

# AMERICAN IDEOLOGY

---

## A CHRISTIAN ANALYSIS

Number 208

by Dale R. Evans

**D**iscussion of the ideological values within a given culture is very difficult. That's because the strength and duration of that culture's expansive drive toward greater dominance is dependent on the strength of the bond between citizen and ideology. Such a bond is strongest when it is subconscious. That condition can only occur after several generations have embraced those values and succeeded in passing them onto children on a subconscious level. For example, the role definitions of men and women are not described in totality with focused presentation, but, instead, are communicated through behavior modeling of diverse expectations and attitudes. That guarantees a paucity of words and language skills necessary to bring such unconscious communication to consciousness. That fragmented, non-verbal communication of behavior also ensures fragmented disputation. Women in America, for example, may well challenge the belief that men are inherently competitive, and women are not, by demonstrating their competitive drive in various contests, but without ever challenging the more basic stipulation that men, are by nature, competitive.

All cultures encourage declarative statements that affirm their core identity or core ideals, but erect strong taboos intended to protect those core ideals from inquiry or question. It is quite acceptable to declare, "Japan is a divine nation." However, any effort to investigate just how that identity came to be, and why it is so persistent, will be met with resistance, evasiveness, and mystery. Such taboos are essential because cultural values retain the power to drive the culture into the future only if they are easily understood and accepted as absolute. Stalin, and a like minded core of the Communist Party faithful in the U.S.S.R., clearly understood that necessity and consequently executed many Russian intellectuals. Those intellectuals were enthusiastic communists but could not grasp that their intellectual tinkering with the communist ideology rendered it tentative, and therefore impotent. America has likewise developed strong taboos and peer pressure to protect its ideology. No where is the evidence of that protection more obvious than in contrast between psychology and sociology. Sigmund Freud was not well received in America because his concept of the unconscious worked against the American ideals of individualism, freedom, and self-sufficiency. The popular culture developed many derisive slogans and attitudes aimed at rejection of his ideas.

Psychology dutifully mutated into a popular adaption which embraced American values. Psychology thereby became quite popular, and psychology and psychologists were regularly featured in print, radio, television, and film. Sociology, on the other hand, never made a similar cultural accommodation, and sociological studies often identify a reality at odds with ideology. Therefore, sociology was not a popular field of study, sociologists seldom if ever received attention from the popular press, sociology departments at universities are smaller, and their professors are paid less.

The process whereby psychology was made to “fit” American values exemplifies a necessary, yet dangerous function of civilization. Knowledge, discovery, innovation, et. al., must be integrated into, and made consistent with the cultural ideals, or be rejected. Failure to do so diminishes the power and dominance of a particular civilization. Such process is not driven by institutional authority, nor by conspiracy, but by a diverse and unquantifiable ethos. In the case of psychology the pressure for mutation took the form of jokes, sarcasm, vilification of Freud, and stubborn social resistance at the common level of culture. Resistance was, in turn, driven by the presumption of absolute truth in the ideology previously accepted. In the case of a dominant culture the process was most often smooth, and apparently successful in the short term. Long term success was more problematic. The forces of change or the emergence of a threat would not result in a reasoned abandonment of the core ideology, but would be met with a broad and organic determination to extend the original core ideology in a determined effort of preservation. If the core ideology proved over time to be less than absolute the culture would inevitably embrace untruth and eventually delusion. The same cultural taboos intended to protect the original core ideology would screen the untruth and delusion, but could do so only for a limited period of time. It was previously said the strength of a culture derived from the subconscious bond between citizen and ideal, hence destruction of that bond weakened the culture. Since the bond was subconscious, it could not be easily restored. The consequence of that internal breakdown would never be “revolution,” because revolution required bonding to a different, competitive value system. The consequence would be immediately evident in the derivative functions of identity and morality. Identity is derived from, and must be preceded by, the subconscious bond between cultural ideals and the individual. The ideals which are appropriated as absolute bestow personal significance through identity. Any personal or cultural development that rendered those values tentative or untrue would destroy the identity derived therefrom. Morality does not come of itself, but rather was appropriated in concert with identity. The failure of the bond between ideal and individual, would cause the failure of identity, which, in turn, would cause the failure of morality. Cultures who strove to force morality through strident proclamation or physical force would only succeed in further destruction of the bond between ideal and individual, which would result in an increase in immorality rather than a decrease. A culture that did not possess the wisdom to restore the bond between individual and ideal would inevitably fail.

The first stage of cultural failure developed through gradual process. A growing social disillusionment that was not specifically identified. A lost of direction and purpose which was foolishly blamed on laziness or psychological dysfunction. A growing immorality addressed by threat and punishment, which, of course, only exacerbated the immorality.

Whereas a culture during its expansive phase demonstrated the ability to integrate new discovery and invention, overcome challenges, and achieve decisive results in warfare, a culture entering the subsequent plateau phase will increasingly be plagued by ineffective social policy and indecisive military success. Those unwelcome

consequences resulted from internal ideological conflict or cultural necessity that contradicted cultural ideology, and could not be resolved without sacrificing elements of the ideology previously embraced as sacred. Continued social stress from such unresolved difficulties would inevitably invite proposed solutions replete with deception, and eventually fraud. The United States Marine Corps was a case in point. Military service was a contradiction of the American ideals of freedom and individuality, but in order to fight wars the Marine Corps had to somehow induce young men to give up their freedom and individuality. They knew full well that young men aspired to a heroic identity<sup>1</sup> and so they crafted a public relations campaign which depicted Marines as a select group of heroic warriors. That heroic ideal was skillfully reinforced during Marine Boot Camp. However, a key element in the Marine Corps' battle strategy was the role of "Fire Teams." Fire Teams were a group of three to five soldiers that were sent out in advance of the main unit for the specific purpose of drawing enemy fire. The rationale for such teams was that it was essential to draw enemy fire to expose the location and firepower of the enemy. In live combat the survival rate of the fire teams was very low. The survival rate of the "Point Man" on the Fire Teams was close to zero. Only eighteen and nineteen year old boys fresh out of Boot Camp and instilled with a strong sense of invincibility were assigned to Fire Teams. And they were watched closely. As soon as a young Marine exhibited behavior or attitude that showed he had figured out he was being "used," he was taken off the Fire Team. If he was especially savvy he was transferred to artillery or logistics.

Strategies of deceit and fraud enabled a culture to "limp along" in the plateau phase for an extended period of time providing no challenge was so great as to exceed the strength of the internal consensus from whence the culture derived. For example, Tsarist Russia survived Napoleon's invasion of 1812, not because of brilliant military strategy, but because Russia's internal consensus remained intact. But Tsarist Russia was nevertheless beset by internal problems. The Russian aristocracy longed to surpass their European counterparts in prestige and conspicuous consumption, but were riding herd over a feudal economy. Rather than creating new economic opportunities, the aristocracy extracted an ever greater proportion of the stagnant economic product from the lower classes. By the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century Russia was locked in permanent depression. Tsar Nicolas, impervious to the reality all around him, sent Russian troops into World War I with meager economic support. Those troops were routinely humiliated in battle due to inadequate resources and poor training. They began limping back to Russia humiliated and starving. On March 8, 1917, a number of Russian boys and housewives had waited in long lines at the bakeshops only to be told there was no bread. They became suspicious and agitated and refused to disperse. The police were called in but that only heightened the size and agitation of the crowd. The resulting food riots led to the storming of the Duma<sup>2</sup>. Tsarist Russia collapsed in a period of just a few days. A democratic government under the leadership of Alexander Kerensky was elected to leadership, but the democrats had no grasp of what had really happened in Russia and no forward strategy. They were overthrown in October by the Bolsheviks. The communists did not overthrow a viable culture, but rather moved into a vacuum created by a failed culture. Communist Russia of the Twentieth Century likewise failed when its internal consensus could not sustain that culture's drive to global dominance.

---

<sup>1</sup> See [Discerning the Need for God in Young Men](#), on this Web Site.

<sup>2</sup> Russia's equivalent of a Parliament.

The best evidence that cultures were driven by ideology embraced as absolute truth occurred during the final, self-destructive phase of the culture. Internal conflict and external threat were met with increasingly strident affirmation of that ideology. "America is the greatest country in the world." "We need to extend our freedom and democracy to the world." "Russia needs the shock therapy of free markets." People bonded to a cultural ideology would never rationally conclude that internal conflict and external failure resulted from an inadequate ideology. Rather humans would always conclude such conflicts and failures resulted from an impure and/or insufficiently courageous expression of that ideology. The solution would always be: "We must express our ideals more purely . . . more courageously . . . no matter what the cost . . . no matter who it hurts." That cost would inevitably become tyranny and violence because what began as an inner determination to live those values more purely and more courageously would always lead to a demand that other citizens likewise live more purely and courageously. Those that did not, and those who worked against such tyrannical pressures would be judged an enemy that must be neutralized or eliminated. Since the values that drove the tyranny were not, in fact, absolute truth, the mental process of the advocates would become increasingly delusional. The greater the delusion, the more limited the success. The more limited the success, the more tyrannical and brutal the delusion . . . an ugly self-destructive cycle that would quickly spiral down into collapse. The Roman Empire, Hitler's Germany, and Communist Russia were good examples.

The human drive that birthed and then destroyed civilizations, arose from within all humans who acted in concert to develop an absolute truth from the experience of revelation or an event that transcended the understanding of all to such a degree that it conferred a unique, transcendent identity. Though the amplitude and duration of the civilizational process thus birthed could vary greatly, the resultant process would have the same structure, and the course of history within that civilization could therefore be predicted with considerable accuracy. In addition, the elements that effected the amplitude and duration of a civilizational process could be identified and exploited to moderate that civilization's propensity for self-destruction.

## AMERICA

The first statement of American ideology was the beginning of the second paragraph of the *Declaration of Independence*, July 4, 1776.

*"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.--That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed . . ."*

The principal subject of the **Declaration of Independence** was, however, a recital of grievances against the British Crown that established a justification for independence from that monarchy. That declaration, and the reasoning contained therein, was unique. The right of a king to rule as he pleased had been the principal ideal in the social organization of all of Western Civilization through the Middle Ages. "The divine right of the king," was an ideal first advanced by Christianity, which held that all kings were appointed by God and therefore ruled by an authority that could not be

challenged by those not designated by God. In challenging the British Crown's right to so rule, the colonists did not say that a large enough number of citizens had agreed the King was wrong, and therefore decided to overrule him. Rather they said, ". . . *all men are created equal* . . .", by which they meant all men had the same divine right as the King. It did not matter how many men actually decided the King was wrong. Only a few actually signed the declaration and no attempt was made to specifically identify the number nor declare a rationale for establishing a suitable number. Since all men were equal to the King, any number would suffice. The elevation of the individual to the status of a "divine right" equal to that of a king was the principal consequence of the Christian Reformation. Martin Luther had declared the doctrine of "*sola scriptura*," which meant that Holy Scripture alone had divine authority. The invention of the printing press in the same period as the Reformation allowed every person access to the Bible. Since the Bible was the only expression of divine authority acknowledged by Protestants, it conferred on each the authority to proclaim God's will. Equality was a derivative of the "*divine right of the individual*." Obviously, if multiple persons were accorded the status of "*divine right*," they all had to be equal. Otherwise one's right would be more divine than another, and that would render the whole ideology equivocal and therefore impotent.

The core ideology of America was, therefore, the *divine right of the individual* and the necessary corollary, *equality*. The core ideals, however, had to be extended so as to define the prescriptive behavior necessary to ensure social custom, business relations, and law were consistent with, and a derivative of, the core ideals. The first statement of prescriptive behavior was the ***Constitution***, September 17, 1787. In that document the Founding Fathers set forth the structure and function of the government, the manner in which it was to be elected, and the limits of its authority. Above all, the Founding Fathers intended the government to be an institution that served the people and was subject to the control of the people, as specified in the ***Declaration of Independence***, ". . . *That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed* . . ." The definition of essential prescriptive behavior was continued in the ***Bill of Rights***, March 4, 1789, and focused on the sanctity and preservation of individual rights.

In the Old World, ownership of land established personal significance. Most immigrants to America yearned to own land, and when they did it established personal significance. The great promise of America was the vast expanse of arable land available for settlement.

In the ***Declaration of Independence***, America did not advocate a revolution in Britain, nor did America advance the idea of world revolution. It specifically declared itself independent from the British monarchy. It was implicit that other people of different custom were not automatically included in America's new ideology. Those who were included appropriated the prescriptive behavior established by those ideals. Those who did not appropriate that prescriptive behavior were not included, were not deemed citizens, and were not granted equal protection under the law. The royalists were an immediate example. Those immigrants who continued to adhere to the prescriptive behavior of the British crown were ostracized, were not afforded the equal protection of the law, and most migrated to Canada to avoid harassment. It was, of course, easy for those who had migrated from Britain to understand the new world order and make a clear choice whether to appropriate the new behavior or to remain obedient to the British crown. Those ethnic groups who did not come from the British Isles, did not understand British custom, and knew little or none of the English language, could neither make a choice nor even understand that a choice was necessary. The instinctive cultural taboos intended to protect the ideology prevented

colonists from explicitly soliciting consent from those who did not understand. Hence, those who did not understand America's prescriptive behavior were incapable of appropriating that behavior, were not included in the new definition of culture, and therefore were neither considered equal nor accorded individual rights. For that reason none of the settlers, North or South, had any problem abusing and exploiting Native Americans. Why then did the North get so incensed about slavery? Alexis de Tocqueville, in his seminal work, Democracy in America<sup>3</sup>, first published in 1835, observed a dark side to America's obsession with equality:

*“There is, in fact, a manly and lawful passion for equality which excites men to wish all to be powerful and honored. This passion tends to elevate the humble to the rank of the great; but there exists also in the human heart a depraved taste for equality, which impels the weak to attempt to lower the powerful to their own level, and reduces men to prefer equality in slavery to inequality with freedom. Not that those nations whose social condition is democratic naturally despise liberty; on the contrary, they have an instinctive love of it. But liberty is not the chief and constant object of their desires; equality is their idol: they make rapid and sudden efforts to obtain liberty, and if they miss their aim resign themselves to their disappointment; but nothing can satisfy them except equality, and rather than lose it they resolve to perish.”*

Cotton was making the South quite prosperous, decidedly more prosperous than the North, and that prosperity was amplified through the use of slave labor. To make matters worse, Southern plantation owners were courted by the British, particularly the textile industry, and thereby began reacquiring the aristocratic attitudes and habits that were so repugnant to those attached to the ideal of equality. The Civil War certainly crushed the aristocratic plantation culture of the South, and certainly ended slavery, but the legacy of that momentous event was more difficult to assess. The abuse and exploitation of Native Americans by both the North and the South increased dramatically after the Civil War. The actual condition of African Americans changed little. They continued to be ostracized and abused. Some theorists contended that the North was driven by economics and cared little about justice. Others opined that America was a free country and once slavery was abolished it was up to African Americans and Native Americans to take the initiative and take care of themselves.

It was true neither group appropriated the American ideology, nor the prescriptive behavior dictated by the ideology. That was counted against them, but that judgement was based on ignorance. The **Declaration of Independence** included the phrase, “. . . they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.--That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men . . .” The colonists had reversed the common interpretation of the “*divine right of kings*.” They postulated that God did not grant kings to do as they pleased, but rather assigned kings the obligation to secure the “*divine rights*” granted individuals by God. The colonists had declared governments had the obligation to take the initiative to secure those rights for all people, that governments were instituted from among people for that purpose, and the failure of the government to succeed in that initiative gave the people just cause to throw off that government and institute another. Apparently America was too focused on itself

---

<sup>3</sup> Modern electronic texts make page references meaningless, so the best thing to do is a word search in a electronic text such as the version of Democracy in America found on Project Gutenberg, <http://promo.net/pg/> .

and the British crown to truly grasp the meaning of that statement. Yet its importance cannot be overstated. For the sake of greater clarity the issue can be translated into the language of this treatise as follows . . . the authors of, and adherents to, an ideology must accept the responsibility of establishing and supporting the subconscious bond between ideology and individual. Success in that regard strengthens the inner consensus that empowers the ideology and drives it into an expansive phase. Failure to secure that subconscious bond, results in failure of identity, failure of significance, and failure of morality. The problem is not self-healing. In the case of the American culture, the problem continued unabated. It was quite meaningless to point to the success of other ethnic groups, for the issue was not ethnic groups but bonding to the American ideology. Chinese, Latinos, Catholics, et. al., who came to America in expectation of a better life quickly bonded to the American ideology. African Americans were brought to America under brutal, dehumanizing conditions, forced to work as slaves, and after slavery was abolished, demeaning and dehumanizing treatment by the American culture continued. Likewise, Native Americans were already established in America, when the new ideology from Europe brought disease, death, confiscation of land, not once, but repeatedly. Native Americans were driven out of their fertile land into ever smaller areas of worthless land, and persistently brutalized in the process. Why indeed would anyone expect these two groups to bond to the American ideology? They did not, will not, and should not. And by America's own **Declaration of Independence**, they have the right to throw off the government and institute another.

Though the aristocratic plantation culture of the South was crushed, the agricultural ideology consisting of individual rights, independence, self-sufficiency, and risk-taking that birthed that Southern culture remained strong in the South and drove the westward expansion of America. That configuration of ideology was well suited to the demands of that westward expansion, but was much less efficacious after the Industrial Revolution. Certainly a family who was determined to venture into unknown territory and settle on land distant from cities and other supporting infrastructure, had to be independent and self-sufficient. But those same values truncated customs that supported cooperation and teamwork. That rendered the rural agriculture class incapable of developing strategies of cooperation and mutual support necessary to withstand domination by the large agricultural corporations which emerged after the Industrial Revolution. Those corporations quickly gained control of agricultural markets and control of the industries that supported agriculture. Pressure from the supply side combined with pressure from the marketing side squeezed the agricultural class into a subsistence life style.

The resolute determination of that class to be independent and self-sufficient also disposed them toward a more limited interest in the life and ideas of others. Consequently, the rural agricultural class also became the most politically conservative. That conservatism prevented their early demise as politicians mined that conservative base by lavishing government subsidies on agriculture. The same politicians most eager to solicit the conservative agricultural vote, however, were also the most beholden to corporate interests, and that did not bode well for agriculture. Corporate agriculture ultimately shifted its interest to global markets where it expected handsome profits from free trade. That made the American agricultural class expendable. Free trade, the necessary precondition for corporate agriculture's desire to dominate global agriculture, required the termination of government agricultural subsidies in America. When that occurs the agricultural class will be completely decimated, corporate interests will assume ownership of the land, and individuals will either leave agriculture or work for corporations for menial wages. Only presidential

politics has forestalled that grim finality, but it can do so only for a limited time.

The earliest immigrants were most interested in equality and the North was their most common destination. Furthermore, the agricultural land in the North was not as fertile as the South, nor did it offer the economies of scale available in the South. Those natural differences led to an instinctive separation of settlers. Those most interested in land and willing to accept risk and the admonition of self-sufficiency spread into the South and also repeatedly pushed the boundaries of the new country to the edge of the Indian Territories. That life style did not appeal to all. The people who stayed in the North were less inclined to risk and self-sufficiency, and less inclined to see ownership of land as the principal means of establishing a sense of personal significance. Northerners were more interested in equality, and equality provided a more cerebral sense of personal significance. It appealed more to people who were thinkers as opposed to doers. It appealed more to early immigrants, and less to succeeding generations. Thinkers, by their very nature, were more inclined toward industry and less inclined toward plantation culture. Industry blossomed in the North. On the eve of the Civil War the North's fledgling industrial economy did not seem so significant, and it certainly lacked the glamour of the Southern plantations. But it was that industrial base that carried the North to victory in the Civil War.

Nevertheless, there was a problem with the ideal of equality. It was a cerebral concept that in its positive expression generated passionate quests for equality like the Civil War and the Women's Suffrage Movement, but once a condition of equality was realized it engendered passivity. Equality did not energize a daily positive initiative in individuals, unless that daily initiative be the degradation of those who had become "more than equal." The degradation of the power of equality to instill a sense of personal significance was directly correlated to the weakening of the memory of a prior life of inequality. That condition was observed by de Tocqueville:

*“. . . but there exists also in the human heart a depraved taste for equality, which impels the weak to attempt to lower the powerful to their own level, and reduces men to prefer equality in slavery to inequality with freedom.”*

Therefore the ideal of equality, per se, was incapable of driving a culture through an expansive phase of development. That problem was of greater concern in the North because the North had developed an industrial base, and the world was in the midst of the Industrial Revolution. The North had to generate expansive forward development or face a future of poverty and insignificance. The mutation had to occur on the level of ideology, and so it did. That mutation was competition.

Competition served three important purposes. It counteracted the negative tendencies resulting from an obsession with equality as identified by de Tocqueville. It elicited initiative from the participant and therefore built a disposition toward initiative in people. It created a mechanism for establishing and maintaining a sense of personal significance.

The mutation in ideology was introduced into the American culture gently and without pretension through competitive games. Most of the games were variations of games already played in Britain, such as golf and baseball, but with some important differences. British games were either complex, like croquet, or had to be played on lavish grounds reserved for the upper class, such as golf. The intention in Britain was to prevent commoners from competing with, and possibly besting, aristocrats. The games adopted in America were either simplified or otherwise made more accessible

to a much broader segment of the population. Those adjustments represented America's preeminent concern that equality should remain more important than competition. Games in 19<sup>th</sup> Century America, and well into the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, were mostly gentlemanly experiences. The players were neither overly aggressive, nor mean spirited in defeat. Business and professional people were attracted to baseball and golf when it was realized the most essential quality for success in those two sports was focused concentration. Focused concentration and an assertive temperament directed toward winning, prevailing, getting an advantage over, out-smarting, et. al., were the benefits of competition increasingly valued by business and industry. Competitive games flourished. The best competitors became rich and famous. Still, the games remained gentlemanly, and were played by the rules through a good part of the Twentieth Century.

That all changed in the Post Vietnam War Period. The social resources funneled into competitive games rose exponentially. Competitive games and famous competitors commanded ever greater attention from the print, radio, and television media. The compensation of the most successful competitors increased dramatically. Billions of dollars was spent on athletic facilities. Games had become a ritual re-enactment of the behavior most highly prized by the culture.

The audience most captivated by competitive games was, not surprisingly, young men.<sup>4</sup> It was well known by military and industry that young American men longed for significance and spent large sums of money watching competitive games and movies with an heroic theme to fuel their own fantasies. It might have appeared, on the surface, that business enterprise was duly rewarded for fulfilling a legitimate male yearning. But obsession with the heroic accomplishment of another was only vicarious need satisfaction and only served to ensure the yearning for significance in young men was not satisfied. Though such yearning may have continued for years, most men resigned themselves to a pedestrian or dysfunctional life style by their mid to late twenties. They did so without protest, having accepted the self-judgement that they were unworthy of their own personal vision. But the need that drove the obsession with heroic figures did not go away. Rather, it transferred to the collective success of military, government, and/or industry.

Whether it was the rural agricultural class trapped in a subsistence life style, or the urban employee class dependent upon authoritarian business management, most Americans of the modern period had given up their freedom and independence, and willing accepted that their sense of personal significance should be dependant on the largesse of those who controlled their life. How was it possible the fierce drive for equality and independence that dominated America at its birth had given way to a meek acceptance of exactly the opposite condition?

There was little competition for the vast land available to America during its period of expansive growth, and no substantive military threat from any other major culture. Its relative isolation during that period insured minimal communication between individuals with differing values, and therefore, minimal ideological contention. The result was an unfettered rise to global power.

The pristine conditions that enabled that rise to global power changed dramatically with the advent of World Communism. Suddenly atomic bombs and intercontinental ballistic missiles nullified America's geographical isolation. The launch of a space

---

<sup>4</sup> See [Discerning the Need for God in Young Men](http://www.renewal-1.com/NewFiles/LordJimRev.pdf), on this Web Site or at <http://www.renewal-1.com/NewFiles/LordJimRev.pdf>

satellite by the U.S.S.R. in 1957 shocked America with the possibility that another culture with a competing claim to absolute truth was more advanced and more capable. The print, radio, and television media flooded with comparisons of the military power of each culture. American became obsessed with the imagined horror of nuclear warfare.

John F. Kennedy responded to that American anxiety with confidence, charisma, and aristocratic credentials. He vowed to bring the “best and the brightest” into government service, close the missile gap, and put a man on the moon in ten years. After his election to the Presidency he entered Washington with his family and entourage with the aura of the coronation of a king. “Camelot” was the metaphor most often used to describe his position in America. But the comparison to the idyllic reign of King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table went much deeper than metaphor. There was an acquiescence, an unconscious transfer of authority and power, over to that aristocratic president, and the “best and brightest” he brought to Washington. In that transfer of authority and power, there was a “letting go” of responsibility . . . a “giving up” of freedom by the people. The *best and brightest* would run the world, and the people would do as they were told.

That deep mutation in American ideology had not occurred abruptly. There was an upwelling of yearning for authority from within that had been underway for some time. That yearning was previously exposed by the research of Solomon Asch.<sup>5</sup> Asch assembled eighteen groups of seven to nine college students each, and told the group the purpose of experiment was to test visual discrimination. Actually all the students except for one in each group were accomplices of Asch. The real purpose of the experiment was to test the degree to which the one test subject would be influenced by the judgement of the others in the group even when that judgement was obviously wrong. Two cards were passed from one to another in the group. One card had one line on it of a specified length, and the second card had three lines, one of the same exact length as the line on the first card, and two lines that were obviously a different length than the line on the first card. When the person received the cards they were asked to state out loud which of the lines on the second card matched the line on the first card. The group was arranged so that most of the accomplices spoke before the test subject. After several rounds in which the accomplices made the correct judgement, and some group bonding had formed, the accomplices would assert that one the lines that was obviously a different length was in fact the correct match. About one third of the test subjects publicly yielded to the position of the majority, even though in a later interview with Asch they said they knew the group choice was wrong but did not want to appear to be out of step with the group.

Actually, Asch’s study was a formal verification of the obvious. Any socially aware observer knew people were willing to significantly modify their behavior, attitudes, and beliefs in order to win peer acceptance. American citizens, in spite of all the bravado about freedom and independence, increasingly longed for an authority to define the prescriptive behavior essential for successful cultural process. They looked to their peers, then to the administration of President Kennedy, and then to the *best and brightest*.

But there was a dark dimension to the need for acquiescence to authority. That darker aspect was exposed by the infamous research of Stanley Milgram.<sup>6</sup> Milgram set up a

---

<sup>5</sup>Asch, Solomon, “Opinions and social pressure,” Scientific American, Volume 195, 1955, pages 51-55.

<sup>6</sup>Milgram, Stanley, Obedience to Authority: An Experimental View, Harper & Row, New York, 1973.

laboratory at Yale University for the expressed purpose of testing people's obedience to authority. The lab consisted of two rooms separated by a wall with a window which the subject of the experiment was told was one-way glass. In the other room was a person strapped into a chair with electrodes attached. The subject of the experiment was told the purpose was to determine the effect of punishment on learning. The subject would ask the "learner" to remember word pairs, and was instructed to apply an increasingly severe shock with each successive mistake by flipping a switch on the control panel in front of the subject. The switches ranged in voltage from 15 volts to 450 volts, and the corresponding label above the switch ranged from "slight shock" at the low end to "danger - severe shock" at the high end. The subject was further told that the learner had a heart condition, but that the shock would not be dangerous. The purpose of the experiment was to determine how far the subject would go in administering pain to the learner when instructed to do so by an authority figure.

Student subjects were first recruited through the Yale University student newspaper with an invitation to participate in a psychological experiment. All of the first group of subjects applied shocks all the way up to and including 450 volts, "danger - severe shock." The results were so dramatic and surprising that Milgram modified the experiment by adding tape recorded messages from the learner which were intended to communicate to the subject the degree of pain they administered to the learner. At 125 volts the learner shouted "I can't stand it." At 195 volts the learner complained of heart trouble, and at 270 volts the response was a horrible scream. After 270 volts there was only silence. Sixty-five percent of the subjects in that later study pulled the switches all the way up to 450 volts.

It was not unusual in the annals of history for people to surrender their liberty and eagerly accept rule by another. Israel was established as the people of God:

*"Then you (Moses) will say to Pharaoh, 'This is what Yahwah says: Israel is my first-born son.'"*<sup>7</sup>

But then they later demanded that they have a king just like other people.

*"Then all the elders of Israel gathered together and came to Samuel at Ramah. 'Look,' they said to him, 'you are old, and your sons do not follow your ways. So give us a king to rule over us, like the other nations.'"*<sup>8</sup>

The people of Rome likewise received Julius Caesar as their ruler when he crossed the Rubicon River in 49 BC, and that marked the end of the Roman Republic.

America marked the end of its republic with the transfer of power and authority to the *best and brightest*. The best confirmation of that transfer was the public response to the battle of Tonkin Gulf<sup>9</sup>, which marked the beginning of the overt war in Vietnam. That battle occurred in the night of August 4, 1964, during which the USS Maddox (DD-731) sent twenty-three priority Flash messages over the High Command communications network, one for each torpedo recorded "coming at" the Maddox.

---

<sup>7</sup> Exodus 4:22, Jerusalem Bible.

<sup>8</sup> 1 Samuel 8:4-6, Jerusalem Bible.

<sup>9</sup> See THE BATTLE OF TONKIN GULF: How High Command Intentionally Provoked War in Vietnam, on this Web Site, or at <http://www.renewal-1.com/judging.html>

Any person with only modest knowledge of Naval operations would realize twenty-three torpedoes was an impossible number. Indeed, shortly after the end of that battle Commodore Herrick sent out a Flash message on the same High Command network which affirmed the first torpedo then questioned the validity of the other twenty-two. Nevertheless, President Lyndon Johnson ordered the bombing of North Vietnam, and a few days later submitted the infamous Tonkin Gulf Resolution to Congress. That resolution was passed with only two dissenting votes and gave Lyndon Johnson unlimited power to wage war in Vietnam. Various Naval pundits later said the battle did not occur at all, or resulted from a bunch of trigger happy sailors. Others affirmed the battle. Neither the stark suggestions of Naval stupidity, nor the “convenient” timing of the Tonkin Gulf Resolution, ever led to any formal inquiry into that event. Since then President Lyndon Johnson has been tenaciously protected by the *best and brightest* in government and media. And the American people allowed that subterfuge without protest, having already surrendered any pretense of a demand for accountability.

It must be noted, however, that the transfer of authority was not driven by a thorough assessment of the meaning of *best and brightest*, nor by a comparative analysis of the accomplishments of that amorphous group vis-a-vis the American republic. The acquiescence was driven by the deep, compelling need of the American people. Yet that need was inconsistent with the ideals of individual equality and self-sufficiency and the resulting tension prevented conscious acknowledgment of that need. The real force driving the acquiescence eluded articulation and therefore generated inadequate solutions. The *best and brightest* was one of those inadequate solutions, evidenced by the fact they managed and lost the war in Vietnam. And they did so in spite of all their subterfuge. That loss was neither routine nor inconsequential. It was humiliating. It called into question virtually every grand proclamation America had ever made about its self.

Consistent with the theory of cultural process previously developed, America did not respond to the crisis perpetrated by the loss of the Vietnam War with repentance or acknowledgment of error, but rather a radical and polarized political dynamic set on making those ideals prevail as expected. There was a ground-swell of people who longed for the idyllic life of individual self-sufficiency in rural America, and a similar ground-swell of people who yearned for personal significance through competition. The political right was determined America would be obedient to authority, stronger militarily, and stronger economically. The political left was just as determined that individual rights would be paramount, and equality reestablished. The previous conduct of Lyndon Johnson in Tonkin Gulf, and the subsequent conduct of Richard Nixon in the Watergate scandal, Ronald Reagan in the Iran-Contra scandal, William Clinton in the Lewinsky affair, and G. W. Bush in the war in Iraq, plainly demonstrated the grim determination to reassert America’s ideological superiority would not be restrained by law, domestic or international. The consistent shredding of legal restraint by successive Presidents exacerbated the advance toward tyranny identified by the research of Stanley Milgram as originating within the individual. Individual Americans increasingly justified tyranny in their favorite politicians, but with unexpected consequence.

All of the dramatic aspirations of Americans after the Vietnam War empowered *Corporate America*. The yearning for the simple rural life of self-sufficiency only contributed to *Corporate America’s* stranglehold over the rural agricultural class, and worked to block the development of common cause and cooperative strategies necessary for their survival. The yearning to establish significance through

competition only ensured that *Corporate America* would be the arbiter of that significance. The Right's desire for America to be stronger economically meant *Corporate America* needed to be more prosperous. The desire to be stronger militarily meant government had to contract with *Corporate America* for that capability. The goal of obedience to authority depended upon individuals accepting *Corporate America* as the source of authority.

The Left's desire for equality focused primarily on equality of opportunity and equality of compensation in *Corporate America*. The desire for individual rights focused on the individual success, or opportunity for success, in *Corporate America*.

*Corporate America* was therefore greatly empowered by:

- ✓ the quest for self-sufficiency,
- ✓ competition
- ✓ the goals of both the Left and the Right,
- ✓ their ownership of the political process through campaign finance,
- ✓ the shredding of legal restraint by successive Presidents, which freed *Corporate America* of all but token legal restraint.

In spite of that process of empowerment, *Corporate America* was moribund. Established industry in America was burdened by dated manufacturing facilities, and the adversarial relationships within and without that derived from the competitive ideal. The formation of the *Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries* - OPEC - in the 1970's ignited a dramatic increase in the price of oil, forced the world into economic recession, and propelled Japan toward economic dominance. Japanese industry alone demonstrated the ability to construct oil supertankers by an automated process that no other country, including the United States, was capable of replicating. The stunning success of Japan in taking over the supertanker market was followed by a steadily increasing share of the automobile market and consumer electronics, both within the United States and world wide. Prominent Japanese business leaders regularly belittled America's business culture for excessive executive compensation, persistent failure to direct sufficient corporate resources into the capital improvements necessary to remain efficient, a burgeoning but entirely unnecessary middle management class, and the demeaning and counterproductive treatment of lower level employees.

American business was told repeatedly by consultants and academics that it had to adopt the Japanese management style or face oblivion. Several large corporations invited worker participation in management committees, but all of those efforts were short lived. Workers complained of bad faith on the part of management whose only objective, they said, was to get more from the employees for less. Management complained the workers only desired higher compensation and more control. A new airline company . . . People Express, Inc . . . was founded in the early 1980's. It was touted as an American adaption of Japanese management practices, and had the blessing of Harvard Business School. It failed completely in just a few years. Disgruntled employees complained that it had been nothing more than a gimmick to get more work from the employees for less money.

The horrendous deficit spending used by the administration of President Ronald Reagan for military expansion triggered the economic recession of 1989-1991. That recession exposed the over dependence of Japan on the American consumer market, which, in turn, ended the advocacy of the Japanese management model in America. The U.S.S.R. and World Communism collapsed in the same time frame and left America as the sole superpower and the dominant claimant to absolute truth in the secular realm.

However, moribund *Corporate America* still needed a practical vision for forward movement. That vision was provided by the entirely unexpected invention of the personal computer by Steve Jobs and Steve Wozniak. That invention created an industry that was new and completely controlled by the United States. The business model that was quickly adopted by the new High Technology Industry and soon provided *Corporate America* with a desperately needed business model was first inaugurated by a few silicon chip manufacturers in the late 1970's. Those early technology companies emerged from a creative relationship between Stanford University and the technology industry. But the new companies had difficulty attracting gifted employees. Out of necessity they offered compensation considerably higher than more established industries. That in turn generated considerable downward pressure on profits. The resulting influx of well paid employees to *Silicon Valley* created a strong upward pressure on housing valuation, which accentuated the upward pressure on the compensation necessary to attract gifted employees. The combined pressures fed into each other and caused a real dilemma for the fledgling industry. That dilemma was resolved by exporting the less skilled jobs to Southeast Asia. Wages there were so low they more than offset the spiraling compensation requirements in America.

*Corporate America* recognized the usefulness of that business model and rushed to replicate it in their operations. All manner of business enterprise from mid-sized to large solicited Third World countries for permission to establish therein manufacturing or assembly operations. Naturally they intended to employ the local indigent population which could be pressured to work for the least money, and for whom human rights could most easily be sublimated.

It was important to note that the *best and brightest* of government and industry did not originate the new global business model. They appropriated it. And then they embellished it with ideology. The yearning in *Corporate America* to take advantage of Third World labor resources was dressed up as *free trade*, *global capitalism*, and the *shock therapy of free markets*. The ideological slogans disguised the actual reality. It was often gruesome. The following captured the experience of 'shock therapy' as applied to Russia at the behest of American *economic experts*:

*"At the beginning of 1992, the Russian government started an economic experiment known as 'shock therapy.' Abolition of price control in a highly monopolized economy resulted in soaring consumer prices, a rapid decrease in real wages and pensions, a nearly complete loss of personal savings, and a tremendous increase in the poverty rate. These adverse changes were followed by a unprecedented upsurge in mortality which has no parallel in modern history: female life expectancy dropped by 3 years and male life expectancy by more than 5*

*years within a three year period.”<sup>10</sup>*

It was plain to see from the inability of American enterprise to adapt to the Japanese management model in the 1980's, the inability of Japan to change its long entrenched customs in order to extricate itself from recession in the 1990's, and the brutality visited on the Russian people in the name of capitalism during the 1990's, that people were not motivated by intellectual proposition or academic theory. They were driven by ideology. Ideological derivatives were not successfully appropriated apart from the core ideology from whence they derived. The Japanese management model could not function apart from the deeper conviction that Japan was a divine nation, and that divine status was conferred on Japan as one entity without individual differentiation.<sup>11</sup> In the case of America, capitalism, competition, free markets and democracy were derived from the core ideal of the status and the rights of the individual. The sanctity of the individual was first protected by a government structure under the control of individual citizens, by a judiciary obligated to protect individual rights, and then the ideals of capitalism, free markets, and competition derived from and were dependent upon those core ideals. The successful appropriation of American ideals in Russia would first have required a deep, positive bonding to the American ideal of individuality. That could only occur if the Russian people viewed American ideology with complete positive regard. They did not. Like African Americans and Native Americans, their experience of American ideology had been almost entirely negative. Therefore, the attempt to force Russian acceptance of the American economic model was actually an expression of tyranny. And it was intended tyranny. The phrase “shock therapy,” denoted certain and intended harm, justified in the forced transition to values judged absolute. Of course that transition failed. But how was it that economic and corporate interests had acquired such power?

The confluence of the five American social processes denoted above empowered *Corporate America* from within America. Combined with the demise of world communism, the prolonged recession in Japan, and the new business model appropriated from the fledgling technology industry elevated *Corporate America* to the status of global “War Lord.” *War Lord* herein defined as a secondary power center arising from within a given culture, dependent on the ideals of that culture, but no longer under the parent culture’s control. Such global *War Lords* garnered strength from insecure people, both within their parent culture and from people of other cultures who offered their allegiance. Such commitments were always one directional. The *War Lord* only committed to use the person who offered their allegiance according to the terms, and for the duration determined by the *War Lord*.

Though *War Lords* appeared powerful and worthy of allegiance in the short term they were, in fact, burdened by the same heroic needs of individuals and therefore, the same self-destructive tendencies as individuals. As noted above, those needs were projected into the corporate culture by individuals who had given up on their personal heroic aspirations. The political and economic policy of *shock therapy* was the same kind of self-destructive behavior identified in individuals, and, predictably it produced exactly the opposite outcome of that desired. And the contradictory result guaranteed those countries would not appropriate American ideology. Consistent with the theory

---

<sup>10</sup> “The Response of Violent Mortality to Economic Crisis in Russia,” by Natalia S. Gavrilova, Victoria S. Semyonova, Galina N. Evdokushkina, & Leonid A. Gavrilova; from the Introduction, *Population Research and Policy Review* 19:397-419, 2000, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Printed in the Netherlands.

<sup>11</sup> See “Japan,” on this Web Site or at <http://www.renewal-1.com/judging.html>

previously developed, global *War Lords* did not acknowledge error, nor accept any responsibility for the disaster. Rather they blamed the government, laws, and customs, et. al., of the failed cultures. The predictable solution? The global *War Lords* had to have more power and more control so local obstacles could be overcome or set aside as necessary. The World Trade Organization was created to satisfy that need, embellished, of course, with promises of prosperity for the poor.

The foreign policy of the United States was no less self-destructive during the modern period. After the rise of world communism, there was extreme anxiety in the American government that communism would spread to the smaller, poorer countries. The success of Fidel Castro in making Cuba a communist state was exactly the scenario most feared by Washington. A global strategy came to fruition during the Presidency of Dwight Eisenhower. That strategy called for the United States to identify:

- weak but friendly rulers who needed military and/or economic support in order to stay in power;

- countries experiencing political turmoil in which there was an opportunity to install a ruler supportive of American foreign policy objectives, and then secure that ruler's power as necessary with American military and economic assistance;

- countries with rulers or potential rulers sympathetic to communism in which there was an opportunity to undermine or eliminate that ruler before a communist government was in place;

- encourage friendship between American military officers and the military officers of the various smaller countries through personal contact, mutual attendance at training camps, work shops, tactical and command schools, and symposiums appropriate to the rank of the subject officers;

- use the military friendships and personal contacts to maintain loyalties and a flow of information on the day-to-day and behind-the-scenes events in the client country.

The rationale behind that foreign policy strategy opposed the idea of any attempt to transform the client states into democracies because that would make the long term relationship unpredictable. If a client state was democratic it could, at any time, elect a government opposed to the interests of the United States. Furthermore, the initiative directed at long-term friendships between military officers would be wasted if there were regular regime changes. A dictator, on the other hand, could remain in power indefinitely, or so it was thought at the time. The officer corp was always vitally important to a dictator and therefore the long-term friendships between military officers were expected to be very, very useful.

From a detached and purely intellectual point of view, that global strategy seemed well conceived and "the best one could hope for given the threat of communism." Some of the notable examples of that strategy were; the Shah of Iran, the House of Saud in Saudi Arabia, the Baath Party in Iraq and subsequently Saddam Hussein, Suharto in Indonesia, Marcos in the Philippines, Diem in Vietnam and the several that followed in his footsteps before the end of the Vietnam War. Some examples of leftist

governments destroyed by the United States in keeping with that strategy were Chile under Allende and the Sandinistas in Nicaragua. It was the same strategy at work in the present action in Iraq where the United States hoped to first install Chalabi as their client dictator, and now are working to install Allawi in that capacity.

From a long-term ideological point of view that global strategy was a complete disaster. In most cases the United States continued supporting brutal dictators that were hated by their own people. In exchange for that support the dictator allowed economic exploitation of the client country by the global *war Lords*. Was it any wonder the common people of those countries came to hate America passionately?

It can be said that the American government, in a manner similar to individuals and corporate businesses within the culture, initiated and then pursued strategies that were self-destructive. At every stage the self-destructive process was shielded from criticism by ever grander ideology proclamation. And at every stage the consequence was more painful, more brutal, more contradictory, and more self-destructive.

Since that horrendous process was driven by the claim of absolute truth, it took onto itself the mantle of a god. It will therefore be judged from that perspective.

## A CHRISTIAN EVALUATION

The heightened awareness of things physical and ethereal, and the frontal lobes of the human brain which provided the ability to conceptualize future possibilities and imagined realities, only guaranteed an isolated individual would be frozen in a state of paranoid insanity. That was so because sensory data, in and of itself, carried no meaning. Such sensory information had meaning only when it occurred within, and according to, a scheme of order that linked sensory data streams with each other, and linked the experience of those data streams with the comparable experience of a multiple number of other humans. The requisite linkages required communication and consensus and that could only occur over time. Random or tentative consensus alone would not succeed in constructing order. It would instead contribute to a more anxious experience of disorder. Since understanding the necessity of the process could only emerge after multiple experiences of apparent success, the construction of an ordered experience of reality could not begin by preliminary consensus. It could only begin by event. That event could be divine revelation such as experienced by Israel during the Exodus out of Egypt<sup>12</sup>, or the divine status appropriated by Japan after typhoons destroyed Kubla Khan's fleet each of the two times he attempted an invasion of that country<sup>13</sup>. But in both cases the event had to be compelling such that it established an absolute condition. Israel became the *people of God* . . . period. Japan became a divine nation . . . period. There could be no equivocation.

Nevertheless, there was a problem. The revelation or event that conferred an absolute condition had to be singular. Two or more claims to absolute truth either rendered all claims conditional, or forced rival claims to absolute truth to war against each other until one prevailed. Such has been the course of history.

---

<sup>12</sup> See "Israel," on this Web Site or at <http://www.renewal-1.com/theology.html>

<sup>13</sup> See "Japan," on this Web Site or at <http://www.renewal-1.com/judging.html>

There was a second problem. The social process had to be derived from an actual experience of absolute truth or it would, at some point, fail. History was littered with such failures.

It can be deduced from the multitude of failures that humans of all historical periods, and of all geographical locations, carried within a desperate and urgent need for an absolute truth from which they could derive order and meaning.

Such was the condition of the early settlers that formed the American ideology. The Reformation and the invention of the printing press that allowed broad distribution of the Holy Bible allowed individuals direct access to God. That new order of being empowered people to break free of the suppression experienced in the kingdoms of Europe. But that freedom could not actually be accomplished in those kingdoms. It was, and would have continued to be, suppressed as revolutionary. The vast expanse of arable land in America transformed the new order of being into a powerful cultural process. The synchronicity of the Reformation, the printing press, and the discovery of America was of the same order of essence as the two typhoons that protected Japan from Kubla Khan. Both were miraculous events but neither bestowed any divine authority. That was confirmed by the self-destructive social processes that ensued in both cultures.

America was certainly a Christian nation at its inception and adhered closely to those beliefs for some time. But the *divine right of the individual*, birthed by the Reformation, gradually elevated itself above God. When confronted with the Cold War and the threat of annihilation by intercontinental ballistic missiles with atomic warheads, America surrendered its liberty and its principles, and embarked on a determined initiative to make its ideology *work* no matter who it hurt or what it cost. That collective anxiety arose from the desperate subconscious need for God in every human, used deception to disguise the false god as truth, waged war against those who would doubt or question its claims, and thereby warred against the saving purposes of Christ..

To all of those Christ said:

*“How blest are those who know their need for God, the kingdom of Heaven is theirs.”* (Matthew 5:3, New English Bible)

But what was wrong with the ideals of equality and self-sufficiency that led America away from its roots into self-deception?

Humans are not above God, and do not have the right to created their own God. There are not separate, self-contained entities within a reality comprised of billions upon trillions of separate objective components. Each human is a manifestation of the Spirit of life that wells up from within, and forms the heart, and the soul, and the mind of each human in a wondrous and completely unique reflection of the glory of God.

*“Thou it was you who didst fashion my inward parts;  
thou didst knit me together in my mother’s womb.  
I will praise thee, for thou dost fill me with awe;  
wonderful thou art, and wonderful thy works.  
Thou knowest me through and through:  
my body is no mystery to thee,  
how I was secretly kneaded into shape  
and patterned in the depths of the earth.*

*Thou didst see my limbs unformed in the womb,  
and in thy book they are all recorded;  
day by day they were fashioned,  
not one of them was late in growing.  
How deep I find thy thoughts, O God,  
how inexhaustible their themes!  
Can I count them? They outnumber the grains of sand;  
to finish the count, my years must equal thine.”*  
(Psalm 139:13-18, New English Bible)

And humans are not, and cannot be self-sufficient. They all need one Father to insure all know, at all times, that relationship transcends knowledge . . .

*“Our Father<sup>14</sup> . . .”*

Our Father must be divine so as to satisfy the deep hunger of the human spirit for an absolute corner stone upon which to construct identity, meaning and relationship . . .

*“. . . who art in heaven . . .”*

Our Father must be transcendent so as to always be worthy of the complete and abiding respect of all people . . .

*“. . . hallowed be thy name . . .”*

Our Father must be the source of order for all human organization to block individual submission to false gods . . .

*“. . . thy kingdom come thy will be done on earth as it is  
in heaven . . .”*

Our Father must renew in us day-by-day, every day, the power to walk the path set down for us before our birth, and to retain the identity bestowed upon us . . .

*“. . . give us this day our daily bread . . .”*

For humans to succeed they must have a Father who is patient and forgiving for it takes time to be transformed into the likeness of our Father, and we must acquire that same patience and forgiveness toward others who likewise need time to transform . . .

*“. . . and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those  
who trespass against us . . .”*

Our Father must take the initiative in protecting us from the delusions that bubble up from within, when we experience need or disappointment that cause us to think we are not loved and to think we must take matters in our own hands . . .

*“. . . and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil . . .”*

And for all of this we acknowledge our Father . . .

*“. . . for thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the  
glory forever and ever. Amen.”*

---

<sup>14</sup> The Greek word *Abba* which is translated as *Father* is the word used by children up to the age of twelve, so it really should be translated as *Daddy*. That English word carries the same degree of intimacy and trust. It is still translated here as *Father* because of tradition, and also because the text retains a more beautiful rhythm.

The Lord knew we were created to be in intimate relationship with the Father but because of the sin of Adam our fathers and forefathers were raised in ignorance of that need. They suffered the pain wrought by the false gods they created, and in return our Lord offered himself as a sacrifice for their ignorance and our ignorance to prove the Fathers's love, and to prove the Father's initiative to restore us to truth . . .

*“For at the very time when we were still powerless, then Christ died for the wicked . . . Christ died for us while we were yet sinners, and that is God's own proof of his love toward us.”* (Romans 5:6 & 8, New English Bible)

He also knew we would remain ignorant, and die in our ignorance, unless someone reached us with the message of love and restoration . . .

*“But they will not ask his help unless they believe in him, and they will not believe in him unless they have heard of him, and they will not hear of him unless they get a preacher, and they will never have a preacher unless one is sent . . .”* (Romans 10:14-15, Jerusalem Bible)

Humans were not equal and the state of equality was not the state of highest regard for the individual. Neither was there any meaningful mechanism for declaring or establishing a state of equality. Humans are unique. The highest state of regard for an individual human was the recognition and support of the unique attributes, capabilities and destiny inscribed in the heart and soul of the individual by Our Father.

There was no contest between persons, no measure of comparative attributes or accomplishments, that had any meaning or significance in the Father's kingdom. Such comparisons were repugnant to the Lord.

*“How can you believe, since you look to one another for approval and are not concerned with the approval that comes from the one God?”* (John 5:44, Jerusalem Bible)

Ritualized competition only caused the majority of humans to conclude they were unworthy and/or incapable. That was a completely false conclusion. Competition in the work place only undermined the productivity of American institutions, and when sold to foreign cultures as a viable ideal only insured the ownership of their resources and industry would transfer to global interests.

Self-destructive social, economic and political processes have been, for the most part, successfully disguised with ideological proclamation. That condition will change abruptly. The need to eliminate agricultural subsidies in order to achieve the goals established for the World Trade Organization has made that agricultural class a burden to those global interests. The rural agricultural class will therefore be sacrificed in the short term. Since that class provided the dependable electoral base that has enabled the conservative political establishment to win elections, its demise will mean an end to electoral success for those conservatives. In addition the “out sourcing” of jobs to foreign countries will result in an unrelenting downward pressure on the urban middle class. That will result in economic turmoil in the short term, not unlike that experience in Russia in the 1990's. Therefore a dramatic move toward an authoritarian government is in the offing. The 2000 Presidential election was extremely important to the conservative establishment. The 2004 Presidential Election is an absolute must. They would greatly prefer to win by legitimate election. If a legitimate election appears unlikely, a reason to either suspend the election or force the result in their favor will occur. “Trial balloons” have already been floated for; 1) the delay of the election as a result of a terrorist attack, and/or 2) an assassination attempt. The actual scenario will have to be blamed on terrorists. Though the terrorists might actually take the bait, their actions cannot be assured. Therefore insurance will be necessary. It will be crafted

much like the “insurance” that guaranteed an incident on the night of August 4, 1964, in Tonkin Gulf, that provided the justification for bombing North Vietnam.<sup>15</sup> In any case, a reason will be found to “guarantee” the election and thereafter suspend the Constitution. Economic turmoil will insure it remains suspended. *Corporate America*, the military, and the conservative political establishment actually believe that course of action is necessary for the “greater good” of the human race. In fact, it is self-destructive. And it will damage their own interests more than the interests of any other class of people.

But the larger question is how was Christianity in America seduced into supporting and lending its legitimacy to the very ideology that most aggressively challenged, belittled, and made a mockery of Christianity? Liberal Christianity gradually appropriated the goals of liberal secular ideology. *Corporate America*, the military, and the conservative political establishment purchased the allegiance of conservative Christians by a feigned embrace of Christian morality, and an offering of token support on the issues of abortion and gay marriage. It is deeply repugnant to the Lord that Christians were so easily seduced into supporting predatory economic policies, gross injustice, and blatant deception at the level of the Presidency. Christians consistently advertised their knowledge of absolute truth, yet they failed to generate even a modest tempering of America’s grandiose claims. Could a Christian in good conscious vote for a candidate that supported abortion? No. Could a Christian in good conscious vote for a candidate who viewed the world as putty for his political persona? No. Could a Christian vote for a candidate who had no regard for the law? . . . whose administration committed war crimes . . . habitually lied to the public? Absolutely not. Where was it said in doctrine that Christians were free to ignore nine commandments if you zealously embraced one? Where was it said in Christian doctrine that Christ could only return after other cultures were brutalized by war and death? Such a doctrine was rubbish and diametrically opposed to the saving purposes of Christ. Where was it said in Holy Scripture or Christian tradition that a Christian ought to support a false claim to absolute truth, when that claim usurped the very role God wished in human affairs? It was not said. It was not said in Holy Scripture, and it was not said in Christian tradition.

The only hope for America is a radical Christian renewal. A Christianity that no longer tries to fit Christ into its worship of secular ideals. A Christianity that is willing and able to challenge America, temper that ideological zeal, and counter aggression with repentance and forgiveness. Because the only hope for secular America is a radical conversion to Christ.

History shows us that the residue of failed cultures lingers for centuries. As if the people who once were proud and powerful could never really admit the fact that they were wrong and the glory was gone. Egypt after the Pharaohs never had another great success. Greece never recovered its glory after the end of the Hellenistic Period. Italy never really recovered from the fall of the Roman Empire.

Because of that intransigence the coming renewal in American will require new leadership. The Lord allowed slavery and allowed the mistreatment of African Americans and Native Americans for the same reason Israel had to first exist in slavery in Egypt before they could become the People of God.<sup>16</sup> New vision requires complete freedom from old deception. The experience of slavery and mistreatment visited upon

---

<sup>15</sup> See Tonkin Gulf on this Web Site or at <http://www.renewal-1.com/judging.html>

<sup>16</sup> See Israel on this Web Site or at <http://www.renewal-1.com/theology.html>

African Americans and Native Americans gave those people a deep and abiding understanding of the false god self-destructing in their presence. Therefore, the Lord will call forth new leadership from those two groups and they will be given the power to wield the sword of the Spirit in separating the Sacred from the profane and establishing a clear and Holy direction into the future.