



# The Conservative Underground



Vol. 3 Issue 10

“Printing what they don’t want you to see,  
Teaching what they don’t want you to know”

25 May 2010

© Copyright 2010 Individual authors retain copyright to their own submissions

## In This Issue:

When Evil Has Destroyed the Foundations, What Are the Righteous To Do?	p. 1
From a High-Tech Lynching To Impeachment	p. 3
Corrrrrrupt Calderrrron	p. 5
A Vietnam Veteran Reflects on Blumenthal's Pretend Vietnam Service	p. 7
American Principles and History: The Basics	p. 8
The “Best of Times” or the “Worst of Times”?	p. 9
The Paganization of America	p. 13

In this issue, Linda Kimball warns us against the terrible effects of subjective moral

## When Evil Has Destroyed the Foundations, What Are the Righteous To Do?

By Linda Kimball

In a [video](#) posted on *Worth Reading*, Mexico's President Felipe Calderon receives a standing ovation from Democrats for criticizing Arizona's recently passed immigration law. By this law, Arizona citizens desperately hope to prevent their state from disappearing under a tidal wave of illegal immigration and all of the problems connected therein. But self-preservation, whether individual, state, or national is today viewed as a hate crime by monstrously self-inflated Transnational Progressive insiders and the religious zealots who follow their lead.

Do not be deceived by Calderon's seemingly reasonable stance, nor by the Democrats' enthusiastic reaction to it, for neither Calderon's criticism nor the Democrats reaction to it are rational. Rather, they are irrational and, in this instance, wicked. Wicked because the reasoning of these individuals is the corrupted outworking of thought filtered through disordered passions—narcissism, self-entitlement, contempt

standards in our society, while our new contributor, Nathan Bedford, points out the hypocrisy of the feminists whose own laws, taking advantage of the railroading of Clarence Thomas, led to Bill Clinton's impeachment. G. Bray shows us the stark realities of the corruption and violence of Mexico's political system, and why Arizona was right to try to stem its effects in our country, and Joe Clarke takes issue with yet another Stolen Valor Democrat. Carla Harper reminds us of the fundamental principles upon which our system rests, while Robert Maynard suggests that Obama and Co. may have overplayed their hand and bit off more than they can chew. Finally, Tim Dunkin draws some uncomfortable parallels between where America is at today, and other societies that collapsed under the weight of their own corruption and immorality.

for the “little guy”, resentment, covetousness, greed, malice, and above all, lust for power.

Sanity is the ability to recognize right from wrong independently of personal feelings, fears, impulses, desires, and compulsions. Rational thinking then, is reasoning disciplined to resist the corrupting influence of personal feelings, thus allowing for the acceptance of truths that contradict feelings, desires, and fancies. In short, rational thinking is morally-informed reasoning. It is dispassionate, rightly-ordered, clear thinking and logical, and is the fruit of impulse-control and unswerving commitment to enduring truths, moral law, and principle. Irrational reasoning is the opposite. Irrationality is the inability to recognize right from wrong independent of personal feelings, impulses, and compulsions. By the degree to which the moral sense is corrupt, so too is reason. The greater the degree of corruption, the more depraved is reason.

So when during the course of his presentation, Calderon spoke of reality, which itself reflects enduring truths over time, he spoke hypocritically, for what he really embraces is flux - the continuous change resulting from the restlessness, narcissism, covetousness, boredom,

and other vices that relentlessly gnaw the disordered soul of every morally and intellectually immature terrible-infant in an adult-size body. Translated, what Calderon is really saying is that laws ought to be changeable according to what we want when we want it, or more precisely, what self-inflated, self-serving Liberals and those like Calderon desire when they desire it.

To see the consequences of this way of reasoning, consider for example the chaos, breakdown and violence that would ensue if the rules on which football, basketball, golf, and baseball are founded were subject to arbitrary change in accord with the desires, whims, and caprices of resentful, envious, greedy players, fans, franchise owners, bureaucrats, or government officials. In practice, a disgruntled player or self-conceited club owner could arrogantly demand that foul balls be redefined as "alternative home runs" when it suited their purpose.

But why should this subversion of rules not come to pass when we have already accepted as valid the desires and consequent demands of narcissistic males and females who, controlled by disordered erotic impulses and compulsions, have demanded and received redefinition as "gays"? On the basis of this insanity, "gays" have been accorded "special rights" protected by paralegalistic hate crime laws and politically correct speech codes (paramoralism). By acquiescing to the demands of "gays", we invite ourselves to be further intimidated, terrorized, and blackmailed into giving in to yet more outrageous demands by the psychologically-disordered until finally, sanity and freedom will have given place entirely to insanity and tyranny. This will happen because:

*"...the United States is currently suffering from an epidemic of narcissism," insist Jean M. Twenge, Ph.D., and W. Keith Campbell,*

*Ph.D., in The Narcissism Epidemic: Living in the Age of Entitlement. "American culture's focus on self-admiration has caused a flight from reality to the land of grandiose fantasy." (David Kupelian, How Evil Works., p. 80)*

*"The evidence Twenge and Campbell have compiled is compelling and appalling," summarizes Holly Brubach in the New York Times. "Never mind the (narcissistic) celebrities; their arrogance is equaled if not surpassed by the grandiosity of so-called average Americans." (ibid., p. 81)*

*"Does the narcissism of this man (Barack Obama) know no bounds?" asks Charles Krauthammer, a former psychiatrist and Pulitzer Prize-winning columnist. (ibid., p. 80)*

*"Our work suggests that contemporary culture has become fixated on a group of stars whose narcissistic tendencies appear to be approaching personality-disorder levels," reported the Journal of Research in Personality, Oct. 2006. (ibid., p. 79)*

According to the Mayo Clinic, narcissistic personality disorder is "a mental disorder in which people have an inflated sense of their own importance and a deep need for admiration. They believe that they're superior to others and have little regard for other people's feelings." (ibid.)

In other words, their moral sense and reasoning processes are corrupt, meaning they are no longer able to "recognize right from wrong, truth from lie independently of personal feelings, fears, impulses, and compulsions." And because narcissism is all about what self wants with little regard for other people's feelings, then narcissism is both insane and tyrannical. (cont. on page 10)



Find out what's worth reading at <http://worthreading.ning.com> – the site that they don't want you to know about!

## From a High-Tech Lynching to Impeachment

By Nathan Bedford

Someday historians will acknowledge the direct causal relationship between the attempted high-tech lynching of Clarence Thomas and the impeachment of Bill Clinton.

Liberal partisans such as Nina Totenberg, feminists disguised as reporters, contrived to enrage much of the world against Clarence Thomas for alleged offenses which, in the wake of Clinton's sordid grotesqueries and felonies committed during the Monica Lewinsky affair, can in comparison be considered to be but trivialities. What exactly did Thomas do to Anita Hill? She testified for the first time, years after the alleged facts, that he (1) exclaimed that there was a "pubic hair" on his coke can and that he (2) had seen the movie Long Dong Silver. She also alleged that Thomas repeatedly (3) asked her out, (4) bragged of his sexual prowess, and (5) said that he had satisfied women with oral sex.

What Bill Clinton did a couple of years later was so egregious that it renders these unsubstantiated allegations merely frivolous, a fey neurosis of a bizarre era: Bill Clinton, in contrast to Thomas, sodomized a young intern in the Oval Office with a cigar and committed an indecent act with the presidential sink. Bill Clinton repeatedly talked dirty to his young intern over the telephone while they pleased themselves. Bill Clinton suffered his young intern to perform indecent acts on him while she was crouched under the presidential desk. I wonder what Nina Totenberg's reaction would have been had she learned that Bill Clinton had committed the atrocity of asking Monica Lewinsky out on a formal date?

Liberals say that the matter of sexual harassment is all about redressing the imbalance of the power relationship between men and women, between master and servant, and between boss and employee. Of course, the relationship of Clinton and Lewinsky fit this template perfectly. But the Clintons did not stop there, they tag-teamed women who complained of sexual mistreatment (even actual assaults) by Bill Clinton and compounded his original crimes. Gennifer Flowers was made to lie publicly to protect Bill Clinton, to sign a perjurious affidavit denying their relationship, thus establishing a Clinton *modus operandi* and had her apartment ransacked for her pains, or perhaps for her favors. Kathleen Willey

was intimidated professionally by ominous strangers. Juanita Broderick was admonished by Hillary Clinton, the implication clear that Broderick was to remain silent about her rape by Bill Clinton. Other women whose silence and lies could not be assured by intimidation were vilified, publicly humiliated, and discredited as "sluts and nuts".

The record revealed much more outrageous conduct that should make anyone who has even the most cavalier concern for women's rights righteously indignant. The Nina Tottenbergs of the world never turned a hair.

Even from the perspective of time it is hard to believe how the liberals succeeded, with the Thomas hearings, in convulsing a nation over such relatively frivolous charges that were very likely untrue, explicitly denied, and otherwise uncorroborated. For three days the nation sat transfixed before its television sets, absorbing a drama played out in the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate.

As a result of these proceedings it is possible, if not likely, that four or five leftist women were added to the United States Senate as Democrats: Murray, Moseley-Braun, Mikulski, Feinstein, and Boxer. Indeed, 1992, the year following the hearings, became known as the "Year of the Woman." The ripple effect from these proceedings extended beyond politics and beached again in the judiciary as Bill Clinton appointed to the Supreme Court an extreme feminist, an arch advocate for the ACLU, and, in my view, a bloodthirsty abortionist, Ruth Bader Ginsburg.

**NOTORIOUSLY**



**CONSERVATIVE**

Notorious conservatism at its finest, at <http://www.notoriouslyconservative.com/>

It is not a stretch to assert that the election of Bill Clinton was clearly advanced by the contrived hysteria surrounding the Clarence Thomas hearings. Clinton's famous sales pitch, "vote for me and you get her - two for the price of one," referring to Hillary Rodham-Clinton, was simply echoing the drumbeating on behalf of Clinton and Rodham by the mainstream media press who had dubbed Hillary, "the smartest woman in the world" in the run-up to "The Year of the Woman."

Polls taken during the course of the hearings of Americans who actually watched the proceedings on television and drew their conclusions from what they saw, revealed that Americans believed Clarence Thomas and they did not believe Anita Hill. Polls taken months and years later, after the mainstream media had its relentless way with the public, reflected precisely the opposite sentiment.

After Clinton attained the White House, a coalition of Democrats passed The Violence against Women Act over the opposition of minority Republicans. That pernicious statute federalized domestic violence and distorted our precious presumption of innocence. If there is a saying of the law, "hard cases make bad law", surely there is a corollary, "mass psychosis makes for bad laws." Even the ACLU was led to criticize the excesses of the statute.

The Clintons and the Democrats shamelessly exploited the feminist pathology as the national psychosis played out in the Clarence Thomas hearings. They rode it into the White House. But irony had yet a card to play. In addition to the Violence Against Women Act, the Democrats contrived a law which made evidence alleging incidences of sexual-harassment admissible if a defendant in such a lawsuit might

have previously engaged in sexual "harassment" against a third unrelated party. The theory behind the law: once a cad always a cad; so evidence of bad behavior on one day is proof of bad behavior on another day. Bill Clinton signed this bill into law. With the stroke of his own pen, he ensured that his own real sexual offenses against Kathleen Willey, Gennifer Flowers, and especially, Monica Lewinsky, would become the stuff of Paula Jones' lawsuit.

When the Monica Lewinsky scandal erupted, I was struck by the dichotomy between the reactions of folks here in Germany and back home in America. Later, I was to be struck by a similar dichotomy in reaction to the invasion of Iraq. The unanimity of opinion in Germany was striking. Germans simply could not believe America had lost its mind over a trivial matter like sex and they certainly could not believe that the world's only superpower would overthrow its government over a few bumps and tickles. Ultimately, the German view would come to prevail in America and the case for impeachment against Bill Clinton would not lie in the Senate. The assault on Clarence Thomas also failed, but no one ever said he got any bumps or tickles in compensation for his ordeal. To the contrary and unto this day he is denied by the Left even the decency of an acknowledgment that he has by every standard conducted himself utterly free of taint. Justice Thomas' only compensation would be the quiet inner satisfaction that comes from a righteous life, a "Normal Christian Life."

I did not share the German view then and I do not hold it now. I believe that Bill Clinton committed high crimes and misdemeanors in trying to fix a civil trial (for money and reputation), that he conspired to fix a court case (with Monica Lewinsky, Betty Currie), that in furtherance of that conspiracy he suborned perjury (of Monica Lewinsky, Betty Currie), conspired to hide evidence, hid evidence (gifts hidden under the bed), and actually committed perjury (too notorious to require recounting). These were all felonies and as such they qualify as "high crimes and misdemeanors" under the constitutional standard for impeaching a president. Further, the president is the chief law enforcement officer in the land and by committing a string of felonies he breached his constitutional duty to see to the faithful execution of the laws - which misfeasance constitutes additional impeachable offenses. One need only consider the brouhaha over the alleged misrepresentations made to Congress by Attorney

**Free Republic** – The best conservative forum on the internet! Sign in today and start getting informed! –

<http://www.freerepublic.com>



General Gonzales, or the ordeal of Scooter Libby, to understand the gravity of the real offenses committed by Clinton.

As the Lewinsky impeachment drama played out and it became apparent that Slick would slither around impeachment, those of us who had a memory span larger than a gnat and so recalled the hysteria of the Clarence Thomas hearings, were utterly dumbfounded. I can recall explaining to my German friends and neighbors that the Monica Lewinsky affair was not just about sex but about the very real and important felonies I have described. One could tell from the expression on their faces that they had never heard this information before, yet they received it quite skeptically, even begrudgingly. I challenge any reader to lay out Bill Clinton's crimes to your apolitical American friends and neighbors. I bet you will get the same reaction today of surprise, indifference, and even hostility from most Americans. Like the vines of Angkor Wat, time has shrouded Clinton's crimes.

It is a sure bet that few of them will remember the Clarence Thomas hearings, their context and aftermath, much less will they be aware of the chain of causation which led from the near high-tech lynching of Clarence Thomas to the impeachment of William Jefferson Clinton.




---

## Corrrrrrupt Calderrrron

By G. Bray

*“And there was a cloud that overshadowed them: and a voice came out of the cloud, saying, This is my beloved Son: hear Him.”*  
(Mark 9:7)

Why is it that Premier Hussein gets along a lot better with corrupt dictators than he does with our friends? He seemed so comfortable with the Mexican Jefe, unlike those freely-elected leaders like Netanyahu and Brown. Perhaps he wished that Calderrrron and the corruption of his inner circle

were a better example of what America looked like than what we were pre-Obama, or he may know they see through his façade. To be the pompom girl for a corrupt thug really speaks more for where he is attempting to take our country than anything he reads on his telecrutch. He is another corrupt pol, bought and paid for by the Chicago machine the same way his Amigo is owned by the drug cartels.

It is not a coincidence that one of the major drug routes into America is through Arizona. The drug cartels have hired and trained paramilitary groups to transport marijuana and meth through the southern corridors of Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona due to the wide open borders and access to freeways heading north. The drug runners' biggest concern is for either the fence being built or the police actually taking their jobs seriously. Presidente Calderrrron understands that the \$40 billion drug trafficking is Mexico's largest income, larger than the \$35 Billion being sent back to families in his country from migrant workers. That money buys a lot of protection both physically and politically for the drug cartels.

The drug trade has exploded in Mexico when many of the cartels relocated from Colombia, making it #1 in the Americas and #2 in the world. It has become the Chicago Exchange of drugs as the lords vie for more and more of the market. The biggest of the drug lords is Joaquin “Chapo” Guzman, who is a billionaire and is #41 on the *Forbes* top 100 list, with a bullet. He has made this war a bloodbath as he has killed in excess of 20,000 since 2007 in the drug wars, primarily over drug routes. The largest war was in Juarez/El Paso, feeding the East Coast although not far behind is Arizona. This route is a short drive to the lucrative Western markets without the intense patrolling of the California border.

The drug mules often carrying 150 lb. Packs, having military escorts of anywhere from 2-5 AK-armed patrolers on point, with the same number on either flank and 1-3 guarding the rear, with 10-500 carrying the drugs. The armed men are ex-military and have been trained by their and our armies. They will kill anything in their way and it is rumored they have a standing \$100,000 bounty on any Border Patrol agents they kill. They have killed thousands of innocent people who have stumbled upon them, leaving their bodies where they lie. This is what the Arizona law and the border states are attempting to address as there is an obvious fear on our side, and pure corruption on



Renew America (<http://www.renewamerica.com/>) is a grassroots organization that supports the self-evident truths found in the Declaration of Independence, and their faithful application through upholding the U.S. Constitution, as written. Its purpose, therefore, is to thoughtfully and courageously advance the cause of our nation's Founders.

Calderrrron's. The drug cartels have corrupted the police, military and gummit all the way to his Drug Czar who was caught with a \$450,000 bribe. By all appearances they have been going after every cartel except Guzman's who happens to be from the same state as Calderrrron. Of course there is no chance he is corrupt.

When bribes don't work, the cartels turn to terror. The people of Mexico are terrorized by the drug cartels to the point of 21,000 Mexicans being victims of the drug wars since 2007. If you want to go on a safe vacation, pick Afghanistan or Iraq rather than our southern neighbor. These killers have murdered not only their rivals and people caught in crossfire, but police, military, politicians and journalists who would dare to stand up to these dirtbags. Calderrrron has had both an affiliate and a political enemy killed in the last year by the cartels. His enemy was a very convenient hit since he was one of the main candidates who ran against the powerful PAN Party ( which ran Mexico for decades) in the last election. Mexico makes Trashcanistan/Iraq seem like a southern picnic when it comes to corrupt drug leaders, although we can trust Calderrrron is clean. Certainly clean enough to get a standing ovation from the DNC?

Unlike the outrage from our press over Karzai's corruption from his drug lords, El Presidente gets a pass from our Establishmedia. Mexico is a larger drug producer and exporter than Trashcanistan in all but heroin, and is far more violent tatall levels of its society. Their police and military are underpaid and have poor weapons compared to the firepower most cartels possess. In most cases, the police are either corrupt or killed, and the cartel has taken their methods of killing to a new and brutal level with beheading and putting the head on a spike becoming the preferred method. The reports of being tortured for hours prior to death are legendary as they have used every method imaginable to make most deaths an example. There was the murder in Florida of a girl,

brought with others as sex slaves, who was raped and beheaded as an example to the others. Corrupt politicians are not reported on since it also has the highest level of murdered journalists of any country in the world. Over 25 journalists have been killed since 2000, including one who had written a report on a local politician in which he accused him of being bought by a cartel, and ended up dead the next day. Perhaps MSDNC can send some of their talking heads down there to show how wonderful they are. "See they don't even need to show papers...why are you pushing me into this jeep?"

To pretend that this corruption isn't spilling across our border to reach our southern cities is a pipe dream. Our Border Patrols have as much chance of stopping this as a one-armed man fighting Mike Tyson. It is only a matter of time, as we see the murder and kidnap rates in Phoenix exploding. This will happen in not only Arizona, but in Texas and every other state on the routes. The Arizona legislators have taken a bold and dramatic step to give our police a weapon to use against these cartels while El Bozo screams racism. The police are outmanned and an all-out war would kill thousands. We see the violence on the routes as girls are raped and ranchers killed for being in the wrong place at the wrong time. Until we take this serious we will begin looking more and more like Mexico. The people on the border know all about this violence and are being terrified just like the Mexicans. This is simply our states fighting back, unlike our gummit.

Presidente Calderrrron has no motivation to stop the drug trade on the border. If he did, he would post his military on their side and stop the cartels from bringing those drugs across. Rather, he makes a big splash like he really means to do something, when in reality it is nothing more than a show while he takes the bribes under the table. How hard would it be to send him money through backdoor channels or threaten him and his family to get him to do what the cartels want? What

motivation does he have when it is one of the biggest exports his gummy has and employs millions of Mexicans in good paying jobs? It is one of his strongest industries and is recession proof. He has as much of an interest in keeping that Arizona route open for the cartels for political reasons as the kingpins do for financial ones. When he called out the state for human rights violations, he should have looked in a mirror and asked himself about the 21,000 Mexicans who were murdered as victims of his drug trade? Rather than a standing ovation perhaps, our criminals in Congress could have had a moment of silence?

Pray for America




---

## A Vietnam Veteran Reflects On Blumenthal's Pretend Vietnam Service

By Joe Clarke

I am always amazed by those who did their best to escape Vietnam, but later wish that they had been part of that war, *né* police action. People have privately approached me, as if seeking some sort of absolution for their faux Vietnam War service. I, of course, tell them to "go in peace, and sin no more," or, maybe something not quite as biblically dramatic.

Yet, I am still puzzled as to why, especially libs, who were very much anti-war and indeed tried to lose Vietnam as much as they are trying to lose Iraq and Afghanistan, would claim to be part of something that has not been known as one of America's winningest moments - by a long shot.

While on leave from the Marine Corps during the Vietnam "era," I was spit upon - by a lesbian - just because... After serving 16 months in Nam in S-3 Operations and as a helicopter aerial gunner, I was medevaced out of country for a nervous condition and disability-retired for life at the age of 21. God had better plans for me, though. In any event, if anyone knows history, Viet vets were thought of as either crazy (I was labeled "Psycho Joe") or society tried to ignore us, hoping we would just go away.

Hollywood was overly eager to depict Vietnam Veterans as wild men, ever ready to lose it and commence firing on anything or anybody that moved - in civilian life. The American cultural *zeitgeist* just did not know what to do with us. In subsequent years, I witnessed many brothers in arms commit suicide (I even tried), go crazy, drink or drug themselves to death, get divorced, etc. Quite a few made the transition, yet always somewhat burdened with the stigma.

The lib media and academia, after winning at losing the war for the U.S., became so energized that it has kept a stranglehold on nearly all of our sacred American institutions (including the churches) for lo these many years.

But why would aging, grey pony-tailed ex-hippies be wanting to redo their past so much that they would, quite commonly as we see, desire to be retro/redux soldiers?

Probably because they see how that despite the socialists' best attempts, we still honor our veterans - from WWI, WWII, Korea, Vietnam, Kuwait, the Gulf War, Iraq, Afghanistan, and countless other places across the globe. They just have not been able to devalue our great American military, which by the grace of God, has been a pillar of our economic and societal stature in the world. Nevermind the Commies working overtime to undo that greatness, employing every tactic to decimate the military's morale as well as its budget.

The same Commies who provoked the Kent State students (near where I live in Ohio) and the same Fascist totalitarians who undermined the Vietnam conflict, have not been so successful in stealing the hearts of Americans, except for the aberrational administrations of Clinton and Obama.

I honor all Tea Partiers, Soldiers of Christ, and Patriots in general who are fighting the fight against modern day tyranny, just as much as I honor my fellow veterans. Serving your country includes not only those who wore uniforms, but all those who would like to rescue these United States from the clutches of evil. After all, the Colonial fathers were heroes long before they donned a uniform, and they were great men after the Revolutionary War as well.

Not everyone would like to be so honored. I understand that the *Family Guy* creator Seth McFarland, after ridiculing Sarah Palin's daughter in his cartoon, has now produced an episode where a former Viet Cong mocks the Vietnam Veterans Wall, shouting, "I killed him and him," as he points to the names of those dead veterans who died in action. I don't know about you, but I never fought to protect the *Family Guy's* freedom. Only someone deranged would lay down his life for Seth McFarland. I might lay down McFarland's life, but not mine, certainly.

The Huffington Kos (they're all the same to me) remarked about Blumenthal's lame apology; "Vietnam veterans were not really scorned after they returned from Vietnam as we have heard," according to some psychobabble study by a lib professor who was probably not even alive during the Vietnam War. Then again, because he's a lib professor, he will probably pretend he was alive during the Vietnam War some day.

---

## American Principles and History: The Basics

By Carla Harper

This is a simple review of what made America the freest and richest nation in all of world history. If you have already decided that America needs to fundamentally transform into something that looks like any other country in the world, stop reading now.

[The Declaration of Independence](#) (July 4, 1776) laid the foundation for a government principally set up to protect life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness - not happiness, but the pursuit of happiness.

Our distant ancestors fought in [the Revolutionary War](#) because their ruler, [King George III of England](#), increasingly took the fruits

of their labors through excessive taxation and interfered in their lives through arbitrary and unjust edicts. The people got fed up with heavy handed government.

Those who stepped forward willing to risk their treasure and lives, [the Founders](#), *shared the same fundamental beliefs, despite varying educational backgrounds and social status*. They were not all rich slave owners. According to Cleon Skousen, author of *The 5000 Year Leap*, they shared well-defined convictions concerning religious principles, political precepts, economic fundamentals, and long-range social goals. They often disagreed with each other and personalities clashed, but on the overarching desire to create a truly free people based on the wisdom of the ages, they were unanimous. The debates at the Constitutional Convention and the writings of them all reflect a broad knowledge base including the thinking of Polybius, Cicero, Thomas Hooker, Coke, Montesquieu, Blackstone, John Locke, and Adam Smith. They all knew and respected the teachings of the Bible. They studied the histories of the Greeks, Romans, Anglo-Saxons, Europeans, and English.

Of the most significance is their belief in "*the laws of nature and of Nature's God*" as penned by Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence. Natural law is God's order of things. They often quoted [Cicero](#) who wrote extensively about Natural Law:

*"True law is right reason in agreement with nature, it is of universal application, unchanging and everlasting; it summons to duty by its commands, and averts from wrongdoing by its prohibitions...We cannot be freed from its obligations by senate or people, we need not look outside ourselves for an expounder or interpreter of it...one eternal and unchangeable law will be valid for all nations and all times, and there will be one master and ruler, that is God, over us all, for he is the author of this law..."*

Our governmental system is called a [Constitutional Republic](#). Our Constitution that was "fathered" by James Madison and signed by thirty-nine delegates focuses on the architecture of the government so as to minimize the abuse of power. It has been amended twenty-seven times. Contrary to what many would argue today, THE CONSTITUTION WILL NEVER BE OBSOLETE. Again, Cleon Skousen, writes, "*It was designed to control something which has not changed and will not change - namely human nature.*" A republic is defined by James Madison in the Federalist Papers,

Numer 39 as “...a government which derives all its powers directly or indirectly from the great body of the people, and is administered by persons holding their offices during pleasure for a limited period, or during good behavior.”

America is not a democracy. The word is found nowhere in the Constitution, but when most of us say “democracy” we mean something more akin to our traditional Constitutional Republic. A democracy is governance by full participation of all the people in the legislative or decision-making processes. This can’t work in a country our size because people simply don’t have time to follow or study issues that closely. So, we elect representatives through the democratic process of every adult having one vote.

Our government exists to secure basic rights, safety, and to act as umpire in the market place. The most important right, according to the Founders, was the right to property. They knew that life and liberty could only be secured alongside secured property. John Locke wrote in his *Second Essay Concerning Civil Government* that all property is an extension of a person’s life, energy, and ingenuity. A person must reasonably believe that whatever he creates or purchases will be protected by the law. This is the secret to America’s success, according to Peruvian economist Hernando de Soto, author of *The Mystery of Capital: Why Capitalism Triumphs in the West and Fails Everywhere Else*. When asked why poverty persists in the developing world and why capitalism works so well in the West, he says, “*Because the West has a property rights system, and property rights systems seem to be about ownership. What we’re discovering more and more is that it’s really the system that undergirds the system of values called capitalism.*”

We are a country of legal immigrants, initially attracted to the freedoms made possible by the unique American form of government, not free handouts or desire to tear the country down out of some contorted religious beliefs known as *jihad*. Kjell Nordstrom, a professor at the Institute of Business at the Stockholm School of Economics, is an international expert on economies. He says the US remains in the top five most powerful economies because America is the ultimate meritocracy, open to all comers. “*This openness allows the US to systematically mop up good people - bankers, professors and engineers,*” says Mr. Nordstrom. “*America puts people into productive work in a very short time, it imports innovation and success. An American investment bank is like a mini-United Nations. It doesn’t matter where you come from as long as you can deliver. In the US, if you fail, it is not because of your ethnic background, it is a question of your competence.*”

## The “Best of Times” or the “Worst of Times”?

By Robert Maynard

Recently I have been following a friendly debate between two champions of liberty that brings to mind this famous quote from Charles Dickens "A Tale of Two Cities":

*"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity, it was the season of Light, it was the season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair, we had everything before us, we had nothing before us, we were all going direct to heaven, we were all going direct the other way — in short, the period was so far like the present period, that some of its noisiest authorities insisted on its being received, for good or for evil, in the superlative degree of comparison only."*

The debate I am referring to was being run as Op-Ed pieces on various Internet sites between columnist Mark Steyn and Hillsdale College Professor of History and Politics Paul Rahe. The debate starts with a column by Mark Steyn entitled “Tattered Liberty” in the January 25, 2010 edition of *National Review*. In this column Mark makes this observation about England:

*"In my book America Alone, I point out that, to a five-year-old boy waving his flag as Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee procession marched down the Mall in 1897, it would have been inconceivable that by the time of his 80th birthday the greatest empire the world had ever known would have shriveled to an economically moribund strike-bound socialist slough of despond, one in which (stop me if this sounds familiar) the government ran the hospitals, the automobile industry, and much of the housing stock, and, partly as a consequence thereof, had permanent high unemployment and confiscatory tax rates that drove its best talents to seek refuge abroad."*

He goes on to discuss how European civilization went from being the dominant one on the planet to a civilization in decline in a relatively short time frame. Even this time frame might have been shorter if the Europeans had been required to shoulder the burden of their own defense during

the Cold War. Mr. Steyn sees America as heading down the same path toward welfare state dependency and the eventual decline of civilization that comes with this. He is not very hopeful that we will be able to reverse our current course towards destruction. It is with this final assessment that Paul Rahe dissents. Mr. Rahe agrees with just about everything that Mark Steyn is saying except the conclusion that we will be unable to reverse course. In a piece entitled "A New Birth of Freedom," which appeared on the *Big Government* website, he lays out his counter argument. Mr. Rahe has argued in his books "*Montesquieu and the Logic of Liberty*" and "*Soft Despotism: Democracy's Drift*" that the real danger for democracies is not a surrender to socialism via a coup d'etat in the manner that Obama and crew are trying to foist on us. On the contrary, he asserts that:

*"The larger danger has always been what Tocqueville feared: that the citizens of liberal democratic republics would gradually and unobtrusively come to depend on centralized administration for help in every aspect of their lives. Our propensity to drift in the direction of obviously surrendering our liberties one by one in search of a security that no government can really guarantee has always been where the greatest peril lay."*

He believes that Obama has unwittingly spared us from that fate by rushing the move toward welfare state socialism:

*"Like Mark Steyn, I view Barack Obama as 'one of the most consequential presidents in history,' but not for the same reasons. In my view, he and today's Democratic Party represent the last gasp of the Progressive impulse. The tyrannical ambition hidden at the heart of Progressivism's quest for what Franklin Delano Roosevelt termed 'rational administration' Barack Obama has made manifest; and to all with eyes to see, the danger that we have temporized with for nearly a century is now perfectly visible. As Obama himself has insisted in speech after speech, the moment in which we now live is a 'defining moment.' What is required in what he calls 'this defining moment' is what Abraham Lincoln once called 'a new birth of freedom.' The period we just entered could be our finest hour."*

His basic premise is that we Americans

have not yet succumbed to servitude as the price to be paid for security to the extent that the Europeans have. In short, there is still time to turn things around and all Obama has "done is to awaken a sleeping giant and fill him with a terrible resolve." (This is actually part of a quote from Japanese Admiral Isoroku Yamamoto after the bombing of Pearl Harbor) The sleeping giant is, of course, the Tea Party movement.

So, which is it? Is this the best of times, or is it the worst of times? That will depend on whether the American people still value their individual liberty and independence over a government provided security. In short, have we caught the "European Disease"?



<http://www.reclaimingtheblade.com>

**(When Evil, cont. from page 2)** "*Liberty is the prevention of control by others*" - Lord Acton

Either truth, morality, laws, and rules have enduring, fixed meaning or they do not. If they do not, which is the stance of America's legions of narcissistic immoralists, then truth, morality, laws, and rules are to be made up as they go along, according to what they want when they want it. By extension of the illogic of this depraved reasoning, America's founding documents - the Declaration of Independence, Constitution, and the Bill of Rights - and the rule of law are as meaningless as the politically correct paralegalisms, inverted truths, and paramoralisms invented by the mentally-disordered immoralists who currently control the UN and our White House. These are not only increasingly gaining control of government at every level of society, but as well, of universities, judiciary, media, entertainment industry, church pulpits, and unions. In one fashion or another, all of these emotional-

tyrants are forcing their insanity and depravity onto all of us.

### **America: A Constitutional Republic, Not a Democracy**

America was founded as a Constitutional Republic. A Republic, by definition, has two principle elements. First, it is controlled by Law which transcends mankind, hence neither man nor Republic control Law.

Second, it recognizes the private, sovereign nature of each man, which means that the transcendent Creator Who gave us Law gave us life and liberty at the same time. Life and liberty are inseparable. All men, regardless of creed, color, and sex are human beings made in the spiritual image of the transcendent Creator, hence each person is endowed with an individual immortal soul and a mind endowed with reason, conscience, will, imagination, and memory. This means that all men, while not physical or mental equals or equal in gifts and talents, are however spiritual equals in the eyes of their Creator. Since by their nature men are both free and individual thinkers and choosers, they are therefore endowed with the capacity to be self-governing when they mature both morally and intellectually.

By extension, America's founding documents are spiritual documents. For it is our spiritual property that is unalienable and precedes material property. Unalienable means: *not from man but from the transcendent Creator*:

*"The moment the idea is admitted into society that property is not as sacred as the laws of God, and that there is not a force of law and public justice to protect it, anarchy and tyranny commence. If 'Thou shalt not covet' and 'Thou shalt not steal' were not commandments of Heaven, they must be*

*made inviolable precepts in every society before it can be civilized or made free."* - John Adams, *A Defense of the American Constitutions*, 1787 (source: [The Patriot Post](#))

In the essay on "Property" by Madison, published in *The National Gazette* on March 29, 1792, Madison clearly defines the meaning of property and just government in the examples below:

*"He has a property...in his religious opinions, and in the profession and practice dictated by them.*

*"He has a property...in his opinions and the free communication of them.*

*"He has an equal property in the free use of his faculties and free choice of the objects on which to employ them.*

*"He has property very dear to him in the safety and liberty of his person.*

*"Property is 'a man's land, or merchandize, or money...'*

*"...as a man is said to have a right to his property, he may be equally said to have a property in his rights.*

*"Government is instituted to protect property of every sort...This being the end of government, that alone is a just government, which impartially secures to every man, whatever is his own.*

*"Where an excess of power prevails, property of no sort is duly respected. No man is safe in his opinions, his person, his faculties or his possessions."* (source: [Lex Rex](#))

**Backcountry Notes**

*Reports and Commentary from Mid-Nowhere*

**"Sometimes old news is the best news."**

History, folklore, culture, society, and more!



Backcountry Notes, where sometimes old news is the best news! - <http://www.backcountrynotes.com/>

In other words, power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely because human nature is a mixture of good and evil, of strength and weakness, and is not perfectible during life on earth:

*"In questions of power...let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."* (Jefferson, Kentucky Resolutions, *ibid.*)

*"Show me that age and country where the rights and liberties of a people were placed on the sole chance of their rulers being good men, without a consequent loss of liberty! I say that the loss of that dearest privilege has ever followed, with absolute certainty, every such mad attempt."* (Patrick Henry, Virginia Ratifying Convention, 1788, *ibid.*)

The Constitution therefore, recognizes man's sovereignty, the divine nature of man's creation and man's divine right to life, liberty, the means of acquiring and possessing property, and the pursuit of happiness. Hence our Republic recognizes Law as unchangeable because the transcendent Creator is the Lawgiver.

In light of the fact that all men are created to be free, individual thinkers and choosers, the paralegalistic, paramoralistic, scientific and religious concepts of atheist evolutionism (negates the transcendent Creator), materialism (negates man's soul and mind), determinism (negates free will), socialism (utopia for non-beings), collective sovereignty (denial of individual sovereignty), group and/or special rights (negates individual rights), gayness (negates God-designed male, female sex norms), political correctness (group think), hate crime laws and speech codes (negation of individual spiritual property), distributive justice (theft of property), fairness and/or social justice (punishment of individual achievement and theft of individual property), progressive taxation (theft of wealth), sustainable development (theft of land and resources), population control and adjunct, choice-abortion (denial of life/liberty) must themselves be absolutely negated for they are the antithesis of America's founding worldview and of the rights and liberties arising there from. Needless to say, all of these concepts are near and dear to self-inflated Transnational Progressives and their totalitarian global village agenda.

In sum, the Constitution of the United States of America is firmly grounded in the Bible's

Genesis account, while the moral ethics that underpin the Rule of Law and our society's traditional understanding of right and wrong are the Ten Commandments. Hence, in order to determine between just law and unjust or paralegalistic law, explains Martin Luther King, Jr., one must determine if it coincides with the law of God:

*"How does one determine whether a law is just or unjust? A just law is a man-made code that squares with the moral law or the law of God. An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law. To put it in the terms of St. Thomas Aquinas: An unjust law is a human law that is not rooted in eternal law and natural law."* (Martin Luther King, *Excerpts from his Letter from the Birmingham Jail*, Apr. 16, 1963)

### **The Death of America**

After undergoing more than eighty years of a diabolical program of deconstruction, dumbing-down, and demoralization, today's America more nearly resembles the hedonistic, tyrannical pagan democracies the Founders abhorred and warned future generations against:

*"[D]emocracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention; have ever been found incompatible with personal security, or the rights of property; and have, in general, been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths."* –James Madison, Federalist No. 10, 1787

Those individuals possessed of the greatest will to power will quickly seize control of a democracy after which it is assuredly doomed to collapse of its own corrupt weight. In the words of John Adams:

*"[D]emocracy will soon degenerate into an anarchy, such an anarchy that every man will do what is right in his own eyes and no man's life or property or reputation or liberty will be secure, and every one of these will soon mould itself into a system of subordination of all the moral virtues and intellectual abilities, all the powers of wealth, beauty, wit and science, to the wanton pleasures, the capricious will, and the execrable cruelty of one or a very few."* – John Adams, *An Essay on Man's Lust for Power*, 1763

The Psalmist laments: *“If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?”*

This is the untenable position today's morally sane, freedom-loving individuals must contend with, for the spirit of immorality and nihilism and its vice squads of evil have virtually destroyed the foundations of our nation. Having removed the transcendent Creator and put diabolical narcissists in His place, Americans were then cast into a vast spiritual desert through the teaching of atheistic evolutionism and materialism as scientific fact. Indeed, having lost their faith in the existence of the transcendent God, millions of apathetic Americans no longer believe that they have either souls or minds. Through the enormous success of this one step, the spirit of immorality and nihilism moved quickly to render meaningless this nation's enduring truths, unalienable rights, moral law, and Rule of Law, and by extension, property rights, traditions, cultural institutions, traditional holidays, language, and national boundaries. In short, the foundational “glue” that defines good from evil, truth from lie, sane from insane, normal from abnormal, decent from indecent, and which held us together, defining and shaping Americans and America, providing stability, security, and individual liberty (without license) in an orderly, decent society has been destroyed by the spirit of immorality, nihilism, evil.

*“Evil people exploit good people by persuading them that it is wrong to call evil by its name.”*  
(James Hitchcock, *Persuasive Wickedness & What We Must Say About It*)

That legions of self-inflated monsters, from George Soros and his puppet Obama to Pelosi, Hillary, Holdren and Calderon, have not only not bothered to read Arizona's recently passed immigration law, but have also besmirched it as evil comes as no surprise, for wickedness is what the wicked do. And why not? They can get away with it, for has not the spirit of evil convinced us that it is intolerant, racist, homophobic, xenophobic, sexist, confusion-causing, and yes – hateful - to call evil by its name?

**Linda Kimball is a writer and author of numerous published articles and essays on culture, politics, and worldview. She is a member of the New Media Alliance, Grassroots.org, and MoveOff.**

## The Paganization of America

By Tim Dunkin

America as we see it today is not the same nation as the America in which my parents grew up. It is certainly not the America that was founded over 230 years ago by a group of patriots who had just won a war of liberation against the most powerful monarchy in the world at that time. These changes, this *degradation* of America, has accelerated in the last 40 years, however, as a moral sea change swept over this land, driven by the purposeful rejection of America's Christian foundations and the system of government that was influenced and established under their auspices.

Let us make no mistake – while America was not founded as a Christian nation in the sense of the establishment of Christianity as the state religion, nevertheless America was a Christian nation at her inception. The entire warp and woof of society was permeated with the biblical worldview. Our Founders, realizing the truth of the Christian doctrine of the inherent sinfulness of man, established a government in which power was divided at the federal level between three competing, contrary branches with specifically-defined powers. Further, political power was divided between what was supposed to be a relatively weak federal government and the state governments. The intention underlying this choice was to dilute the ability of any one man or group of people from being able to exercise power, naturally corruptible, over their fellow citizens. This intention, we must understand, was a *spiritual* and *moral* one, based upon biblical understandings of the nature of man.

The biblical worldview informed many of the decisions and beliefs of the Founders, not least of which being the claim, embodied in no less a document than our Declaration of

Would you like to read more of Linda Kimball's essays on liberty and tradition?  
Visit <http://patriotsandliberty.com/>



Independence, that all men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with unalienable rights. The purpose of government was to protect each citizen in the enjoyment of these rights. The right to self-defense, embodied in the 2<sup>nd</sup> amendment, derives ultimately from Scripture. The right of each man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience is consistent with a true understanding of New Testament religion, regardless of what may have happened under the established religions on the European continent. Some colonial writers even claimed to have found a mandate for representative republican government with democratic institutions (like voting and jury trials) in the commands of God to the Israelite commonwealth to choose leaders from among their own people to serve as judges. Clearly, the men of this generation respected the Bible, looked to it for political and philosophical guidance, and were steeped in a worldview that accepted the truths of Scripture.

Despite the attempts at historical revision by some, biblical religion had a strong and tempering influence on our nation in her early years. Some claim that our Founders, and those of their generation, were “rational Deists” who rejected the Bible and its truths. This idea must be flatly rejected, however, when we look at the sum total of what these men said and did, instead of pulling a few quotes out of context, as the atheists and “freethinkers” do. Indeed, one of the first acts of Congress under the new Constitution was, at public expense, to have Bibles printed and distributed to citizens of our nation living in what were then frontier areas. This is not the action of people who rejected Scripture and sought to establish a radically secular nation, such as was seen with the revolution in France.

The biblical worldview, and the system built upon it, helped to protect Americans from many of the ills and vices that have befallen so many other nations throughout history. Pagan nations, by which I mean nations that have rejected the Creator’s worldview in favor of some form or another of purely manmade sentimentality, have traditionally been very different than those societies in which the Judeo-Christian ethic and worldview have been pervasive. These nations have typically been rife with corruption, have considered human life to be a very cheap thing, and have not blushed at even the vilest of immoralities.

For much of her history, America could have been counted among those nations that rejected the pagan for the Judeo-Christian. She was one of a few nations, along with Great Britain and her daughter colonies and a handful of northern European nations, that were holistically Christian nations. As each of these societies has gradually rejected their moral bases, they have drifted into pagan, God-rejecting ways. America is no different. Since the 1960s, the gradual trend towards devolution that was caused by unbelieving, liberal theology accelerated to a breakneck pace. We are to the point now where America cannot credibly be called a truly Christian nation. We have a small residue of those who hold to a truly biblical worldview, but even many of those who call themselves “Christian” hold to a worldview that is utterly alien to the worldview upon which our nation was founded. We, as a nation, are regressing backwards towards a set of social and moral conditions that have characterized pagan, God-rejecting nations all throughout history.

How are we doing this?

In pagan societies, there was no sense that God was the Creator, that the universe and all that is in it is the product of a loving, perfect God who made it by His own hand, and placed mankind into it as a steward. Instead, most pagan societies held to some version of a creation myth in which the “stuff” of creation was always there and was merely shaped by finite and limited gods or other supernatural forces. There was no understanding of creation *ex nihilo* among them. Instead, the gods, man, and everything else were all just a part of some eternally pre-existent matter that might change in form, but certainly could not be said to have been a product of special creation by a loving, all-powerful God to Whom we will one day give an account of ourselves. As a result, pantheism sooner or later would recommend itself to them as the “obvious” choice for explaining reality, as it did the Stoics in Rome and the Hindus in India.

Would you like to sound off on something you've read in Conservative Underground? If so, then send the editor your thoughts or comments at [editor@conservativesunderground.us](mailto:editor@conservativesunderground.us)!

This, naturally, leads to two outflowings. The first is the placing of humanity and the natural world around us on the same level. A man equals to a dog is equal to a mouse is equal to a tree. The most obvious example of this is the view of the transmigration of the soul as it is expressed in karmic Hinduism. In this worldview, a man may very well end up being a dog in his next life, or a tree, depending on how good or bad he was in this life. Even among the Greeks and others pagans, however, there was this same sense of man having an intimate connection with nature. This formed the basis of the sympathetic magic and astrology that were practiced throughout so much of the ancient world – they arose out of the pantheistic belief that all of physical existence was connected, and that the actions of one part would subtly influence other parts. The motions of the stars would control our destinies. Using the right ingredients and speaking the right formulae would influence anything from the weather to the emotions of other people.

We see this same general mindset today in the rise in astrology, the occult, alien Eastern religions, and so forth, all of which rest on the same pantheistic foundation. However, the most pervasive example of the inroads that this worldview has made into the psyche of our nation is to be found in the widespread acceptance of the principles and beliefs embodied in the environmentalist movement. While I believe that there is certainly a place within the biblical worldview for a proper stewardship over the earth and its resources, the modern “Green” movement goes far beyond this. Instead of viewing the earth as a special gift of God to man for his use and benefit, the Green movement views the earth as something which transcends man, a system in which man is simply one little cell in the greater mass of life which is called “Gaia.”

There are many thousands in our nation who, literally, worship the earth as a mother

goddess, just as the pagans in many societies did thousands of years ago. But there are millions more who, while not revering the mother goddess openly, still accept the implicit teachings of pantheistic environmentalism. “We belong to the earth,” they say, “it does not belong to us.” That is an anti-God statement, and one which is as likely to be said by a religionist in a liberal church as it is an earth-worshipping Gaiast. The whole “Earth First” movement is predicated on the notion that man, by exercising his industry and intelligence to improve the world around him, is acting on an alien and desultory instinct which is “ruining” the earth. Man needs to know his place, to be “in harmony” with nature. Indeed, man, because he uses earth’s resources, deserves to be “culled” according to some of the more radical Greenies. Even the belief, imparted to our children in the public schools and in many children’s entertainment programs, that we need to “save the earth” by crash recycling programs, ending CO<sub>2</sub> production, and saving the rain forests is predicated on pantheistic Green assumptions. Need I say it, but Captain Planet was nothing more than a high priest of Gaiasm, tasked with converting your children to his religion.

Coupled with radical environmentalism, we also see the advance of the religion of evolutionism – which is a religious and mystical belief system, rather than a scientific. Again, materialistic evolution finds its basis in the myth that all of existence has been eternally – there is no God who called it into existence from nothing. Whether all that exists is now ordered from some hypothetical Big Bang (the initial point of explosion itself existing without a beginning), or through some sort of eternally contracting and expanding steady-state system, the fundamental constant in all this is the rejection of any need for God the Creator.



Get all the latest Tea Party news at Tea Party Patriots! - <http://www.teapartypatriots.org/>

Instead, all of us, and everything else, are just flashes in the pan in that great cosmic stream of non-consciousness. Life arose from non-life, and is just another form that matter happens to take, much like crystals and planetoids. When you get right down to the nuts and bolts, that is what materialistic evolutionism is – a worldview that exists to give its believers a reason to reject a personal God to whom they will one day be accountable, and to replace it with a soulless diversity of “change” in which we just form one point on an ever-evolving continuum of existence, all of it interconnected and interrelated. In evolutionism, man really is no better than a dog or a mouse or a tree, for that’s merely what man *was* millions of years ago.

The other outflowing of the pantheistic *ethos* is the devaluation of human life. If we’re all just part of some great big Everything, then no single one of us really matters for much. Our nation is well on its way to losing the sense of the uniqueness and value of innocent human life. In godly societies, it is understood that man was created in the image of his Creator, and that he occupies a special and revered place in the estimation of God. To assault the life of man, except under very stringent and atypical circumstances clearly delineated by God Himself (such as capital punishment for very specific crimes), is to assault God Himself.

In pagan societies, life was cheap. The Greek and Roman myths are full of stories of unwanted babies who were exposed – left to die on mountains or in the wilderness. In the stories, these babies were often taken in by kindly strangers. In real life, this was a standard practice in these societies for getting rid of unwanted children, especially girls (who were less valued), and usually, nobody was there to take them in. In the games of Rome, men fought to the death, spilling each others blood and lives onto an arena floor, all for the entertainment of a hooting crowd. In war, there was no concept of “human rights,” no distinction between civilian and combatant. When the Assyrians, the Mongols, or the Romans conquered you, the *best* you could hope for was a relatively short period of bloodletting and rapine, followed by the enslavement of the survivors. Human life was just another commodity, and a cheap one at that. Even today, in non-Christian societies all over the world, we see the same contempt for the value of human life – how else can one describe, for instance, the genocide

committed by a paganized Germany under the Nazis, or the Rwandan massacres in Africa?

But what of America today? What can we say of a nation where a million babies a year are aborted in the womb, practically always because they are inconvenient to one or both of the parents? How is that *really* any different from leaving the baby to freeze to death or to be eaten by wolves on a mountain? Abortion is a thoroughly pagan practice, and nobody who accepts that it is a woman’s “right” can credibly claim to be a Christian. Nobody. It is a pagan abomination, the existence of which shows starkly the terrible depths to which our land has fallen.

But let’s look beyond that. What about our popular entertainments, the movies and video games and the like, in which blood and gore are glorified? Our people are entertained, amused and titillated by seeing graphic, on-screen depictions of people’s lives being destroyed in a splatter of blood. Our children play video games where the object is to kill and maim in as grotesque a fashion as possible. How are these any different from the jeering Roman crowds who urged gladiators to behead and disembowel each other as spectacle?

Another practice that was common in pagan societies was the acceptance and practice of sodomy, so-called “homosexuality.” This sin was rife among the filthy pagan societies of the Canaanites. The pagan Greeks practiced it with abandon. The Spartan system of military training for their boys included conditioning to sodomy. The Thebans had their “Sacred Band,” 150 couples of male lovers who were honored as the highest warriors in their city-state. The Romans, as they became more decadent, cast aside their repugnance at this sin and it became widespread among their upper classes. Even in religion, sodomy has been revered by a pagan, anti-God world. The role of male temple prostitutes in the Baal religion of the ancient Near East, against which God and His prophets objected so strenuously, is well-known. The Greeks, especially the Spartans, had entire festivals devoted to the “carrying away” of young teenage boys by older men as lovers, in emulation of the myth of the abduction of the young man Ganymede by Zeus. Far from being abhorred, sodomy was a virtue in many pagan systems.

# Fight FOCA

Sign the Fight FOCA Petition  
at [FightFOCA.com](http://FightFOCA.com)



And so it is today in America. Sodomites form a protected class, afforded special protections by law that are unavailable to those who follow normal patterns of sexuality. “Gayness” is held up as laudable and good by our popular entertainment, in the movies, on television shows, among the chattering classes. What was once the most shameful of practices is now performed openly and without punishment on the streets of many of our cities. We are even on the brink of appointing an open lesbian to the highest court in the land. Even religion, so-called “Christianity” as it is practiced in our liberal, unbelieving “churches,” is a part of the mainstreaming of sodomy. Just look at the denominations today who are seeking to openly place practicing homosexuals into their clergy, and who are at the forefront of the condemnations leveled at those who hold to the biblical position on this sin. “Gay is good,” we are told even by churchmen in these denominations, while those who side with God are bigots and hateful. Our society has advanced far down the path of pagan rejection of God.

One final way in which we see our nation rejecting the biblical worldview and regressing to the same standards of behavior as seen in pagan nations throughout history is in the acceptance of institutionalized corruption in politics and government. Granted, human nature being what it is, there has always been corruption to one degree or another in every government ever conceived, even our own back in the good old days. But late Republican Rome set a new standard for such behavior. Offices were bought and sold with impunity. Patrician notables with personal armies would invade the Republic’s neighbors for the purposes of extracting gold, slaves, and glorious acclaim back in Rome. Provincial governors openly milked as much tax revenue as they could without inciting open rebellions, so as to fund lavish lifestyles and the furthering of their political power back in Rome. Bribery was rampant. Members of the ruling class used the courts as a tool to destroy each other, instead of exacting true

justice. Despite the moralizing against the effects of this corruption by a few lonely voices, there seems to have been little moral or ethical concern that would have served as a brake on the advance of corruption.

Rome wasn’t the only corrupt society. Even into modern history, the extent of corruption among government officials and others at high levels in society generally correlates inversely with the degree to which biblical Christianity and the biblical worldview had penetrated into the consciousness of a nation. As they lose that influence, they lose their good government by honest people.

So today, in America we see a system in which bribery is increasingly accepted as “politicians being politicians.” We have a President who dithers in his response to grave natural and environmental disasters such as we have seen recently in Tennessee and Louisiana, because those states voted for his opponent. The present administration has been involved in selling Senate seats to the highest bidder. It has tried to bribe a sitting member of Congress with the promise of a high office if he would refrain from running against the President’s chosen candidate in a senatorial primary. This President has surrounded himself with ethically questionable individuals like Van Jones and Valerie Jarrett, and only got to where he is because of his ties to a political machine dominated by such sterling examples of ethical goodness as “Hot Rod” Blagojevich and “Fat Tony” Rezko. Obama’s campaign for the presidency was financed in part by foreign money, funneled into his treasury from various Middle Eastern sources. This administration’s immigration enforcement apparatus has openly said that it “may not” process illegal immigrants arrested under an Arizona law that the President doesn’t like, thereby positively refusing to do its duty under law. Obama and those around him have not been shy about using thugs – Black

Panthers, SEIU mobs, and ACORN operatives – to intimidate voters, opponents, and those who are being made into examples to the rest.

Even before the current administration, Bill Clinton was able to get away with high crimes and misdemeanors because he was popular and well-liked, and was able to convince the gullible people of this country that he was merely being persecuted by prudish Republicans for whom it was “all about sex.” Of course, Clinton also got away with financing his campaign through foreign money, when Al Gore facilitated the entry of Chinese money through his fundraising at a Buddhist temple. Other candidates for office, from John Kerry to Richard Blumenthal, have been given passes by the media and their own supporters, despite their bald-faced lying about their war records in Vietnam.

The list goes on and on. But you know *why* this is the case? Because the *people* love to have it so. These politicians get away with what they do, and continue to get a pass election after election after election, because the mainstream media and the people themselves are willing to accept and condone this ever-increasing lawlessness and corruption. We the people could change this if we wanted. But too many of us don't want to, because the corruption in Washington is merely mirroring the corruption in the personal lives of many in this nation. To really and truly get serious about holding (Democrat) politicians accountable would mean that too many liberals, and even moderates, in this country would have to face up to their own culpability for many of the same sorts of things, only on a smaller and less noticeable scale. The corruption is not merely at the top in this country. It goes all the way through, and it is so because a large portion of this country's population has rejected biblical morals and the biblical worldview – we have become a pagan nation in the way that a goodly share, perhaps the majority, of the people themselves think and act in their personal lives. Just as in

Rome, the patrician class got away with corruption because the people were too busy with their bread and circuses and with their own increasingly immoral lifestyles, so it is in 21<sup>st</sup> century America.

So what can we do? How can we, as conservatives and Christians, oppose the seemingly inevitable march towards the paganization of America? Well, first and foremost, we have to get serious about standing up and making our voices be heard on the matter, regardless of who wants to naysay, regardless of who wants to criticize, regardless of who opposes us. We have to be willing to vote our consciences, instead of constantly compromising with every moderate, RINO, and social libertarian who comes along and says they are a fiscal conservative. We have to start demanding that our candidates and those who claim to speak for us on the national stage hold to our worldview – that they respect human life as a gift from God, that they respect God as our Creator, that they oppose the perversions that are increasingly stamping themselves onto our culture. We have to make the case in positive terms to those around us, showing them why abortion is bad, why gay marriage is detrimental, why environmentalism is not what it is cracked up to be.

Even more so, we have to get serious about living the biblical worldview ourselves, instead of merely telling other people about it. We have to practice what we preach. We have to make our words and our testimonies match, and we have to be able to present them to those around us who have accepted the pagan philosophies and worldview, and show why ours is better. In our free society, we do not – nor should we – have the right to impose our worldview by force of arms or violence. We *do* have the right to present it into the marketplace of ideas, and we have the responsibility to make it so obvious that it imposes itself, by the iron force of reason and wisdom. So let's get busy doing so.

“True religion is the foundation of society, the basis on which all true civil government rests, and from which power derives its authority, laws their efficacy, and both their sanction. If it is once shaken by contempt, the whole fabric cannot be stable or lasting.” - Edmund Burke