

Lecture 6
Wilson, Bryan, Robertson, Buchanan

Intro: Woodrow Wilson is used by the current neocons in order to pursue their views on global hegemony and he and they have some fundamentalist traits.

WOODROW WILSON, 1856-1924, was President before, during, and after the First World War. To set the stage for America's entry into world politics, Teddy Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson grab the attention of many scholars today. These Presidents were not fundamentalists in the sense that I am using the term, but they are both called on today by the Right Wing as crucial to their empire building in the world now. 'It is our duty toward the people living in barbarism to see that they are freed from their chains.' [Teddy]. But he was a classic European imperialist with his Rough Riders charging up San Juan Hill in Cuba and his takeover of the Philippines. Wilson believed in the extension of the US constitutional project as the new world order.¹ He worked for the League of Nations that was scorned on both sides of the Atlantic and he wanted to make the world 'safe for democracy.' He also believed, strongly, that he was called by God to the Presidency and that America had an exceptional, biblical mission to free the world for capitalism etc.

'We did not of deliberate choice undertake these new tasks which shall transform us ... all the world knows the surprising circumstances which thrust them upon us came ... as if part of a great preconceived plan ... The whole world had already become a single vicinage; each part had become neighbor to all the rest. No nation could live any longer to itself ... [It has become] the duty of the US to play a part, and a leading part at that, in the opening and transformation of the East ... The East is to be opened and transformed whether we will or no; the standards of the West are to be imposed upon it; nations and peoples which have stood still the centuries through ... [will be] made part of the universal world of commerce and of ideas ... it is our peculiar duty ... to moderate the process in the interests of liberty ...

¹ "America had the infinite privilege of fulfilling her destiny and saving the world."

This we shall do ... by giving them, in the spirit of service, a government and rule which shall moralize them by being itself moral.' [10/00]

'European modernists could not help mocking this proposal of a postmodern Empire: the chronicles are full of the ironies and insults of Georges Clemenceau and Lloyd George along with the fascists, who all declared that the refusal of the Wilsonian project was a central element of their projects of dictatorship and war. Yet poor maligned Wilson appears today in a rather different light: a utopian, yes, but lucid in his foresight of the horrible future that awaited the Europe of nations in the coming years; the inventor of a world government of peace, which was certainly unrealizable, but the vision proved nonetheless an efficient promoter of the passage to Empire. This is all true even if Wilson did not recognize it.'²

But Americans still hold on. Euphoria after the end of the Cold War and the apparent success of Wilsonian idealism led some historians to conclude that Wilson's foreign policies and his diplomatic legacy were fundamentally sound. 'The first two post-cold war presidents, George H W Bush and Bill Clinton, articulated visions of the new era that may be characterized as broadly Wilsonian in rhetoric and aspiration.'³

The US pursued a path of expansion during the Cold War. It did so with enormous gusto with the conviction it was serving a larger purpose – the containment of a threat and the promulgation of the liberating idea of democracy for everybody ultimately. As Steel points out, it is worth pondering that the 'US is virtually alone in the world in declaring the promulgation of democracy to be a major foreign policy objective.'⁴ ... Liberty is not a blessing to be savored privately, but a grace that must be spread to others.'

²Hardt and Negri, p 175-6

³ Ambrosias, , p 8

⁴ Steel, p 18-19

Tony Smith said ‘Since Wilson’s time the most consistent tradition in American foreign policy with respect to this global change has been the belief that the nations’ security is best protected by the expansion of democracy worldwide.’⁵ Others have said that it provided the ideology for the US to resist the two alternative world orders of Communism and Nazism. FDR used it. Truman to Reagan used it. Neocons use it now.

But many would say that democracy is no guarantee of peace and totalitarianism is no guarantee of aggression. There was a certain amount of unrealism about this as the Europeans saw. Reinhold Niebuhr was always on about American *innocents abroad*, following Mark Twain’s title of an amusing book and Henry James’ accounts of all those misguided Americans in UK. Wilson’s innocence was in many respects like that of today – that somehow those conquered for their own good will greet us with flowers. It hasn’t happened in the past and it isn’t happening in Iraq. Henry Kissinger lamented that most Americans had embraced Wilsonianism. The ‘realism’ school that he represents says that self-interest, the Metternich model that Kissinger wrote his thesis on, is better for peace in the long run. This bothers most Americans who want to be thought of as virtuous, not cynical. They also don’t like to think of empire as a money-making proposition, even though it certainly is. It is also a hidden goal of American planners that the global market economy should exist, and this ‘globalization’ benefits America mainly even though a lot of idealistic talk about how other countries are going to benefit takes place. This is partly why Reagan was so popular with his ‘city on a hill’ metaphor harking back to the Founding. He avoided talking ‘realistically’ even though he might well have believed it.

⁵ *ibid*

‘American exceptionalism is rooted in the conviction that the US, created as an alternative to the tyrannous regimes of Europe, would retain its republican and humanistic values by strict separation from the intrigues of the Old World. Herein lay the counsel of Washington in his Farewell Address, and of J Q Adams who wanted against involvement in all the wars in interest and intrigue ... and the US should recommend the general cause of liberty by the countenance of her voice, and the benign sympathy of her example. It should be an exemplar to the world rather than a dabbler in its sordid rivalries ... Also America had an obligation to spread the blessings of freedom. This missionary impulse, which drove church ministers to convert the heathens of China and other unfortunate lands to the blessings of Christianity and capitalism, also took a political form. Salvation would be found not merely by protecting and improving the nation, but by spreading democracy throughout the world. Although it is said that the business of America is business, it is equally true that the ideology of America is democracy ... which drove General de Gaulle so say that the nation that sought “to help those who were in misery or bondage the world over, yielded in her turn to that taste for intervention in which the instinct for domination cloaked itself.” ...

The morality of the Western lies in the myth of a struggle for civilization against the forces of savagery. ‘The American film hero is a lonely fighter for civilization, for society, for virtue. He uses harsh means to achieve good, employs force not for his own sake but for a morally higher goal. He is Superman, Shane, of the Terminator, wielding power not for him but to help others. Often he is a bit naïve and overly trusting, yet his moral purpose is clear.

Contrast this with James Bond, the amoral hero of British spy dramas. Contemptuous of any ideals or loyalties, Bond is an elegant hired cynic. Ostensibly on “her Majesty’s service,” his only values are those of power and prestige, and his only interests those of pleasure. He is the supreme individualist, the rogue killer unbounded by oath or loyalty. Bond is the sybaritic and cynical European; Superman the puritanical and idealistic American.’⁶ My first ever Oxford talk in 1964 was ‘James Bond – prophecy or potency?’ but I didn’t have the insight to compare James Bond to Superman, and the Terminator wasn’t yet born. You can see why some want to make the Austrian born Governor Schwarzenegger president even though the Constitution doesn’t allow it. He has that righteous tough guy appearance like Reagan – maybe more than Ronnie. Even Gary Trudeau’s comic strip ‘Gropenfuhrer’ hasn’t stuck with the majority.’ Terminator’ certainly has!

Despite all this, many Americans are reluctant to go abroad in the younger Adam’s celebrated phrase, “in search of monsters to destroy.” The American public is essentially inward-looking. Thus they needed to be presented with ideas that going into Korea and Vietnam were not in fact what they so patently seemed to others – efforts to retain regional hegemony – but something far nobler.

All this is deeply linked to the understanding of the founding of America as a ‘new Israel’ and that God’s blessing was upon it and it was our noble task to expand the democratic dream to the rest of the world. During the Revolution Bishop James Madison, President of William and Mary College and cousin of the President of the same name, trained up divinity students to change the Lord’s Prayer to ‘Thy Republic come’ instead of ‘Thy Kingdom come.’ Woodrow Wilson was President of Presbyterian Princeton and this idea resonated throughout the Ivy League from the 18th century to the present day.

⁶ Steel, p 36-9

And as Steel remarks, there is enormous need for Americans to be liked because we assume that we are doing good. When the favor is not appreciated, we are puzzled at such ingratitude, and ultimately annoyed. It is at this point that we either go home, as in the case of Somalia, or wreak a terrible vengeance on those we are ostensibly helping, as in Vietnam. Thus George Bush Sr., in preparing his war for cheap oil, had to pretend that saving the palaces of the Kuwaiti royal family was also a blow for righteousness. Even when we know that self-interest is involved, we like to believe that our use of force is reserved for virtuous causes.⁷

Wilson's vision for the future included the League of Nations, and its ultimate successor the UN. All this was for collective security. He also wanted self-determination. He believed that this would help stop world violence. That is still believed by the Bushies.

But it doesn't work according to Steel. Most wars rest on specific quarrels. The danger with the former notion is that it describes all disputes as those between good and evil, and turns them into crusades for the soul of mankind. By invoking moral arguments, such a doctrine makes possible the use of the most immoral practices. 'Every aggressor is not Hitler and every war is not World War II.'⁸

'How can order, let alone tolerance, be guarded in a world where ethnic and tribal [and religious - CB] loyalties are becoming every more important? This is an issue we never thought to address during the long decades of the Cold war when we insisted that it was enough simply to be "free." Now we are learning that it is not enough.'⁹

⁷ *ibid*, p 39-40; 42

⁸ Steel, p 93

⁹ *ibid*, p 100

Nevertheless Wilsonian idealism has replaced anticommunism as the guiding light of American foreign policy.¹⁰ America has intervened to get rid of governments, usually on the left, of which we disapproved, as in Guatemala, Nicaragua, Cuba, and Grenada. It would be naïve to ignore that behind the noble rhetoric about democracy we have often been concerned about the safety of American investments. We ignored Rwanda in 1994. Only France sent forces to stop the bloodshed. We have messed up Haiti terribly.

Just to take Nicaragua as a quickie. Liberation theologians and priests and nuns were on the job there. I knew quite a few of the Maryknoll Fathers who were there, but I saw the Pope dismiss Father Ernesto Cardinale when he was Finance Minister of the then government from his presence when he visited there, and I have heard rumors which sound like truth to me about American involvement against the Catholic Church and its liberationists.

What does this have to do with Fundamentalism? Wilson or Teddy Roosevelt didn't fall into that camp, but they laid the groundwork along with the original visions of America in the 17th and 18th centuries as a chosen people for democracy and eventually its spread around the world. For Fundies it is a big issue, and the majority of Americans are not fundamentalists, they nevertheless voted Bush, who follows in the Wilsonian camp perhaps more than any other President, into office and seem to believe it still.

As I hinted when I mentioned Nicaragua, this idea also echoes in liberation theology. They take the **exodus** from Egypt, the **prophetic** writings about justice for the poor, and the opening sermon of Jesus in **Luke 4** very seriously. In case you are not familiar with this classic text in Luke, here it is:

¹⁰ *ibid* p 102

The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to bring good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind, to let the oppressed go free, to proclaim the year of the Lord's favor [4:17-19].

This refers to the Jubilee Year some scholars suggest. Take it literally, and you have a radical program indeed even if it is once every 50 years!

Wilson summed up his vision at Salt Lake City, and interesting geographical and spiritual location to do this, when he said:

[America must be a] ... a liberating power, a power to show the world that when American was born it was indeed a finger pointed toward those lands into which men could deploy some of these days and live in happy freedom, look each other in the eyes as equals, see that no man was put upon, that no people were forced to accept authority which was not of their own choice, and that out of the general generous impulse of the human genius and the human spirit we were lifted along the levels of civilization to days when there should be wars no more, but men should govern themselves in peace and amity and quiet.

He also said 'American had the infinite privilege of fulfilling her destiny and saving the world.'

And when it came to the League of Nations he said:

I wish that [the opponents of ratification] could feel the moral obligation that rests upon us not to go back on those boys, but to see the thing through, to see it through to the end and made good their redemption of the world. For nothing less depends upon this decision, nothing less than the liberation and salvation of the world.

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN – 1860-1925 [died just a few days after the Scopes Trial] the ‘Great Commonor’ was noted for many things. A busy man all his life, he ran for President for the Democratic Party 3 times, but held immense power of persuasion. Like George Whitefield, he could speak to 30,000 people without electronic aids and be heard. His wife said she could hear him 3 blocks away. My wife says the same thing but this is not a flattering remark. Born in Nebraska in 1860 he was a stalwart of many causes, some very unpopular at the time – women’s suffrage, prohibition, peace [he resigned as Secretary of State from Wilson’s Cabinet after WWI was certain], a literal Bible and a moral nation. The latter were linked in his mind.

A brief excursus on his various crusades, so-called by his biographer Robert Cherny shows his wide range of interests. Free silver, anti-imperialist, corporate power and anti-monopoly, pro-prohibition, and finally his anti-evolutionary stance. I don’t understand very much about gold v. silver other than to say that his *Cross of Gold* speech was one of the most famous in America at the time and for all time apparently. But the other ‘crusades’ interest me a lot. He advocated public ownership of the railroads, telegraph, telephone systems, and merchant marines. He wanted tax relief for the poor. He pushed for a national nonpartisan bulletin to inform the public of government actions. He later supported the League of Nations. His attacks on corporate power and anti-monopoly stances are similar to Teddy Roosevelt’s. At the time the so-called ‘robber barons’ especially of Western Pennsylvania where I come from were controlling the country. Carnegie, Rockefeller – then the two richest men in the world – Frick, the Pews, and the Mellons all made their money in West Pa. The rest such as Jay Gould, JP Morgan were

based in New York. Eventually all the Western PA types fled to NYC, taking their billions with them constructing fabulous houses on 5th Avenue. WJ lectured on the Chautauqua circuit from 1900. Again that is close to home. Chautauqua was founded as a summer training camp for Methodist Sunday School teachers, but soon became the leading place in America for summer politics and cultural pursuits. Teddy Roosevelt called it 'the most American place in America.' It was liberal, and helped birth such famous preachers as Harry Emerson Fosdick. Most Presidents still show up during the summer sessions for some politicking. They took their show on the road, and Bryan was a big part of the draw. As early as 1903 he suggested that Christ's injunction to love the neighbor as oneself held the potential so 'solve every problem economic, social, political, and religious.' That put him in the Social Gospel movement that started to make a difference in how the churches understood their social mission to the poor and oppressed in America and elsewhere. It also went along with William Howard Taft, a Unitarian, and Teddy Roosevelt who came from Dutch Reformed & Episcopalianism background. It was Roosevelt who got the Sherman Anti-Trust Act passed, and the Courts later backed it up effectively stopping Standard Oil and other firms from tightly controlling the market, wages, world trade, etc. and opening out the fields for competition.

Because of a split vote between Roosevelt and Taft, Woodrow Wilson won the Presidency for the Democrats after 16 years in the wilderness. He appointed Bryan as Secretary of State and he retained the post of party leader. The first crisis he faced was, however, internal. California legislature took a swipe at Japanese immigrants where would suddenly forbidden to own agricultural land. Anti-Asian sentiment had long

smoldered on the West Coast, and on occasion it had burst into flames. Bryan went to address the California legislature ‘the most thankless task I ever undertook’ and sought modifications. If tailed, and when Japan insisted that the Wilson administration should declare the law invalid, some American military officers began to discuss preparations for war in the Pacific. Bryan managed to keep relations with Japan from reaching the boiling point, even though he could find no way of cooling them.

He moved against the protective tariff, played a large part in the formation of the Federal Reserve System, assisted the farmers, and limited the power of bankers and their interlocking directorates – the most significant piece of domestic legislation of the Wilson administration.

On the international scene, WJ tried to theologize and said ‘the Gospel of the Prince of Peace gives us the only hope that the world has – and it is an increasing hope – of the substitution of reason for the arbitrament [sic] of force in the settlement of international disputes. And our nation ought not to wait for other nations – it ought to take the lead and prove its faith in the omnipotence of truth.’ In a major speech of 1910 he denied that armaments brought peace and condemned the ‘profitable patriotism’ that sought contracts to build even more and bigger battleships. Treaties were important in order to quell the urge to fight. Otherwise, ‘no matter what the subject is, it turns into a question of national honor and goes to shooting.’ He signed 30 treaties, and had some old swords melted down and cast into miniature plow-shaped paperweights with the biblical injunction **THEY SHALL BEAT THEIR SWORDS INTO PLOWSHARES** and with two of his own axioms **NOTHING IS FINAL BETWEEN FRIENDS** and **DIPLOMACY IS THE ART OF KEEPING COOL**. Would that we still believed in these epigrams.

There were some exceptions of course. The Pancho Vila raid on Columbus, New Mexico was put down and General Pershing assembled the troops in Deming, my wife's home town, and raided Mexico with dispatch.

The crunch came with the entry of America into WWI. WJ tried to hold the line. When France asked JP Morgan for help in borrowing money in the US, Bryan said that was incompatible with neutrality. At first, he and Wilson saw eye to eye on neutrality. But soon it all changed. It is a long story, but Wilson became convinced that America needed to be involved, and Bryan never did. The split caused him to resign as Secretary of State. So you see, it does happen.

The final battle was the crusade against evolution. This is what he is most famous for alas, and the film and story *Inherit the Wind* has made a right and proper mess of the whole thing. What were his concerns? It wasn't a literal reading of Genesis, and the 7 day or even eon theory of creation. The crux was the moral result of believing in Darwin's survival-of-the-fittest concept. **'This hypothesis does incalculable harm.'** First, it takes people away from God by giving them a materialistic rather than divine origin. Secondly, it 'lays the foundations for the bloodiest war in history.' He drew on Stanford evolutionists David Starr Jordan and Vernon Kellogg who linked German militarism to the Darwinian notion. Evolution produced Nietzsche's writings in which Bryan discerned 'a defense, made in advance, of all the cruelties and atrocities practiced by the militarists of Germany.' It also affected industrial relations. 'Survival of the fittest was driving both

capitalist and laborer into a life-and-death struggle from which sympathy and the spirit of brotherhood are eliminated. It is transforming the industrial world into a slaughter-house.’ Some thought it would incite racism.

He also saw the split between church and school as increasing because of evolution teaching. He said only creationists should be allowed to preach in Christian churches. Only fundamentalist Christians should teach in church-sponsored schools. And in schools supported by taxation there should be real neutrality in religion.

He didn’t attack science or scientists as such however. This was a specific fight. But he did fall back on metaphors. ‘It is better to trust in the Rock of Ages than to know the age of rocks; it is better for one to know that he is close to the Heavenly Father, than to know how far the stars in the heavens are apart.’

The famous trial was in 1925, and a young teacher named Scopes was accused of teaching evolution in a Tennessee school. The trial pitted Clarence Darrow, self proclaimed agnostic and long time champion of organized labor and the underdog, set out to reveal the intellectual shallowness he discerned in his erstwhile political ally. I can’t go into detail, except to recommend that you see the film with the caveat that it is very biased towards Darrow. He was allowed to put Bryan on the stand and then asked Bryan about the fish that swallowed Jonah and Joshua’s commanding the sun to stand still. Bryan insisted that the Biblical account was true. Bryan said Darrow was just trying to bring scorn on the Bible. Anyway, the Court found Scopes guilty, and Bryan won the case. But a few days after the trial, he died in his sleep.

But most of the country in the Blue States found Darrow the winner, and Tennessee a backwards place filled with hicks. Nevertheless a number of states passed anti-evolutionary laws. 18 different anti-evolution bills appeared in 14 states, but some local educational boards took the initiative in moving against evolutionary teaching. California directed teachers to present Darwinism 'as a theory only' while North Carolina barred state high schools from using biology textbooks that 'in any way intimate an origin of the human race other than that contained in the Bible.' Some choice words came out of the debates. 'Let this tommyrot be taught in the schools of Mississippi and the whole system of state and Christianity will be undermined. 'If evolutionists want to teach this theory, let them build their own schools just as the denominations do. Defeat of the pro-evolution bill will be a compromise with the devil.' 'We don't want evolution theory rammed down the throats of our children.' Etc.

The Red State people heard America laughing. They know that the eastern press had pilloried Tennessee for the Scopes trial. Many of them surely read *Elmer Gantry*, Sinclair Lewis's best-selling 1927 satire whose benighted main character was modeled partially on the anti-evolution leader John Roach Straton. 'What's the matter with Kansas' by Thomas Frank brings us up to date with the Red State Rage against eastern establishment.

The anti-evolutionists continue however. Senator Rick Santorum, from my neighborhood, offered a non-binding 'sense of the Senate' amendment to the year's major education bill. It stated, 'Good science education should prepare students to distinguish the data or testable theories of science from philosophical or religious claims that are made in the

name of science ... Where biological evolution is taught, the curriculum should help students to understand why this subject generates so much continuing controversy.’ Senators passed this, but it began arousing opposition as soon as it became public. (Congresspeople often do this with us.) The presidents of 80 science societies sent a letter asking Congress to delete Santorum’s resolution from the bill’s final text. There is no controversy over evolution among scientists, the letter stated. ‘Evolutionary theory ranks with Einstein’s theory of relativity as one of modern science’s most robust, generally accepted, thoroughly tested and broadly applicable concepts.’ In a 1997 survey of American scientists, it found near universal acceptance of the theory of evolution, albeit a significant minority of them saw God as guiding the process. Santorum held fast, and still does. Pennsylvania continues to bring it up in the courts as I am speaking.

But the intelligent-design movement faces a steep, uphill battle. Their audience remains largely a popular one, but it does swing elections as half of the American people reject evolution. The battles are bound to continue.

Regarding WJ many things could be said. He was more tolerant than most of his fundamentalist friends. He was more interested in social issues than most of the churches. He took radical and left-wing stands on industry, war, and tax matters. Most right-wingers are just the opposite. But he tended toward binary thinking, and couldn’t see the grey areas in-between.

Nevertheless his crusade against evolution has one thing to say for it from my point of view. The theory of natural selection can be used to push the most odious race and class and national ambitions. This doesn't mean however that the theory is wrong. It is just that so many politicians and people can't distinguish between that which IS and that which SHOULD BE – the old ethical chestnut on the difference between IS and OUGHT. Fundamentally we need to sort that out still. We need to be aware of the danger of applying scientific findings to social problems. Had WJ made that distinction, I wouldn't say that his reputation would be clearer, but it would be better. What a shame that it came out so badly at the end of such a productive and forward-looking life.

PAT ROBERTSON. Much of what I will say is taken from the excellent introduction to *The New Christian Right – Political and Social Issues* edited by Melvin Urofsky and Martha May 1996. There are three chapters on Robertson who they think is the biggest person on the current fundamentalist scene.

After his failed bid to capture the Republican nomination for president, Robertson founded in 1989 the Christian Coalition. The son of a former US Senator, Robertson's 700 Club on TV became the basis for this Christian Broadcasting Network (CBN) which is now huge with more than 1500 radio stations and 350 TV outlets. He also founded Regent University in Virginia which trains graduate students in education, religion, communications, and law.

The theology has a very particular agenda. It wants to reorder the nation's political structure under the authority of a Christian government. This is called 'Christian Reconstruction' or 'Dominion Theology.' The original idea came in 1973 from Rousas John Rushdoony. Impossible to summarize in a few sentences, but in essence they believe pluralism is wrong. Toleration merely means exposure to error. As Rushdoony said,

'In the name of toleration, the believer is asked to associate on a common level of total acceptance with the atheist, the pervert, the criminal, and adherents of other religions as though no differences existed.'

Byron Snapp put it even more harshly:

'The Christian must realize that pluralism is a myth. God and His law must rule all nations ... At no point in Scripture do we read that God teaches, supports or condones pluralism ... Clearly our founding fathers had no intention of supporting pluralism for they saw that the bible tolerates no such view.'

And there was the famous comment by Bailey Smith to the Southern Baptist Convention in 1980, 'God Almighty does not hear the prayer of a Jew.'

Robertson said 'we all want a time when, as the book of Proverbs puts it, "the righteous are in authority and the people rejoice."' On May 1 1986 on the 700 Club, he said that 'God's plan ... is for his people to take dominion ... What is dominion? Dominion is lordship. He wants his people to reign and rule with him.'

‘Essentially the country had been founded as a Christian nation, adopting biblical principles and governing itself pretty much under biblical countenance ... Today the US struggles under a social philosophy of pluralism. There is no unified reality ... if this continues and the rival factions increase and strengthen, the country will fall quite simply from violation of the law of unity.’

‘Most Christians deal with absolutes. If God said it that settled it. We cannot compromise or negotiate away matters of principle. We deal with eternal issues. We hold in our hands the keys to the kingdom of heaven. How can we deal away these things in political bargaining?’ [Italics are Robertson’s own emphasis]

As always there is a time obsession. Many times he has predicted the End based on signs such as Ethiopia falling to communism; the disposing of the Shah of Iran; Somalia and Libya as Marxist countries; Soviets in Afghanistan etc. All these come from the Bible.

Israel is crucial. Not only the 1967 War was a sign of the End, but all events there follow the predictions of the Bible. America had better watch its step:

‘For the US to force territorial concessions on an unwilling Israel at this state of history would be to invite the wrath of Almighty God to fall on our nation ...

Many Bible scholars feel that the downfall of mighty Britain came about because Britain presumed to “divide his land.”’

In the mean time, Reconstructionists propose a new society that would eliminate most forms of government and leave citizens accountable to church authorities for their moral behavior. Taxes would be replaced with mandatory tithing, and what few social services would exist would be provided by church agencies. Security and police would be provided by local militia. Crime would be severely punished, and the death penalty would be administered for a variety of felonies, including adultery, unchastity, and sacrificing to false gods. Rushdoony has written:

To the humanistic mind these penalties seem severe and unnecessary. In actuality, the penalties, together with the Biblical faith which motivated them, worked to reduce crime. Thus, when new England passed laws requiring the death penalty for incorrigible delinquents and for children who struck their parents, no executions were necessary: the law kept the children in line.'

This comes through in Robertson's book *The New World Order* 1991. His model is colonial Massachusetts. His efforts to gain control of the Republican Party are designed to provide him with a vehicle by which this Christian view of America can be imposed upon the nation. He said that politicians 'who believe in Judeo-Christian values are better qualified to govern Americans than Hindus and Moslems.' But getting elected was difficult. Ralph Reed, the executive director of the Coalition, gained instant notoriety when he spoke about 'stealth candidates' who were not to tell people that they were members of the Coalition. When the Coalition announced its Contract with the American Family, Reed stood with House Speaker newt Gingrich in the Capitol, a reflection of his expanded political authority.

The European Common Market is more than a disaster. Europe will soon be in shambles and ready for another Hitler. It is in Revelation 17.11-12. The beast with 10 horns that represent ten kings were Rome then but now, of course, Europe with its 12 members [more now]. Numbers don't bother him. The EC is just in time for the anti-Christ, who will make a temporary peace with Israel for three and one half years, and then turn on Israel. Christ will return at the end of another three and one half years and defeat the forces of Antichrist, bind Satan, and establish the millennium. So there we are.

PAT BUCHANAN has run twice for President. He is currently national news commentator, and stars on a number of programs. He has the rather unique trait for fundamentalists of being witty at times. He too has many books. They all do. Too many. The one I will use is *The Death of the West – How Dying Populations and Immigrant Invasions Imperial Our Country and Civilization*. Much of the book is based on his fear of immigrants in that they will destroy the American way of life. This always amuses me because we are and always have been an immigrant nation, and most of the hard work is done by them until they too get an education and can move up the ladder. It seems to me, without any empirical evidence to back this up, that the second generation of immigrants are the ones generating the economy while the fat 3^d and 4th generation Anglo-Saxons, Germans, and Italians fall asleep in front of their TVs. One-half of the nations' graduate students in physics are Asian.

The part I focus on is titled *De-Christianizing America*. ‘America is a Christian nation’ as Gov. of Mississippi Kirk Fordice famously said in 1992. Europe, on the other hand, is going to hell on a bicycle. Only 56% of the English believe in a personal God. In Italy, only 15% attend Sunday mass, and in the Czech Republic Sunday attendance is 3%. He quotes Victor Havel:

‘Could not the whole nature of our current civilization with its shortsightedness, with its proud emphasis on the human individual ... and with its boundless trust in humanity’s abilities to embrace the universal by rational cognition, could it not all be but the natural manifestation of a simple phenomenon which, in simple terms, amounts to the loss of God.’ [180-1]

What is happening in America?

‘The Supreme Court reinterpreted the words of ‘free exercise’ of faith to justify a preemptive strike on Christianity. All Christian Bibles, books, crosses, symbols, ceremonies, and holidays were ordered out of the public square and public schools. Out went Adam and Eve; in came *Heather Has Two Mommies*. Out went paintings of Christ ascending into heaven; in came pictures of apes ascending into *Homo erectus*. Out went Easter; in came Earth Day. Out went Bible teachings about the immorality of homosexuality; in came the homosexuals to teach about the immorality of homophobia. Out went the Commandments; in came the condoms.’ [184]

The Ten Commandments have been tossed out of the court rooms and schools; Alabama’s ‘moment of silence’ was declared unconstitutional. The Supreme Court ordered a nativity scene removed from the grounds of the Allegheny County Courthouse.

In 1992 all prayers at high school graduations were prohibited. In 2000, students were forbidden to pray over the loudspeakers at high school games. Ohio's state motto "With God all things are possible" was removed.

What is in its place? Secular Humanism rules now which is itself a faith. 'Whatever may be said against the ACLU, it does not lack for patience and perseverance. As Cervantes said, give the devil his due.' He goes on to say that we do not live by majority rule in America; we live under the rule of 5 justices of the Court, most of whom not one in ten Americans could name. Well, even Jefferson and Lincoln said that.

Reading List

- Ambrosius, Lloyd E.**, *Wilsonianism*, Palgrave, 2002
Buchanan, Patrick J.; *The Death of the West*; Thomas Dunn, 2002
Cherny, Robert W., *A Righteous Cause – The life of William Jennings Bryan*, Ed. Oscar Handlin, Little, Brown & Co, Boston, 1985
 Chambers, John Whiteclay, *The Tyranny of Change 1900-1917*, 1908
Frank, Thomas; *What's the Matter with Kansas*; 2004
 Gatewood, Willard B Jr., ed, *Controversy in the Twenties*, Nashville, 1969
 Hardt, Michael & Negri, Antonio; *Empire*; Harvard, 2000
 Kissinger, Henry; *Diplomacy*, 1994
 Larson, Edward J.; *Trial and Error*; OUP 2003 [on the Darwin battles in USA]
 Levine, L.W.; *WJB – Defender of the Faith*; OUP, 1965
 McDougall, Walter A; *Promised Land – Crusader State*; 1997
 Nickovich, Frank, *The Wilsonian Century*, Univ of Chicago, 1999
 -----, *Modernity & Power – A history of the Domino Theory in 20th century*; 1994
 Perlmutter, Amos; *Making the World Safe for Democracy*; 1997
Robertson, Pat; *The New World Order*; 1991
 Smith, Tony, *America's Mission*, Princeton, 1994
 Smith, Willard H, *Social & Religious Thought of WJB*; Kansas, 1975
 Steel, Ronald, *Temptations of a Superpower*, Harvard, 1995
 Szasz, Ferenc, *The Divided Mind of Protestant America, 1880-1930*, Alabama U P 1982
Tuveson, Ernest Lee; *Redeemer Nation – The Idea of America's Millennial Role*, Midway Reprint, U of Chicago, 1968