, ***THEY DIED FOR FREEDOM.***

Those who joined the army because they needed a pay check are supposedly risking their lives to defend my freedom. Officially, they are acting from the noblest of motives. As a matter of official patriotic pretence, they are ready to die for me, even though they don't even know me. They are even readier to kill on my behalf. They are protecting my safety and my freedom by shooting people 7000 miles away. So why do I feel less safe and less free? Do not Freedom and Safety Increase in Direct Proportion to the increase in the number of high school drop outs given a uniform, an automatic rifle, a packet of condoms and a patriotic comic book by way of a catechism? Why do I feel that the danger to all of us has increased by yet another American attack upon people who live on another continent? Am I not safer now because of all the killing done by Americans in Korea and Vietnam and Afghanistan and Iraq? Why do I feel that the freedom found in America is steadily shrinking, while American military might keeps growing? Why does Freedom require the F.B.I. to round up so many people? We love foreigners enough to throw away billions of dollars and thousands of lives--including thousands of their lives. Meanwhile, we don't love our own children enough to rescue them from abortion. Something here does not ring true. This Liberty Bell sounds like it has a big crack in it.

Soldiers as victims

Of course it is hardly surprising that enemy civilians and enemy soldiers are routinely slaughtered when the lives of our own soldiers are so readily discarded even while the politicians pretend to cherish the lives of these **pawns in the power game**. Of the 60 million people killed in World War II, two-thirds were civilians. But how can you assume that men in uniform are fair game? They are as much the victims of war as anyone else. The excuse for the Russian soldiers who raped a million women in Europe in World War II is that the same thing was being done to them in a very basic way. Twelve million of them were cheated of their young lives. Forced into the army, made to fight for Stalin, they were sent into battle in a terrible winter without boots or rifles, with instructions to get a rifle and a pair of boots from the first fallen comrade they came to. There were plenty to choose from. The sheer brutality and criminality of that war made criminals of all of them if they survived. Few of them did survive.

In *Conversations with Stalin* Milovan Djilas describes Stalin's response to his complaint that the red army kept raping women in Yugoslavia, even though they were now Russia's ally: *A man wants to have some fun with a woman, and you don't understand it!* Then Stalin tells him about a Russian soldier court martialled for killing another Russian soldier who tried to prevent him from raping a woman. Stalin ordered him released and sent to the front. Which sounds like leniency but it was almost certainly a death sentence. Of course the offense for which the soldier was court martialled was the killing of a fellow soldier, not the rape. Other armies did the same. Rape is the most common crime in war. It is routinely concealed, and rarely punished. A guest column by Edward W. Wood Jr. in the 11-12-6 Denver Post 2E says: *A friend of mine who went across France and Germany with the 4th Division says he watched American soldiers loot and rape their way across Europe.* [He is a wounded WW II veteran and the author of *Worshipping the Myths of World War II*] It is not surprising that men who are humiliated and degraded and morally destroyed by the military system humiliate and degrade and destroy others when they get the chance. Violence always begets violence and War is an orgy of Violence. It is Satan's festival--his dance of triumph over Jesus Christ.

instant death

The Irish who had escaped the potato famine in Ireland were conscripted into the armies of the North and the South at the time of the American Civil War. They rioted in New York against the draft but it came down to a choice between army or jail, while Americans with money bought an exemption. And once they got there it was a choice between going forward to their possible doom or being shot on the spot. A TV historian praises the *courage* and the **simple faith** of the Civil War soldier and says that he himself would have argued with the general if told to advance upon a fortified position. As if a private had any chance to argue with a General's order. At Gettysburg, General Meade sent out the usual instruction: *All commanders are authorized to order the instant death of any soldier who fails in his duty.* Lee issued the same order to his officers. It is the standard instruction in war. That is the reason that Pickett's 13,000 men went forward to their deaths, in a suicidal advance upon Union soldiers dug in at the top of the hill.

Colonel Webb's diary for Friday, March 1st 1776 quotes the same order: *Our worthy commander in Chief (in orders a day or two past) has in the most pathetic terms told the Soldierly that on our present conduct depends the Salvation of America, that in all probability e'er long we shall be call'd to the field of Battle--that he is confident his troops will behave as deserves the cause we are contending for, but that in all Army's their are those who would flee before a much smaller number, & that should any such be found Sculking or retreating before the Enemy without orders--they must expect Instant Death by way of example to others.* All the hot air about the courage of soldiers is meant to conceal the reality that it is fear that pushes them forward. They have half a chance of surviving if they go forward. But if they run back before the rest of the group, death and disgrace are certain. Military discipline is built upon the character of the average man who is a coward and a conformist. You dress them all in identical uniforms like convicts. You drill them in lock step until conformity to the crowd is second nature and they will march over the cliff rather than quit the bunch. The soldier is more afraid of the Sergeant than he is of the enemy, so he goes forward on command.

Colonel Tarleton was labeled **BUTCHER TARLETON** because his men killed 100 Virginians who were the enemy. But General Grant was labeled **BUTCHER** with much better reason, and he butchered his own soldiers. He simply overwhelmed the smaller Confederate army by sending masses of Union soldiers in suicidal charges against entrenched Confederates. The Union lost 50,000 soldiers **in one month** after he took command of the Army of the Potomac. Some 620,000 soldiers on both sides were killed in the Civil War, a whole generation of young men--one fourth of all Southern men. General Robert E. Lee once said that *the greatest mistake of my life was taking a military education*. But he found it out too late. Of course the mass slaughter wasn't just General Grant's doing. It was what President Abraham Lincoln expected him to do. They both did what the American People expected them to do. They received applause for doing it. Grant was elected President afterwards. The lives of those immigrant conscripts were thrown away and the survivors were honored with cheap medals and cheaper speeches, as they are today.

charging up hamburger hill

During the Vietnam War, the Secret Service cancelled a visit by President Johnson to Oklahoma City because somebody there phoned in an anonymous threat against the President. Despite all the police and Secret Service agents, they didn't want to take the risk. An empty threat from some anonymous kook was enough to stop the Commander in Chief from advancing to the podium, despite the protection of several thousand body guards. Meanwhile, in Vietnam, one American platoon after another was sent up **HAMBURGER HILL**. The platoon would come back with half its members missing. Then they would send another platoon up the hill. Supposedly the hill had great strategic importance. So many soldiers were killed or crippled in the battle to capture it. A couple of weeks after they took it, they walked away from it. It was just a hill. It was just a place where they could prove that their men were as ready to get themselves killed for nothing as soldiers anywhere.

Ho Chi Minh and General Giap were supposedly moral monsters because they sent masses of teenage conscripts in suicidal charges against fortified French positions at Dienbienphu. But American commanders have done the same thing. We throw away the lives of soldiers like we throw away the lives of embryo children. And then pretend there was some Good and Necessary Reason for it. We pretend to believe that life is precious. Meaning that my life is precious and the lives of those few I care about are precious. The rest are expendable. It isn't just that the America empire has wasted the lives of so many foreigners in its endless wars. It has also discarded the lives of its own soldiers casually, carelessly, for no good reason, even while the patriotic pretense is maintained that they died for Something Sacred.

unmarked graves

The deliberate or reckless killing of civilians, whether friend or foe, is augmented by the clumsy killing of our own soldiers. In *Wartime*, Paul Fussell documented some of the realities behind the heroics presented by the media, such as "the great Slapton Sands Disaster, which has been virtually a secret for forty years except among participants and observers. On April 28, 1944, the 4th American Infantry Division and other units were holding an immense rehearsal (*Operation Tiger*) of the forthcoming invasion. The beaches selected were at Slapton Sands, Devon, near the British naval base at Dartmouth. Two hundred ships took part and 30,000 acres of coastal land were cleared of their residents. The exercise was to be realistic in all ways--air attacks on the beaches, mine fields, live ammunition everywhere. But as the ships were approaching the *landing beaches*, actuality intruded. Nine fast 100-foot German E-boats carrying torpedoes set out from Cherbourg and in the dark they got among the American ships. In the immense confusion, not just between friends and enemies but between training and the real thing, the E-boats sank two LSTs and damaged others. The dead amounted to 749 American soldiers and sailors, mostly engineers and quartermaster troops. Their bodies were secretly bulldozed into a mass grave on the Devon farm of Mr. Nolan Tope while the wounded were quarantined at the hospitals and threatened with court-martial if they talked. . . . The relatives of the dead were informed that the men had died *in action*--true in a curious way--and it is said that for the record the casualty figures were simply added to the Normandy totals run up some five weeks later." He points out that the *Time-Life* history of World war II still conceals what happened. (25-26)

The military may be responsible for the fact that *the truth is the first casualty in war*, but the cowardly media are conscripted to help bury it in an unmarked grave. In the Time-Life volumes about World War II, a full color page is devoted to *A Tank That Could Swim*. Which neglects to mention that, of the 32 *swimming tanks* that were launched on D Day, 27 of them sank in the heavy surf, drowning their crews. (Fussell 23-24) Badly designed or defective vehicles often cause stupid deaths in war. The soldier's family can't sue the manufacturer, the Senator's friends, like you could if it were a defective civilian vehicle. But instead, he is a hero and will get a medal--**Distinguished Order of Military Road Kill**. [6-12-6 In Iraq, 60 soldiers have been killed and 149 injured in roll overs of Humvees made top heavy with added armor. February 2007: 600 of 3000 soldiers killed in Iraq were from *nonhostile* causes.]

friendly fire

Fussell describes "*COBRA*, the immense bombing operation of July 24th and 25th 1944, designed to assist the break-out of the ground forces from the Normandy beachhead near Saint-Lo. The plan was for some 1800 bombers to pulverize the German defenders, after which the Americans were to press forward with, it was hoped, considerable ease." In the first run on the 24th, the bombers inadvertently hit the American positions, killing 25 and wounding 131. The next day, July 25th, bombs killed 111 Americans, including Lt. General Lesley McNair and wounded 500. Some enraged American units "opened fire on their own aircraft, a not uncommon practice among all the armies in Normandy when suffering at the hands of their own pilots." (17) During the invasion of Sicily in July 1943 "American navy and ground gunners mistakenly shot down 23 planes carrying 229 men of the 82nd Airborne Division. Ernie Pyle witnessed the Sicilian debacle but either chose not to mention it in his dispatches or, more likely, was forbidden to." That kind of censorship and self-censorship has been perpetuated by patriotic media. As Fussell points out, "*The Italian Campaign* (1978) of the *Time-Life* series devoted to World War II doesn't mention it at all." (21) Similar things happened in the Pacific. "In October 1944, the Japanese merchant vessel *Arisan Maru* was neatly torpedoed by the U.S. submarine *Snook*. It was carrying thousands of American prisoners of war. All of them were drowned." (23) The British killed 1200 French sailors by intentionally bombing the French fleet in the Mediterranean, supposedly to keep it from falling into the hands of the Germans. (Churchill documentary on PBS)

the not so great war

Some 300,000 British, Canadian, Australian, South African and New Zealand soldiers died in 1917 over 4 months in the effort to capture Passchendaele Ridge in France, another of those *Hamburger Hills*. The weapons of World War I, which seem almost primitive now--flame throwers, poison gas, aerial bombardments, tanks, machine guns--led to mechanized slaughter on an unprecedented scale. The conditions were so terrible that thousands of men just disappeared in the mud and the blood and the flying shrapnel. On a monumental arch there are 54,970 names of men **WHOSE BODIES WERE NEVER FOUND**. Never pieced back together they mean--who wants to even try and do it ? That fancy marble Tomb of the Unknown Soldier supposedly compensates all those thousands of men who didn't even get a grave with a marker, whose remains were scattered like fertilizer. It helps us sustain our blindness to the horrors of war. At Verdun 700,000 soldiers were killed in 4 years of trench warfare and 120,000 unknown French and German soldiers are buried there. The stained glass windows in the nearby Cathedral of Rheims were destroyed, lost forever like so many of the great artistic treasures of Europe. A million soldiers were killed on the Somme. And then, 25 years later, they did it all over again. The legend of young German student soldiers singing *Deutschland, Deutschland uber alles* as they marched to their doom in 1914 was invoked by Adolph Hitler in *Mein Kampf* as part of the patriotic myth that launched World War II. And there are still **78,000** Americans from that war **whose bodies have never been found** ! Contra the *PATRIOT* myth of the military hero, if you want to Disappear into Oblivion, Join The Army !

At Anzac, divisions from England, Australia and New Zealand suffered terrible losses in a futile attempt to invade Turkey from the sea by fighting their way up the cliffs. And it all had to do with getting rid of Kaiser Wilhelm and clearing the way for Adolph Hitler. Or was it because someone shot the Arch Duke Ferdinand ? It happened because none of these *Christian*

soldiers, blinded by patriotism, *blinded by the god of this world*, had ever heard what Origen wrote about real Christians: *We do not brandish the sword against any people, nor do we learn to make war, because we have become children of peace through Jesus, whom we follow as our leader.* (*Contra Celsum* 5:33) It happened because they did not have the Courage to say **NO** to Madness, **NO** to homicide and suicide. But there were those who refused to participate in the madness, who went to prison for their refusal. We arrive at peace by following Jesus who showed us how to wage spiritual war. Instead of **FOLLOWING THE OTHER SILLY SHEEP UP HAMBURGER HILL**, instead of being driven up it by men who are themselves demon-possessed.

X THE DEATH OF CHRISTENDOM

What did they die for, those forgotten men lost in the mud and the blood of a forgotten battle in a forgotten war? They died for **patriotism**. That is, they died for stupidity. First, they **KILLED** to make the demons dance. Then they died so that fat phonies who dodged the draft could make patriotic speeches at memorial services for them. There was one reason for The Great War, and it was Satan's reason. He wanted to display the folly of all those who ever believed in **CHRISTENDOM**. Out of the rotten heart of **CHRISTENDOM** grew the terrible thorn bushes of Communism and Fascism, from twin seeds opened by the fires of the Great War and watered by the streams of blood which flowed from it. World War II was the direct result of World War I. Nazism and Bolshevism grew out of the very heart of what called itself *Christendom* in the aftermath of that war. On April 2nd 1917 Woodrow Wilson asked Congress for a Declaration of War *for the ultimate peace of the world and the liberation of its people . . . the world must be made safe for democracy*. America's intervention instead produced two of the most virulent forms of totalitarianism the world has ever seen.

In his Speech in Pueblo Colorado September 25th 1919 Wilson said: *Again and again, my fellow citizens, mothers who lost their sons in France have come to me and, taking my hand, have not only shed tears upon it, but they have added: God Bless You, Mister President. Why, my fellow citizens, should they weep upon my hand and pray God to bless me? I ordered their sons overseas. I consented to them being put in the most dangerous parts of the battle line, where death was certain. But they rightly believe that their sons saved the liberty of the world. They believe that this sacrifice was made in order that other sons should not be called upon to die. I wish some of the men who are now opposing the settlement could feel the moral obligation that rests upon us not to go back on those boys, but to see this thing through to the end and make good their redemption of the world.* By endorsing the League of Nations, he means. Even though these fellows sacrificed their lives for peace, freedom etc. nothing will come of it unless a big international bureaucracy is set up. The blood of sacrifice needs the hot air of endless speeches to accomplish its aim. No one will know what they died for until someone makes a speech about it.

President Wilson says: **THEIR SONS SAVED THE LIBERTY OF THE WORLD**. They actually died so that Kaiser Wilhelm could be replaced by Adolph Hitler. Their **SACRIFICE** brought Mussolini and his Fascists to power in Italy. Their blood and the blood they shed opened the way for the Bolsheviks in Russia. So that the murder could begin all over again. As it turned out, they were only the warm up act for World War II. In the next round, Americans died so that Stalin could stay in power, so that he might replace Hitler as the Master of Europe. They died so that Mao Tse Tung could come to power in China and Ho Chi Minh in Vietnam. So that Communist Dictators could face off against neo-fascist dictators. That is how much **LIBERTY** the deaths of these soldiers brought about. *Hitler is my only hero*, said General Ky, our boy in Vietnam.

Dying for your Country = Killing for your Empire

Like all patriot orators, Wilson neglects to mention that these soldiers **KILLED FOR THE CAUSE** instead of just dying for it. In fact, it was their killing, not their dying, which produced the victory which supposedly **SAVED THE LIBERTY OF THE WORLD**. An army which just dies without accomplishing the killing it is sent out to do is of no use. But we prefer to ignore that aspect of it. Listening to patriotic speeches, which present fallen soldiers as if they were Christian martyrs, you would never guess that military recruits are relentlessly drilled to shout **KILL !** and to mean it and to do it. **Dying for your country** is the big patriotic lie behind which **KILLING FOR**

YOUR EMPIRE is concealed. If the Patriot could face the truth, he would give the most honor to the soldier who killed the most and lived to brag about it, not the fellows who died in the war. What are the names of those who did the most killing in the war? They are the ones who accomplished whatever it was that was supposedly accomplished.

They *sacrificed* so that *other sons should not be called upon to die*. In fact their *sacrifice* led directly to a war in which 10 times as many would be killed. And that war has led to more wars. War does not lead to peace. One war always leads to the next war. A.J. Muste said: *There is no way to peace. Peace is the way*. It is the truth. But once you have sacrificed your son to Moloch, you have to believe in what you did. Women have to believe in their abortions. Wilson believed himself to be a Christian. And yet somehow believed that sending young men to stick bayonets in other young men meant *their redemption of the world*. You can't **REDEEM THE WORLD** unless you are prepared to stick a bayonet in somebody--unless you are willing to wave your little flag and **SUPPORT THE TROOPS** while somebody from the wrong side of the tracks is hired or drafted to do it. Wilson the idealist perpetuated racial segregation in his administration. Negroes were excluded from federal jobs in the South. Like earlier patriotic preachers of **LIBERTY** he defined it so as to exclude the black population.

comic book morality

The morality of the patriotic Christian is the comic book premise that the good guys with the guns always win out in the end over the bad guys with the guns. In the comics and the cartoons, it is always a struggle of good versus evil. And it easy to tell the bad guys because they wear ugly costumes, have nasty voices, and try to kill people just because they are mean. While the good guys always look nice and have pure motives. And Americans are always the good guys. We prove this by the fact that we belong to the winning side. Since we joined the winners and since we are good, the good guys must have won. Since Joe Stalin and the Bolsheviks were on our side, they are at least temporarily included with the good guys.

If you are a sincere American patriot, never say anything critical of our friend and ally Old Joe Stalin. A bit of a **ROUGH RIDER** perhaps . . . methods sometimes a little **CRUDE** . . . but he was the leader of those 12 million Russian soldiers who died in the war against Hitler, who bore the brunt of the struggle against **Mr. Evil**. *I like old Joe* Harry Truman said. He had to like him and so did the rest of America. American soldiers were dying for the difference between Hitler and Stalin. So we had to believe that he represented a good alternative to Adolph Hitler and the Nazis. Since they were evil, and he opposed them, he must have been good. More or less good anyway. Close enough for a patriotic comic book calculation. Two gangs are contending for control of the neighborhood. You make your best guess as to which one will win and then offer them your support. That is realism. You convert it into idealism by drawing a curtain over the real character of this gang. Now they are the good guys. You focus on how evil the other gang is. You preserve a discreet silence about your own side.

Of course it is simpler just to forget about Joe Stalin and the Bolsheviks. You would never guess from American patriotic reminiscences that Russia played any role in defeating Nazi Germany in World War II, let alone that it played the major role. The Russians were America's allies and they bore the brunt of the war in Europe. Half a million American soldiers died in World War II in both theaters. Twelve million Russian soldiers died in the struggle against Germany. Of all the German soldiers who died in World War II, 8 out of 10 fell in the battle against Russia on the eastern front. The German army on the eastern front was already defeated and retreating by 1944 when the Normandy invasion was launched against Germany's western front. Thirty million were killed in the struggle between Germany and Russia. 3.5 million Russian soldiers became German prisoners and few survived the prison camps. At the battle of Stalingrad, 1.7 million Russian soldiers were killed and 250,000 Germans. Of 90,000 German prisoners only 5000 survived. It was the turning point of the war in Europe. Four times as many soldiers perished in the battle of Stalingrad as America lost in the whole war.

the demonic face of war

The very heart of the battle of World War II was the terrible struggle between Communist Russia and Nazi Germany. Was this Good versus Evil? Plainly it was Evil versus Evil. Early in the war, both armies adopted a policy of tolerating any crime against civilians by their soldiers. German soldiers were not held liable for crimes against Russian civilians and there was an epidemic of murder, rape, and looting as they advanced to the east. The Russian army did the same when its chance came. So both armies murdered, raped and looted all across Europe. That was the real demonic face of World War II, which is still everyone's best example of a Righteous War.

It is the real face of all war. In *War and Peace* Leo Tolstoy describes the War of 1812: *Millions of men perpetrated against one another so great a mass of crime--fraud, swindling, robbery, forgery, issue of counterfeit money, plunder, incendiarism, and murder--that the annals of all the criminal courts of the world could not muster such a sum of wickedness in whole centuries, though the men who committed these deeds did not at that time look on them as crimes.* The flag conceals the crimes. Tolstoy had been an army officer and he knew the reality of war. For some reason, he could not bring himself to mention rape, the most common crime in war. War is criminality let loose. They empty the prisons to fill up the armies, give them weapons and say **GO TO IT BOYS!** All the things you could go to prison for in peace time are tolerated as patriotic acts in war time.

At the end of World War II President Truman said: *This is a great day, the day we've been waiting for. This is the day for free governments in the world. This is the day that fascism and police government ceases in the world.* (August 14th 1945) It is not surprising that America and Britain forcibly repatriated hundreds of thousands of anti-Communist Russians at the end of World War II. (*Operation Keelhaul*) They died in Stalin's prison camps. While Truman proclaimed the end of *police government* in the world, Joe Stalin and his freedom loving red army were occupying a large part of Europe. A conservative estimate is that the Communists killed 40 million between 1946 and 1986--1 million a year, not counting those killed in the war. That is, they murdered about twice as many as Hitler had killed, after they helped defeat him. Secret police, torture of prisoners, and people disappearing without a trial and without a trace were characteristic of the whole Soviet bloc, and of the governments of China, North Korea and North Vietnam which Soviet power established.

The figure of 40 million killed does not include those killed by the Communist governments installed in China, North Korea, and North Vietnam by Soviet power as the direct result of the Allied Victory in World War II. In the 1970s, 20 million Chinese starved to death as the result of Mao Tse Sung's *Great Leap Forward*. A 2005 biography of *Mao* by Jung Chang and Jon Halliday estimates that Mao killed 70 million Chinese **in peace time** alone. It was a new world order for which America can be thanked, which American soldiers killed and died to make possible. In the next round, they would kill and die to oppose it--supposedly to oppose it. In fact America multiplied the carnage. (see the later section on **Vietnam**) *The Harvest of Sorrow* by Robert Conquest, published in 1986, describes how 10 million Ukrainians were deliberately starved to death in the winter of 1932-33 by Stalin's government.

killing and dying

In President Harry Truman's statement there is the same astonishing blindness that shows up in President Woodrow Wilson's statements after World War I. Since the lives of so many have been **SACRIFICED**, peace and freedom must have been established everywhere in the world. When you look at World War II truthfully--60 million people murdered in an orgy of killing in which all of the nations participated--it is not surprising that **MURDER TRIUMPHANT** reigned when the war was over. Millions of children were forced to *walk through the flames to Moloch*. What result would you expect from that except the one we got?

There is an essential distinction to be made between **DYING** for something and **KILLING** for something. If men voluntarily sacrificed their lives by dying for peace and freedom, you would expect peace and freedom to be thereby established. When men kill other men, when they kill

women and children, it is not surprising that Satan's new world order is thereby established. That is why it is important to tell the simple truth about what the soldiers are doing: they aren't just dying, **THEY ARE KILLING**. And they aren't just killing other armed men, young soldiers like themselves, bad as that is. They are killing unarmed men as well. They are killing women and kids as well. A man voluntarily giving his own life to a cause in which he believes has nothing in common with men being forced to kill and die in these wars which are fought for big lies. Some fellow sends you off to kill and die while he makes the big speeches about it. Not surprisingly, the speech is full of lies.

Eisenhower's Vendetta

The declaration by President Roosevelt that *we mean no harm to the common people of Germany* was given the lie, not just by the systematic bombing of German cities but by a post war policy of extermination in the prison camps operated by America and France. **OTHER LOSSES**, a book by James Bacque published in 1991, documents how *a policy of hatred* for which General Eisenhower and his commanders were responsible *caused the death by disease, exposure, and starvation of massive numbers of unarmed German soldiers and some civilians*. No food or rotten food, no water or bad water, and no shelter for 5 million prisoners crowded into wire compounds led to epidemics of *starvation, dysentery, disease*. (page xx) They deliberately prevented the Red Cross help from reaching the prisoners. (chapter 6) *Starting in April 1945, the United States Army and the French army casually annihilated about one million men, most of them in American camps*. (ix Foreword by Dr. Ernest Fisher, a retired U.S. Army Colonel) A French Army Captain who took over the American P.O.W. camp at Dietershei--one of the *slow death camps*--when it became part of the French zone of occupied Germany described the conditions there as *like Buchenwald and Dachau*. (page 87) At another place, *The last act of the Americans at Rheinberg before the British took over in mid-June was to bulldoze one section of the camp level while there were still living men in their holes in the ground*. (page 136) As in Afghanistan recently, German prisoners were *accidentally suffocated* in transit. (page 23)

General Eisenhower's personal hatred of the Germans, which facilitated the post war policy of killing prisoners, has been covered up like other real American history: "In May 1943, Eisenhower had complained to Marshall about the difficulty of dealing with the several hundred thousand German prisoners captured by the Allies at Tunisia. *It is a pity we could not have killed more*, he said in the postscript of a letter which has been suppressed from various official editions of the Eisenhower Papers." (page 21) When 140 German prisoners of war died of suffocation in March 1945, while being transported from one POW camp to another in France, Eisenhower wrote Marshall: *It is irritating to have such things occur, because I certainly loathe having to apologize to the Germans*. (Alfred M. de Zayas *The Wehrmacht War Crimes Bureau 1939-1945* page 86) Eventually, the American government and military yielded to international pressure and the pressure from the huge American grain surpluses, which had to be dumped some where, to launch the *Marshall Plan*. By then more than a million Germans had died from mistreatment in Allied prisoner of war camps. As usual, the reality of mass murder is concealed by humanitarian gestures and pretences.

America's French and British allies did the same. After the German battleship **Bismark** was sunk, a British rescue ship steamed away, leaving hundreds of German sailors to die in the frigid North Atlantic. It was revenge for a British ship sunk by the **Bismark**. That kind of thing was commonly done by all nations, America included, contra the usual military show, put on for visitors, which displays the humane treatment of prisoners.

more suffocation

Of course regular service men can expect no mercy, regardless of all the international conventions, once the chickens from the press have been shooed away, and the cameras have been turned off. Thousands of captured soldiers have died in Afghan prison camps run by America's warlord allies. A large number of them were left to suffocate in sealed containers. The Americans choose not to know anything about it. Why do we assume that such things will not happen to us, when we go along with them happening to others? Did the ordinary soldiers of Afghanistan deserve such treatment? Then we all do. When the Viet Cong abandoned the

city of Hue after the Tet offensive, they put Catholic seminarians in pits and buried them alive. One reason they did that is because the same thing had been done to their families by American and Vietnamese soldiers. If we can so quickly arrive at the depths of moral depravity in the limited wars involving Afghanistan and Iraq, with a TV camera following every platoon, what depths are we not capable of, directly or indirectly, in these impending wars ?

Some 30,000 prisoners died in the Andersonville prison camp in the Civil War from starvation, exposure and dysentery from bad water etc. That is what Americans did to other Americans. What won't they do to foreigners ? Ordinary prisoners taken in Afghanistan have been murdered deliberately or carelessly by the war lords while America shrugged. Prisoners thought to have information are being turned over to the C.I.A. or its allies and they are being tortured to divulge it. Government spokesmen have clearly indicated as much in their statements. They obviously assume that The People go along with it. No doubt they do. That is how **CIVILIZED** we are. When your own son is tortured in some foreign prison camp, remember that you went along with it, when America did it, or looked the other way while America's allies did it on our behalf. **WE REAP WHAT WE SOW.**

XI THE IMPERIAL FAITH

Recently, in Kabul, Afghanistan, there was a wreath laying ceremony in honor of British soldiers buried in the *White Graveyard*. Some 17,000 British soldiers were killed in 1842 in a failed attempt to conquer Afghanistan. Only a few of them are in the graveyard, the others were left where they fell, their bones scattered all the way to the Khyber Pass. The plaque reads: *Lord God, we are soldiers in order to protect peace and freedom; the nation would have known them little but for us. What safety could there be in quiet lands, or in the homes of simple men at night, if we soldiers were all asleep or gone ?* So, having killed as many Afghans as they could, they laid down their lives in the effort to bring *peace* and *freedom* and *safety* to England, 4000 miles away, and / or to Afghanistan. Who knows what might have happened to England had these men failed to get themselves killed in one of the endless wars of the British Empire ? There would have been more unemployment for sure. The Afghans on horseback might have shown up there after a few months, if they had made it across the intervening countries, or if the British navy had offered them a lift: *We want to invade England, the home of simple men. Sure, come aboard, we're headed there.* Who knows what might have happened in Afghanistan ? Who knows how little *peace* and *freedom* and *safety* there would have been there, except for this heroic sacrifice ? Afghans might still be killing and dying in wars 150 years later. Who knows the depths of the madness which **FAITH IN THE EMPIRE** produces ? The real *simple men* are those simpletons who put on uniforms and get themselves killed 4000 miles from home for reasons that would make a Hare Krishna giggle.

Peace and *freedom* and *safety* is supposedly the reason those 17,000 British soldiers had to kill and die in Afghanistan in 1842. *Peace* and *freedom* and *safety* is what the soldiers of World War I had to die for, what they had to kill for. In Mr. Bush's March 7th 2003 press conference he stated that the American invasion of Iraq is necessary to achieve *peace* and *freedom* and *safety*. No doubt there will some day be a plaque there and a *White Graveyard* for those who killed and died to accomplish it. But we never get any closer to *peace* and *freedom* and *safety*. All the killing and dying takes us in the opposite direction. **IMPERIAL MADNESS** blinds us to that simple fact of history.

defending your empire

You have to have some such abstraction as *peace* or *freedom* because of the obvious absurdity of arguing that soldiers thousands of miles from home are defending their country by invading someone else's country. The dumbest draftee must sometimes wonder if he is really **DEFENDING MY COUNTRY** when he finds himself thousands of miles from the nearest American town and swapping shots with someone whose language he does not understand, someone who lives a few miles away or who did live a few miles away before the war started. The current invasion of

Iraq is justified by the assertion that America has a mission to bring *FREEDOM* to Iraq and also that Iraq is somehow a real threat to America. So the invading Americans are really defending America 7000 miles away. Because 19 Moslems, armed with plastic box cutters, launched an attack from American soil on American targets, America must wage war in Moslem countries half a world away in an operation rightly called: **THE EMPIRE STRIKES BACK!**

It is a natural instinct to defend your home and your family. Your hand instinctively flies up to stop a ball thrown at your head. The unsafest place on earth is between a mother bear and her cubs. You can hardly keep your dog from biting the mail and barking at the mail man--he knows when we are being invaded. But what does war have to do with defending your home and your family? Not one thing. That is, nothing.

If every man would sit by his front door, holding his deer rifle, ready to defend his home against all intruders, there would never be a war. In order for a war to begin, somebody has to leave home and start it. When you reach the end of your block, still holding your deer rifle, common sense should tell you that you have gone beyond defending your home, although you may be defending your turf against the rival gang from the next street. By the time you reach the county line, *defending my home and family* obviously does not describe what you are doing, although *Laying Down My Life for my County, My County Right or Wrong, It is sweet and good to Die for Your County* etc. can now be invoked. (Josh Billings on *sweet and good* etc. "I don't know myself--I never tried it.") But American soldiers shipped overseas are regularly brainwashed to believe that they are somehow defending their own homes and families when they are on the other side of the world, destroying someone else's home and killing his family. The children at Mylai were massacred without mercy by American soldiers who would tell you that they were there to protect their families back home. Now their kids have to compete with all those smart kids who came here as refugees from the American War in Vietnam. Their killing and dying accomplished that much. While their kids grow up without a father.

the expanding American empire

By the time you arrive at that front line, thousands of miles from your home, it must be obvious that you are **DEFENDING YOUR EMPIRE**. And that is what American wars are about, all bunkum aside. Which means **EXPANDING THE EMPIRE**, because an empire must grow or die. In fact it grows and dies at the same time, growing at the margins while dying at the center, like a cancer tumor. It can never be at peace for long, nor allow *FREEDOM* except as the empty slogan invoked to cover every kind of coercion.

The roots of World War II in the Pacific go back to the 19th century when the American Empire expanded into the Pacific, annexing all the real estate it could and putting itself on a collision course with the Empire of Japan. American soldiers massacred hundreds of thousands of Filipinos to establish American rule in the Philippines in 1899.

We focus upon the outrage of the Empire of Japan invading the Philippines and ignore the question as to what the Empire of America was doing there. It is 5200 miles from San Francisco to the Philippines, 1670 miles from Tokyo to the Philippines. On the assumption that the world should not be carved up into zones of imperial influence, which Empire had the **LEAST RIGHT** to be there? It was also in 1899 that America sent soldiers to join the European military excursion into China. No doubt America foresaw, even then, that many, many 6 year old girls would be in jeopardy if it did not expand the American empire into the Pacific. Some day it would have to protect those children by re-capturing the Philippines and dropping atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Christian Civilization saves the savages

George Bush speech in Atlanta Georgia November 8th 2001 *We wage a war to save civilization itself.* Andrew Jackson speech December 6th 1830 *all the blessings of liberty, civilization and religion.* (Jackson was a Freemason, in fact he was the Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Tennessee.) President William McKinley speaking to a group of ministers in 1899: *I walked*

the floor of the White House night after night until midnight, and I am not ashamed to tell you, gentlemen, that I went down on my knees and prayed Almighty God for light and guidance more than one night. And one night late it came to me this way--I don't know how it was, but it came: (1) we could not give them [the Philippine Islands] back to Spain--that would be cowardly and dishonorable; (2) that we could not turn them over to France or Germany--our commercial rivals in the Orient--that would be bad business and discreditable; (3) that we could not leave them to themselves--they were unfit for self-government--and they would soon have anarchy and misrule over there worse than Spain's was; and (4) that there was nothing left for us to do but to take them all, and to educate the Filipinos, and uplift and civilize and Christianize them, and by God's grace do the very best we could by them, as our fellow-men for whom Christ also died. (McKinley was a Freemason. It is unlikely that he believed in the divinity of Jesus Christ.)

Christ died for them, so we had to kill hundreds of thousands of them in order to establish the American brand of **CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION** there. In fact, McKinley had decided long before this to grab the Philippines as a base for American commerce and empire in the Pacific. But he is giving the ministers the pious and patriotic donkey dung they relish. While McKinley was sending soldiers to the Philippines, he ignored the request for help from North Carolina where white toughs terrorized the black population to keep them from voting in the 1898 election. The violent disenfranchisement of Negroes and Filipinos fit right in to his definition of **CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION**.

After the Spanish had been driven out of the Philippines in 1898 by a combined action of the Americans and the Filipinos themselves, the Americans betrayed their allies. The Filipinos had already proclaimed their own independent republic, invoking what they foolishly thought to be the basic American principles of the right to independence and self-government. Instead their islands were treated the same way that the American so-called *wilderness* had been treated. 60,000 American soldiers were sent to the Philippines to suppress the rebellion against the new American landlord. By the time the war ended, 200,000 had been sent.

In Mark Twain's essay on American Imperialism in the Philippines, which was not published until April 1992 in *The Atlantic*, Twain quotes an American army officer who estimated the number of Filipinos killed at *one-sixth of the population*, which would have been *over a million*. Whether or not that figure is accurate, it is clear that there was mass slaughter in the Philippines to suppress those who sought Independence. Remember that when you hear the rhetoric about the beneficent doings of America abroad. It was a typical episode, not an isolated example. In the century before and in the century since, America has done essentially similar things many times. The conquest of the Philippines and the massacre of the people there displays the real American character then and now. Mark Twain imagines someone in the Philippines trying to understand it: *There must be two Americas: one that sets the captives free, and one that takes a once-captive's new freedom away from him, and picks a quarrel with him with nothing to found it on; then kills him to get his land.* Twain understood it: Uncle Sam has an evil twin.

America's War **against** Independence

A contemporary book (1982) by Stuart Creighton Miller, *Benevolent Assimilation The American Conquest of the Philippines 1899-1903* describes what Americans did in the Philippines in the name of sharing the blessings of Christian Civilization and Good Business with the Filipinos who fought a stubborn war for independence without the outside help that America got in its war of independence. When the war was only a month old, an American general ordered every town within a 12 mile radius to be burned in retaliation for an ambush. It was typical of the war. More than 1000 people were killed in one village, men, women and children, because it was the nearest village to where the body of an American soldier had been found. When a Filipino killed an American soldier who had raped his fiance, the American commander, Captain Andrew Rowan, executed the Filipino man and then burned down his village AND ALSO the village of his girl friend. (Miller 206) Displaying as it were the attitude which accompanies those who promote Christian Civilization to people of an inferior race. Gang rapes of women by American soldiers were as common as they later became in Vietnam. Captain Thomas Connell "a young West Pointer and devout Irish Catholic with a puritanical streak" tried to stop the rapes before he was killed along with most of his company in the Balangiga massacre. The usual reprisals were taken by the Americans against any Filipinos they could catch. (200-204)

Miller quotes a war correspondent who described the reality of the war in a dispatch printed in the Philadelphia Ledger for Nov 19th 1900: " *The present war is no bloodless, fake, opera bouffe engagement. Our men have been relentless; have killed to exterminate men, women, children, prisoners and captives, active insurgents and suspected people, from lads of ten and up, an idea prevailing that the Filipino, as such, was little better than a dog, a noisome reptile in some instances, whose best disposition was the rubbish heap. Our soldiers have pumped salt water into men to "make them talk," have taken prisoner people who held up their hands and peacefully surrendered, and an hour later, without an atom of evidence to show that they were even insurrectos, stood them on a bridge and shot them down one by one, to drop into the water below and float down as an example to those who found their bullet riddled corpses.* This correspondent was not being critical. On the contrary, he stipulated in the article that such tactics were necessary and long overdue. *It is not civilized warfare, he confessed, but we are not dealing with a civilized people. The only thing they know and fear is force, violence, and brutality, and we give it to them* he concluded approvingly." (211) "A major commanding a marine battalion on Samar had executed eleven prisoners without benefit of trial." (218) Is it any surprise that the cold blooded killing of helpless prisoners became Standard Operating Procedure in Vietnam ? Or that the CIA (Uncle Sam's evil twin) encourages America's War Lords allies in Afghanistan to do it, while Americans refuse to know about it ? We don't care to know about such things, just as we do not care to know what is going on at the neighborhood abortuary.

A policy virtually identical to the one that the American military adopted 65 years later in Vietnam was imposed upon many parts of the Philippines: "The entire population outside of the major cities in Batangas was herded into concentration camps, which were bordered by what Bell called *dead lines*. Everything outside of the camps was systematically destroyed--humans, crops, food stores, domestic animals, houses, and boats. . . . Apparently, army officers were unable to perceive anything objectionable or offensive about being ordered out of one's home while American soldiers burned it to the ground and destroyed one's crops and any food or animal that could not be transported and stored in the larger towns and camps. General Hughes, under whom Bell and Major Smith served, later justified such actions on the grounds that the average native house cost no more than four dollars to build. In the cold parlance of cost-benefit analysis, these tactics were the cheapest means of producing a demoralized and obedient population." (208) (The same argument was used in Vietnam to justify the systematic destruction of Vietnamese villages.)

Military Logic

Many of the islands were devastated by American warships like the U.S.S. *Helena* which leveled defenceless coastal villages with its naval guns. (72) The systematic destruction of villages was carried out all over the Islands by devices such as "a steam fire-fighting engine converted, or more accurately, inverted, to spray villages with petroleum to make them burn more rapidly." (73) Finally, one officer, General Jacob Smith, was court-martialed after he told a reporter at the end of 1901 that he intended to set the entire island of Samar ablaze and would probably wipe out most of its population. (212) It was his indiscretion in talking to a reporter and thereby triggering a political flap and an official investigation that got him into trouble, more than the policy itself, which only followed the military logic of what was already being done.

In the campaign of 1900, Teddy Roosevelt shut up those who criticized the annexation of the Philippines by pointing out that it really wasn't any different from taking the lands of the Indians. He told the truth. America was also annexing the other islands of the Pacific, including the Hawaiian islands and the islands of the Caribbean which had belonged to Spain. Christian Civilization was on the march. Teddy Roosevelt thought war was fun after he led his *Rough Riders* in a cavalry charge up San Juan Hill. Apparently, the Gatling Gun wasn't working that day. But when his son was killed in World War I, he never got over the loss. Whatever glamour there ever was in war disappeared with the mud colored uniforms and the new weapons of mass slaughter. The Great War had all the glory of a meat packing plant operating on three shifts, while men were brought in like train loads of cattle to be driven into the slaughter works. The next war was worse. Now the heroic combat features computer nerds guiding drone airplanes which fire rockets. Like *The Patriot*, we decline the personal challenge. But our computer can whip yours !

the collision of empires

Before the *SURPRISE* attack on Pearl Harbor (which was no surprise to Roosevelt, according to several accounts) American pilots were already flying with the Chinese air force in sorties against the Japanese. For those who understood such matters, it had long been apparent that a showdown between the Empire of the West and the Empire of the East was inevitable. Note that the Japanese did not attempt an invasion of Hawaii, much less of the American mainland. They attacked the American navy which guarded America's Pacific empire. At the same time, the Japanese were attacking the colonial possessions of the British and French empires in Asia. It was a collision of empires. Those who killed and died in those wars did it for The Empire, whatever they thought they were doing. *My Empire, right or wrong. My only regret is that I have but one life to give for my Empire.*

Are those far distant islands of the Pacific the same as *AMERICA*? They are now. If you bomb my military base 10,000 miles from here, it is the same as if you attacked my home and my family. It is all one piece, all one empire. Any of those 600 military bases around the world are *AMERICA*. Teddy Roosevelt insisted that any place Americans had died for the flag must forever remain the possession of America. By that standard, America has a lot of territory to defend. In fact, we have just acquired thirteen new military bases in nine countries, places like Uzbekistan, after paying large bribes to the resident dictators. The Pentagon thinks no more of acquiring a new military base than a billionaire car collector thinks of buying another car. They are now outposts of the *AMERICAN NEW WORLD ORDER*. Defending America is a global enterprise. We will fight to the death to defend that sacred soil, including the golf course. We need new versions of our nationalist hymns to express this reality--*God bless Uzbekistan, Land That I Love . . . O Say Does that Star Spangled Banner Yet Fly o'er the Land of the Free, Diego Garcia?*

Are you ready to lay down your life for your *COUNTRY*, that is, for Diego Garcia? This island in the middle of the Indian Ocean, 1000 miles south of India, is where the B 52 and B 1 bombers are based. From there, they can drop *FREEDOM* on any town in Africa, Asia, or the Middle East. In December 2001, 3 American soldiers were killed and 19 wounded by a misguided *smart bomb* from a B 52, which also killed 5 Northern Alliance Afghan soldiers and wounded 18. When they were brought back to the base, a dozen reporters and photographers were locked in a warehouse to keep them from taking pictures or interviewing the survivors. If that is how accurate the *smart bombs* are, imagine what the **DUMB BOMBS** do, and that is a lot of what the B 52s carry. The B 52 bomber can fly at 50,000 feet and carry 70,000 pounds of bombs. They aren't much good at hitting targets from that high up, where they are out of range of ground fire. In one sorty against the Taliban lines 4 of 30 hit their targets.

delivering freedom

But the B 52s are effective over a big city where you can't miss hitting something down there. In December 1972, waves of them bombed Hanoi for 12 days. Hamburg again. Hamburger city again. In Luke 9.54-56 James and John urge Jesus to *command fire to come down from heaven and consume them, even as Elias did. But he turned and rebuked them, and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them.* Jesus apparently did not comprehend the sophisticated military truth that sometimes you have to destroy men in order to save them. He naively presents these as contraries.

A Patriot has to believe in Diego Garcia and the bombers which are parked there because *AMERICA* and *FREEDOM* and *BOMBING* are synonyms, they are all linked together. America cannot preserve Freedom in the World without regular bombing runs. And you can't bomb without bombers. That is why the proposition that a Patriot must be prepared to lay down his life--or somebody's life--for Diego Garcia is no joke. It is the logic of his position. Diego Garcia represents the cutting edge of America and Freedom--the bombing which is necessary to lead the way to Freedom. In his speeches Mr. Bush says that *Freedom is God's Gift to the World.* But it is delivered by Uncle Sam playing Santa Claus and the B 52 serves as his sled. Down the chimney comes *FREEDOM!* . . . *KA BOOM!* And your house and your family are *LIBERATED!*

the civilizing empire

It is a strange experience to read books written in the 30 years just before the Great War began. People really believed that they had finally arrived at Peace, and that they belonged to something called *CIVILIZATION* which had forever left behind the wars started by barbaric men in the past. The eruption of August 1914 was like a sewer main bursting into an elegant Victorian mansion. In the last years of the 19th century and the early years of the 20th century many educated people shared a belief that Europe and America were spreading progress, prosperity and enlightenment to the rest of the world through the commercial and military power of Western Civilization, through the empires of Britain and France and Germany which had spread their rule to the *backward* countries of Africa and Asia and through the new American empire which now dominated central and South America and the islands of the Pacific. It was a new version of the old faith in the civilizing mission of the Roman Empire. This faith marks President McKinley's speech justifying the imperial conquest of the Philippines.

One novel of that period, Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, exposes this false faith through the story of an apostle of civilization who sets out to bring Progress to primitive Africa. Instead of *civilizing* them he reverts to a savagery made much worse by the power of modern weapons. It is a true metaphor of the 20th century. What is striking about the 20th century is the relapse into total savagery by a society which had such faith in itself. Indeed, it was not so much a relapse into primitive savagery as it was an advance into horrors which would astonish and appall simple savages. The massacres of the Armenians by the Turks, the first genocide of the 20th century, opened the way for what followed. The systematic genocide of two world wars and the scattered genocidal wars, all over the world, which have followed, were on a scale that only *PROGRESS* in armaments could make possible. Now we look to primitive people for some antidote to what is wrong with us. Primitive massacres seem almost human compared to the gas chambers of Germany, the slave labor camps of Russia, the Killing Fields of Cambodia, the American and British incineration of whole cities from the air.

There is no excuse for the ignorance which causes innocents like Mr. Bush to believe that America represents *CIVILIZATION* and that it means something good when you say that. The word is an obscenity because it has so often designated obscene things. It designated the murderous slavery and the endless wars of the Roman Empire which constituted the so-called *Roman Peace*. It was the learned fool's faith of men like Edward Gibbon who really believed that Europe had finally arrived at *PEACE* and *CIVILIZATION* just before the French Revolution started chopping off heads, just before the wars of Napoleon engulfed the continent. The same word and the same illusion appear in that time just before the outbreak of the Great War which launched the horrors of the 20th century. The wars of the 20th century constitute sufficient proof that *CIVILIZATION* is that World which is ruled by Satan as described in Luke 4.6. and Matthew 4.8: *the kingdoms of This World*. That *BEAST* of the Apocalypse, *the beast that was, and is not, and yet is* (Revelation 17.8), alias the Roman Empire, comes again as the empires which have inherited the mantle of the old empire. The new Empire of the West is the true spiritual heir of that Roman Empire which Revelation describes. It is the *DEVOURING EMPIRE*.

a vision of empire

Those who relied upon the help of the French Empire to carry out the Revolution of 1776 against the British Empire aimed at establishing a new American empire which was modeled upon them and upon the old Roman Empire. In a letter to his wife from Philadelphia, dated July 24th, 1775, John Adams describes the *difficulty and intricacy when 50 or 60 men have a Constitution to form for a great Empire at the same time that they have a Country of 1500 Miles extent to fortify, Millions to arm and train, a Naval power to begin, an extensive commerce to regulate, numerous Tribes of Indians to negotiate with, a standing Army of 27,000 men, to raise pay, victual and Officer*. His vision of the task ahead of him has little to do with 13 Christian Colonies gaining their *Liberty*. They are obviously on their way to creating the *GREAT EMPIRE OF THE WEST* which will rival the old

Roman Empire for Greatness and Grandeur and the endless wars which are necessary to achieve it.
George Washington once ordered busts of Alexander

the Great and Julius Caesar. It shows who his heroes were--two empire builders. He described *America* as a *rising empire*. Gouverneur Morris, a delegate to the 1787 Convention, argued for *supporting the dignity and splendor of the American empire*. Nationalism meant imperialism for these delegates. It meant the Power and Glory of the New Empire of the West.

Writing his first full account of the Constitutional Convention to Thomas Jefferson in Paris in a letter of October 24th and November 1st 1787, James Madison says *It appeared to be the sincere and unanimous wish of the Convention to cherish and preserve the Union of the States. No proposition was made, no suggestion was thrown out in favor of a partition of the Empire into two or more Confederacies.* (Smith I 496) But, as he earlier reported, two states sent no delegates to the Convention. Rhode Island was opposed to it. Patrick Henry quit the Virginia delegation because he meant to oppose surrendering the sovereignty of Virginia to the creation of a powerful new federal government. George Mason and others walked out. Only three Virginians signed the final draft. Jefferson was stunned when he eventually discovered how much power had been given to the new government by fewer than 50 men meeting in **secret sessions** for 4 months in the Freemasons Hall in Philadelphia. It pretended to be a *republican* and *democratic* government but it truly was an *imperial* government.

When it considered the *partition of power* between the States and the *General Government* the Convention just failed to approve Madison's proposal to give it a veto over all state legislation. Which he argued for in his letter to Jefferson: *If the supremacy of the British Parliament is not necessary as has been contended, for the harmony of that Empire, it is evident I think that without the royal negative or some equivalent control, the unity of the system would be destroyed.* Jefferson replied that a better way to do it was for the Federal Judiciary to exercise a belated veto over State decisions. As small and weak as the fledging federal government was in 1787, the way was cleared for it to grow into the Imperial Eagle. The practical way for it to obtain supreme power, regardless of how the vote went in 1787, was through war. It soon did. Every war transferred more power from the States to the Federal government, and, once handed over, it won't be handed back again, conservative rhetoric to the contrary. Indeed conservatives are the most enthusiastic for expanding that permanent military establishment--that *Standing Army*--which so many founding fathers pointed to as the major source of Imperial Rule. A state which pretends to be *republican* or *democratic* necessarily assumes a **totalitarian configuration** in war time. The longer the wars and the larger its ambitions the more certainly it must become an *empire*, even while, like ancient Rome, it preserves the trappings of the old Republic and the pretense of democracy.

faith in *the fleets of America*

In the Federalist Papers, America's important men make the case for the new empire of the West. In the first one, Alexander Hamilton spells out that **THE FATE OF AN EMPIRE** depends upon having a united central government. In # 4, John Jay argues for a Federal government versus 13 independent colonies: *what armies could they raise and pay, what fleets could they ever hope to have ? . . . We have heard much of the fleets of Britain, and the time may come, if we are wise, when the fleets of America may engage attention.* The wisdom of the founding fathers was a dream of empire established by great fleets and armies. They set out to build a rival to the British Empire and the French Empire and the Spanish Empire. And so they did. They added pieces of those old empires to their new empire. They had to give up the attempt to annex Canada after two unsuccessful tries, but they annexed the Louisiana territory from France, the Florida territory from Spain, Texas and California from Mexico, and the Oregon Territory from Great Britain. And they went on from there. But **EMPIRE** is defined as much by power as by real estate, and that power always aspires to be and claims to be a universal spiritual power. And it is. It is the power that *the god of this world* confers upon his current favorite. That is what *God Bless America* really means. When Benjamin Franklin suggested to the Constitutional Convention that they pray *to the Father of lights*--by which he meant *Nature's God*, the God of the Freemasons represented by the Sun carved on the back of George Washington's chair--he asked: *is it probable that an empire can rise without his aid ?* Indeed it couldn't and it didn't, and all the signs are there for those who know how to read them.

That vision of empire was well on its way to being realized when Admiral Dewey took an American fleet to the Philippines in 1898. The Founding Fathers would have understood and approved of the American fleet steaming for Manila in pursuit of empire. Pearl Harbor would not have surprised them. The federal government we have today and the 400 billion dollar annual military budget is the inevitable result of the endless wars which were necessary to create the American Empire.

Today that vision of empire has been fulfilled. The *FLEETS OF AMERICA* patrol the world. The soldiers of the American Empire are stationed on every continent. And, beyond the imagination of the founding fathers, American war planes can rain *LIBERTY* on any village any where in the world. The Cherokees have no where to hide except within the Great Empire itself. We have the vision of the founding fathers to thank for those 600 military bases all over the world, and for the fact that we are going bankrupt paying for them and for all the bribes which are the necessary foundation of imperial greatness. Ten billion to this dictator for the American naval base. Twenty billion to that dictator for the American air field. The extension of the Empire to all parts of the world and its impending bankruptcy are the ripe and rotting fruit of the *LIBERTY TREE* the founding fathers planted.

In a 1789 letter from Thomas Paine in London to Thomas Jefferson in Paris, he notes the *national puffery* of the British as displayed in an address by Sir William Appleby which begins: *Britain, the Queen of Isles--the pride of Nations--the Arbitress of Europe, perhaps, of the World.* (*Papers of Thomas Jefferson* v. 14 p. 568) The American Empire has long since succeeded to the position of *Arbitress of the World* which the British Empire once claimed. The *national puffery* of contemporary American speeches makes Appleby's claims appear modest. Nothing is surer than that *pride goeth before a fall* and that empires inevitably *decline and fall*, sooner or later. The more money they spend on the wars of Empire the sooner it happens.

love your country, hate your empire

If you truly love your *COUNTRY*, you must hate the empire which devours it, along with all the other *COUNTRIES* of the world. Expanding it beyond reason, beyond recognition, is the same as destroying it. The growth of the Roman Empire destroyed the Republic of ancient Rome. The old Roman Senate became a rubber stamp for the Emperor's orders before it disappeared. The Capital was moved to Constantinople and the western half of the divided empire was left to sink into the mess it had made for itself. The Imperial armies, recruited from conquered barbarians, looted, raped and burned in the towns of the empire and in the ancient city of Rome itself. From being a powerful nation and then a great empire, Rome was reduced to a city state and then to a beleaguered fortified city which could not even control the province outside its walls. For centuries it was only a fortress in which the remnant of the citizens of Rome languished almost as prisoners while the empire became the home of barbarians equipped with Roman arms. Now the whole world has been supplied with American arms and they are ready to use them against us. Will our money keep us safe? We are running out of money and they already have more than we do. Everything in which we trust for our safety, they can buy. Every time you fill your gas tank you put more money in the pockets of those who have good reason to hate us.

If it means anything sane and sensible, *MY COUNTRY* has to mean the land I can see from the nearest high ridge, the place that I can walk around in a day. When it comes to include far off places which can only be secured by the endless expenditure of lives and treasure, by regular bombing runs, *MY COUNTRY* has become that Devouring Empire which will surely devour *MY COUNTRY* sooner or later, just as it has devoured so many other countries, until it finally devours itself. The proposition that I must defend the hills of home by holding onto an island in the Indian Ocean means that, once that island is lost, my home will soon be lost. The expenditure of money needed to *pacify* territories on the other side of the world requires another lien against my home.

Imperialism is a collective form of that materialism which gets hold of individuals. It leads to an endless trip driven by an insatiable appetite. What did George Washington want with that land far away on the other side of the mountains when he already had his great estates ? Why did Governor Patrick Henry send a military force to the mouth of the Ohio to expel the native inhabitants of a land he had never seen ? It would have taken him two months hard riding to get there and back had he wished to visit it. But in his mind it now belongs to *MY COUNTRY*. The *Shawanese*, *Mingoes*, and *Munsies* must be expelled. Just because they live there and did live there long before the Henrys heard of America does not mean that it belongs to them.

Along with the other *PATRIOTS*, circa 1776, Patrick Henry had discarded the authority of the King of England. But he still in effect claims the land all the way to the Mississippi and beyond, which was granted to Virginia under the Royal Charter issued by the King of England. The King has lost his authority by trying to put a tax on tea, but we still honor his authority when he in effect says that people living halfway across the continent don't own the land they inhabit because the King gave it to Virginia. *MY COUNTRY* includes the farthest place my power can reach. So when the erosion of that power begins, and it will, why shouldn't it include what really is *MY COUNTRY*, the land I actually inhabit ? If the *Shawanese*, *Mingoes*, and *Munsies* had no right to what they thought of as *MY COUNTRY*, what security can we expect when our turn comes ? It is as natural to love your real *country* as it is natural to love your wife. If you truly love your wife, you don't need to acquire a harem. If you truly love your country you don't need to turn it into a world empire. The devouring empire is none other than that *Great Harlot of Revelation* and those who are in love with her worship Satan. Those who cling to the Great Titanic will go down to the bottom with her.

#

Terry Sullivan c. 2008

MORE TO COME

THE SECRET FAITH OF THE FOUNDING FATHERS
--

THE EMPIRE DEVOURS VIETNAM

ZIONISM VERSUS JUDAISM

Terry Sullivan P.O. Box 16861 Denver CO 80216
