From the
Big Bang
to Obama

and other things I don't believe in

By
Jeff
Willerton

Published in Canada by
Emmanuel Marketing Enterprises Ltd.
Box 20008 East RPO
Airdrie, AB T4A 0C2

877.601.0708

Cover Illustration by Andy Phillpotts
Typesetting by Myron Achtman
Calgary, Alberta, Canada

From the Big Bang to Obama

and other things I don't believe in

Jeff Willerton

To Jesse and Martina,
two of the best kids money can't buy.
For everything else, there's Mastercard.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1:

Laying the foundation

In the beginning there was nothing, and nothing acted upon nothing (because there was nothing there to act on it, remember) causing it to explode into billions of bits of everything, which magically re-organized themselves into everything in the universe, including us.

Or God did it.

The third theory of our humble beginnings, that we were dropped off by aliens, conveniently ignores the question of their beginnings so we won't waste further space on it here. The real question is God or no God/ creationism vs. evolution, and on this question rests the major dichotomies and, importantly for the purposes of this book, political divisions in society.

No God/no creation/evolution requires one to accept that we have evolved from nonliving matter, despite this argument's contradiction with both the Second Law of Thermodynamics (that everything, left unto itself, moves from a state of order to disorder) and the Law of Biogenesis (that nonliving matter cannot come to life). The lack of transitional species in the fossil record also argues against this theory. In light of the dearth of empirical evidence supporting evolution then, one has to admit that faith in the same is at least as blind as any other.

Nor, of course, can one prove the existence of God. It's a faith thing, much like evolution, except that belief in a creative, scriptural God is actually quite defensible. Doing so, note, is not the purpose of this book, but it must be done, however feebly, to show how rejection of the same has invariably set different societies throughout history on a path of quite certain destruction.

The Bible, believed by many to be the very Word of God, is at the same time both a historical and prophetic document. As a record of history it is flawless, attempts to disprove that record inevitably falling on the sword of archeological discoveries that invariably support it.

But the Bible is also a prophetic document, and if it fails there it can't be the work of an all-knowing, all-seeing God. Except, of course, it doesn't. There are, for instance, literally hundreds of prophecies in the Old Testament of a coming Deliverer fulfilled in the person of Jesus Christ, including, among other things, His place of birth and manner of death, the latter described in minute detail centuries before its invention [Psalm 22]. (The author capitalizes references to this promised Messiah indicating his belief in His divinity.)

Except He didn't die, according to His critics, at least not on that old wooden cross. Rather, He "swooned." He fainted; they pulled Him down; and He recovered. This, of course, requires one to overlook both the complete thoroughness of the Roman killing machine, *and* His recorded appearances in the days following the event without looking like someone had just tried to beat him to death.

Or maybe He did die and the disciples stole His body, concocting the story of His resurrection. This would be plausible if it didn't contradict the first article of Human Nature 101: that people will die for what they believe to be true, though it be false, but they will not die for a known fallacy. That the disciples were dropped in boiling oil, crucified upside down or otherwise martyred for their belief in Christ's physical resurrection, without recanting, is a matter of considerable historical record, the strength of their convictions putting paid to the claim of the stolen body.

Nor is the One referred to as the Son of Man a myth. There is more evidence of His existence than that of Napoleon. The question is: Who was He? The purpose of this book is not to answer that question either, but if these few words lead the skeptical reader to question his assumptions, well obviously that wouldn't be a bad thing from the author's perspective.

The Bible also predicts events concerning specific places. Among many such prophecies is one regarding the ancient city of Tyre. Ezekiel, prophesying of its ruin [ch. 26] predicted that not one stone would be left upon another and that fishermen would one day spread their nets on barren hills where the city then stood. A coastal city fortified with walls eighty feet wide, its people then also controlled an island, also fortified, off its shores.

Its destruction was a reasonably bold prophetic statement given the circumstances, but three years later Babylon's Nebuchadnezzer began a thirteen year assault on the city. Finally breaching its walls, he

found it empty. Seeing the inevitable, the Tyrenians had fled to their island getaway. The city sacked, Nebuchadnezzar then went home, but what was left was far from the barren landscape of prophecy. It was a wrecked city, but the story isn't finished.

Three hundred years later, Alexander the Great marched through the area, the population wisely acquiescing to his authority. Except the island inhabitants. Fortified by walls and water against an enemy with no navy, they resisted. It was futile. Ever resourceful, Alexander proceeded to take the remains of the old city apart brick by brick and therewith build a peninsula to the island.

A six month battle ensued. In the end, 8,000 islanders were executed and the rest sold the rest into slavery. Today what was the mainland city of Tyre is a small fishing village—where nets can be seen drying on the hills—one of numerous biblical prophecies fulfilled to the letter.

At the time of Christ there were four cities on the Sea of Galilee. He prophesied against three. Guess which one remains. One could go on, but defending the historical and prophetic validity of Scripture is again not the purpose of this book; it's just the foundation on which it rests. The real purpose of this book is to show how the rejection of the Author of the Book of Books and the principles contained therein has led to no end of very real political turmoil on this planet. It will end one day, or at least it's predicted to, but the author is getting a little ahead of himself.

Chapter 2:

The conflict of the ages

Assuming the validity of the biblical record, the author draws the reader's attention to the account of two brothers. As a foreshadowing of what God was preparing to do in Christ, they were instructed (it is assumed) in the matter of appeasing God through sacrifice.

Abel provided a sacrifice pleasing to God; Cain, who would soon murder his brother, did not. Post-failure he was offered an alternative redemption: "If you do well (even now) will not your countenance be lifted up?" [Genesis 4:7, NASB] Rejecting the offered path he chose the way of bloodshed and murder. It was Act II of the conflict of the ages. Act I occurred a little earlier in a garden.

Many readers will be familiar with the biblical account of the Garden of Eden: God created Adam; from Adam's rib He created Eve. The serpent beguiled the latter with promises of greatness—"You will be like God" [3:5]—and thus sin entered the world via the consumption of forbidden fruit. Paradise lost. It is in this setting that God speaks prophetically to the serpent:

> "I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your seed and her seed; He shall bruise you on the head, and you shall bruise Him on the heel" [3:15].

Note the words "head" and "heel." He who presumably knows the end from the beginning acknowledges that there will be an undetermined period of conflict ("enmity") between the two, but in the end the seed of the woman will basically put the boots to the serpent. Not every battle goes to the righteous—good does not always prevail—but those who trust in God's Word can be confident that the snake, in the end, gets his head kicked in.

So Abel is dead, Cain his murderer is sent packing and son number three, Seth, is born to the first couple, in the line of whom the Messiah—the referred to seed of the woman—comes forth.

Somewhere between Seth and the Savior we find Abraham. He, promised a son and a significant progeny, tired of waiting for his wife Sarah to conceive and at her bidding procured a mistress. And thus Ishmael was born. Some years later and already well beyond childbearing years, Sarah herself also conceived and gave birth to Isaac. The women obviously had different ideas about which child would be preeminent in the family, and thus began the family feud between Israel and her neighbors that continues to this day.

Isaac, though, the father of Jacob and grandfather of the twelve patriarchs of the Jewish nation, was the child of promise; Ishmael the product of a faithless, fleshly union. This is not to take anything away from anyone. This gentile is the product of a fleshly union between two very imperfect people. We all are! What he is saying is that the Jews are, according to Scripture, the children of promise: a special people set apart by

God with a unique role in history… including a four hundred year stint in slavery under the Egyptians.

There they multiplied rapidly, an unappealing development to the Egyptian Pharoah who attempted to halt the growth of his enslaved nation by killing their newborn sons. In an early example of civil disobedience the Hebrew midwives refused to co-operate, but note how the enemy's plans are turned against him.

It was at this time that Jochebed, married to one Amram of the family of Levi (one of the twelve patriarchs) conceived and gave birth to a son. They called him Moses. And mama schemed…

Set adrift in the Nile, this Moses was 'discovered' by Pharoah's daughter, raised in the palace (with his mother hired as a nursemaid, no less) and given the finest education money could buy. Born to lead, note that he was given the training and education to do so by the enemy of his Jewish soul. Of course, but for Pharoah's plans to destroy the sons of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, no such training would have occurred.

To make a long story short, Moses grew up, learned of his heritage, fled Egypt and returned forty years later to liberate his extended family, then numbering well over a million souls. That accomplished, they would then wander in the desert for forty years before entering the promised land some 4,000 years ago and establishing the nation of Israel. (Those who claim that strip of land in the Middle East we call Israel today belongs to the Palestinians, because they were there first, clearly don't know their history.)

Used by God to visit judgement on other nations whose own cups of sin were overflowing, they themselves in time would become like those nations and were in turn themselves crushed by the mighty Roman Empire. Thus the Diaspora, or Dispersion, and subsequent oft prophesied persecutions in foreign lands, the Holocaust being only the most notable among many. But once again, we need to back up a little.

Chapter 3:

A King is born

Seventy years before the Roman sack of Jerusalem, a young Jewish virgin named Mary gave birth to a Son. (Note to doubting Thomas: If God can create something as vast as the universe and as intricate and useful as the human eye, the immaculate conception is not that much of a stretch.) His name was Jesus.

Aware that a king had been born, Herod, in whom the serpent's seed was in full bloom, ordered the destruction of every male child two and under in Bethlehem where the Christ-Child was prophesied to be born. The resulting massacre of innocents while the parents were reportedly being entertained in the palace is disquieting to consider, but they missed baby Jesus.

Mary's husband Joseph, warned in a dream of the impending doom, fled with his family to Egypt, thus fulfilling Hosea's prophecy: "Out of Egypt did I call My Son" [Hosea 11:1b].

The Egyptian Pharoah; Herod in Bethlehem; Hitler in Germany: what is this ongoing persecution of the Jews? It's the "enmity" between the seed of the serpent and the seed of the woman—Christ—and His family. But does the latter refer only to the Jews?

Abraham is physically the Jewish patriarch, granted, but spiritually he is the father of all who bow the knee to

the Judeo-Christian God. Those who believe in Christ, then, have the privilege of sharing in the sufferings of the Jewish carpenter [2 Cor 1:5] and His kin. And, of course, in the blessings of Christ.

Joy unspeakable; a peace that passes all understanding; a measure of wisdom available for the asking; His provision in the here and now; eternity with Him when the here and now is no more. The narrow road may be narrow and uphill, and it will certainly be accompanied by tribulations, but it leads to life; the broad road, which is our natural lives without Christ, to destruction. It would be counterproductive to go back to it even if one could.

To reiterate, the author's purpose here is not to explain the faith or defend the Bible. He has simply had to do that, however feebly, to show how acceptance or rejection of the same has shaped our various political environs. It is to that he will soon turn… but first a little history.

Chapter 4

You can't keep a good faith down

Christ is crucified by the Romans, the Christian church is born on the day of Pentecost, and it grows like wildfire—underground—until the day it's sanctioned by the state in the year 313 of the Common Era. When those who accept Christ do so knowing they risk their lives in the process, prior to 313, they don't do so lightly. Three-thirteen's sanction sadly became 380's enforcement whereby citizens were made to become Christians by force of law and threat of punishment, with or without faith or commitment.

And where did the creation of a state Christian church lead? To praying to Mary and the saints (neither of which is commended by Scripture); to the invention of purgatory to suck filthy lucre from the uninformed; to indulgences (the selling of forgiveness before the fact); to the adoration of 'relics' (the supposed bones of the saints, etc); and finally to the point where, in 2013, the 'infallible' Pope can in complete disregard of Scripture suggest that an atheist can get past the pearly gates by simply living according to his or her conscience.

People need to be free to worship whoever they want, however they want, but Christ, if the writer under-

stands Him at all, would be the author of precisely none of this, and as surely as night follows day, moral decline and the Dark Ages followed hard on the heels of these developments.

Some rebelled. Many were "burnt alive (at the stake) broken on the wheel, impaled, beheaded… quartered. Flesh was (basically) as cheap as dirt"[1] in that era, and it was not until the fifteenth century that "the morning stars of the reformation (finally) began to rise."[2]

In 1517 a German monk named Martin Luther nailed his ninety-five theses to the door of what he deemed the apostate church in Wittenberg, and the world will never be the same. Despite torture and imprisonment the Protestant church was born, but before long it too, in part, became a state-run institution under the dominion of kings and princes with the spirituality of gnats and rabbit-like self-control.

Christ said, "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Saducees" [Mat. 16:6]. The leaven of the Pharisees is widely defined as ritualism (even Catholics will admit the Papacy is rife with it); rationalism—the denial of the supernatural—is the fruit of the Saducees. The creation account, the virgin birth, the miracles… none of it is exactly 'rational'. To be rational one must ultimately reject all things supernatural, including God, the end of rationalism being the banning of religion altogether. European countries dabbled in it to varying degrees. England, it is widely acknowledged, was largely spared by revival. France, unfortunately, dove in head first.

Chapter 5:

The French Revolution

The rise of rationalism, socialism and anarchy define eighteenth century France. Forget God! Man will solve man's problems through 'philosophy'. This philosophy invariably involved the equitable distribution of wealth and lands regardless of who had gone to the trouble of accumulating them, but this was hardly a new idea.

"By 1185 a secret order was functioning in France under the name 'Confrere de la paix', the Brotherhood of Peace."[3] Their aim was to promote an end to war and the communal ownership of all lands. (They were the pacifistic, pre-communist communists.)

Six centuries later, a group of similarly misguided philosophers called the "Illuminati" began to spread their lies: Civilization was a curse that robbed man of his liberty and the prevailing property laws (that is, private ownership) the cause of all human misery. It is widely accepted by historians that this group was the driving force behind the French Revolution.

What's wrong with having all things in common (the alternative to private property)? The American experience began as a socialist experiment, the Mayflower pilgrims holding their lands in common.

A couple of years on the crops were a disaster. ("It's not my turn to weed!") They trashed the experiment; it became every man for himself and out of that grew the strongest economy the world has ever known. (At the time of this writing that economy is in a world of hurt, but that's hardly the fault of the founding fathers.)

The problem with communal ownership, of course, is that it negates individual freedom. You can work as hard as you want, but we'll all share in the rewards. This, of course, suppresses the incentive to work, which is why it never works. But, you might argue, didn't the early disciples have all things in common?

Well, yes, but so too did David sleep with Bathsheba. In other words, just because the Bible records something doesn't make it a commandment or even a recommendation. Helping and otherwise caring for the downtrodden is an honorable objective. Clearly, though, one can help more people in the long run by improving one's lot in life as opposed to impoverishing oneself... 'because all things should be held in common'. By the same token, taking away people's freedom to support the less fortunate by taxing them into the poorhouse so the benevolent state can do it is equally counterproductive.

God, assuming that He exists, is for freedom. Galations 5:1 teaches that "It was for freedom that Christ set us free." Assuming that His Word is true, to the degree that socialist or communist philosophies rob people of their economic or any other kind of freedom, they can to that extent be construed as anti-God. But back to France.

According to one Mr. Robinson writing in *Conspiracy of World Revolution* (1793), an organization called the Illuminati "accounted all princes and rulers usurpers and tyrants (and) they would endeavor to abolish all laws which protected property; root out all religion... and (note) destroy the bonds of domestic life by doing away with marriage."[4] Priests were murdered, religion was banned, and from their failing hands the torch to destroy the institution of marriage was passed to some considerably more successful twentieth century lobby groups, but I'll come back to that.

Chapter 6:

1917

The streets of France ran with rivers of blood in the eighteenth century, granted, but the French Revolution was a veritable tea party compared to the Bolshevik revolution that followed.

Born in 1818, the son of a Jewish lawyer studied in France until his revolutionary ideas got him kicked out of the country. (Given their recent history, they were understandably sensitive about these things.) Karl Marx would go on to publish his "Communist Manifesto" in 1847, and his adherents have been spreading its lies ever since.

One of communism's fundemental tenets is that the interest of the capitalist is diametrically opposed to that of the worker. That, of course, isn't true, as both have an interest in the success of the enterprise, one for profit, the other for employment. "Proletarians (workers) have nothing to lose but their chains," was another whopper. What they actually lost was any semblance of freedom if the experience of communist countries is anything to go by.

Marx further maintained that mankind was an accident of nature, and what he dubbed "economic determinism" stipulated that the form of government is determined by the form of production in society. Now logically mankind could be a cosmic accident, but when

America went from slavery to non-slavery (thus changing the form of production in society) they did so without changing their form of government, so Marx was dead wrong on three of these points, and probably all four.

So Marxism is based on lies and misconceptions, and it would have done the world no end of good had Marx's philosophies perished with him in 1883. They didn't, of course, and in 1915 Russia, a government and God hating Marx devotee appeared in the person of Nicolai Lenin.

Czar Nicholas II abdicated the throne in March, 1917. Provisional leader Alexander Kerensky then made the small mistake of inviting home and offering amnesty to thousands of exiled revolutionaries. Among them were Nicolai Lenin, Joseph Stalin and Leon Trotsky.

"These leaders began to sow their revolutionary seed among war-weary troops promising them (among other things) the division of all lands among them. In July, 1917 a premature uprising ended in failure, after which Lenin and his associates fled to Switzerland. They returned (Lenin himself in a blacked-out train after having been granted safe passage by the Allies) and staged an armed revolt in November of that same year."[5] For many, it didn't end well.

Hundreds of thousands of land-owning kulaks and bourgeoise met their doom. Trucks and tractors would be lined up around apartment buildings and stadiums with their engines left running so neighbors wouldn't hear the screams inside. It was the continuation of the French Revolution against God and government writ large. Improperly procuring a loaf of bread for one's children, without a ration card, often led to one's demise. A

police force (the Cheka) was created with the discretion to torture and kill without mercy. Millions perished.

And while thus terrorizing their own citizens, communists would preach disarmament abroad, through their proxies, while at the same time becoming one of the greatest war machines the world has ever known. In the '80s, for instance, Margaret Thatcher was under considerable 'internal' pressure to scrap her nation's ballistic missile program. But as the 'Iron Lady' reasoned, even if the Soviet Union reciprocated as promised, that would still leave England at the mercy of the communist bear's comparatively gargantuan conventional forces.

In 2008, President Barack Obama conversely gave voice to the myopic vision of a "world without nuclear weapons." (Consider that when the technology to build nuclear weapons exists, the world will never be safe without them.) Two years later his administration's position was that if a country flattened Chicago by conventional means but was otherwise in compliance with the Non-Proliferation Treaty, he would shelve the nuclear response. As the author's father would often say of his son's exploits, "That's not very smart!"

Nuclear superiority is a deterrent (I won't hit you with this stick because I don't want you to pummel me with that baseball bat) but a deterrent you won't use is no deterrent at all, and as more and more countries gain the technology to build them, obviously nukes become an increasingly essential deterrent.

On subject again, who inspired the whole, horrible Soviet experiment? From the grave it was none other

than the Bible-rejecting atheist Karl Marx. Who exposed its horrors to the world? That would be Siberian exile Alexander Solzhenitsyn through his several quality books, including, most notably, *The Gulag Archapelago* (Harper and Row, 1973).

Who brought it to an end? That would be one Ronald Reagan through his Strategic Defence Initiative, otherwise known as the Star Wars Program. The Soviet Union couldn't begin to compete with that technology and ultimately collapsed in 1991. But is that bear dead or merely hibernating?

Democratic reforms have been reversed and power increasingly centralized in Moscow; pro-democracy demonstrators are beaten and imprisoned; critics of the regime perish. In 2009, the Soviets announced their intention to deploy what are purely 'offensive' missiles in neighboring Kalingrad if Poland and the Czech Republic proceeded with plans to host an American missile 'defense' system. The eastern block countries refused to back down. Unfortunately, America under Obama did it for them.

Stalin starved Ukraine in the 30's. Today Putin cuts off their gas in the dead of winter to let them know who's in charge. Things… haven't changed terribly much, really.

The author, comfortable with the relative freedoms we enjoy in the west, isn't planning a Russian vacation anytime soon. Of course, he doesn't have to actually go to Russia to experience communism. The seeds of it were planted in his country decades ago.

Chapter 7:

The Red Army marches on

Communism is, above all, a godless philosophy promoting communal ownership of the means of production in society and an end to private property. Enforced at the end of a bayonet, it is ALWAYS associated with either atheism or what the author believes would be a profound misunderstanding of the nature of God.

Marx claimed religion was the "opiate of the people." Lenin, Stalin and Trotsky claimed to tolerate it, but a marble slab commemorating the names of forty-two Lutheran pastors murdered by the Red Army in Riga, Latvia in 1918 puts the lie to the claim.

And, of course, it's not enough to merely be a communist at home. To undermine 'unenlightened' foreign countries, communists infiltrate their governments and promote both disarmament and social discord by, among other things, encouraging labor disputes to disrupt capitalist society: strikes.

This explains why communists are regularly found stirring the pot behind the picket lines. In one prominent example, Arthur Scargill led the British coal miners into a year long strike in 1984. When money got tight, he received "solace and succor from the trade

unions of then Soviet controlled Afghanistan."[6] Except there were no trade unions in Afghanistan, leading to the obvious conclusion that he was collecting rubles directly from the Kremlin itself.

Closer to home, Dave Werlin, then leader of the Alberta Federation of Labour, was both a card-carrying communist and the driving force behind the Gainers strike in Edmonton, Alberta in 1986, otherwise known as the Battle of 66th St. So communists are alive and well in western society and can often be found hanging out down at the local union hall. And do they ever know how to play the game!

Between 2004 and 2008, organized labor contributed $68 million to the Democratic Party. President Barack Obama rewarded the same with the laughably entitled "Employee Free Choice Act," effectively stripping union members of their right to a secret ballot. You voted against the union? You might want to think twice about answering that knock at the door for a while.

Beyond disrupting and disarming capitalist societies, to promote acceptance of their philosophies, communists have also aimed to remove God from all cultures. In a pre-WWII broadcast from Moscow, their plan of influencing various cultures concluded: "Practical measures will be taken to introduce a new calendar to replace the present religious calendar."[7]

This publication was written in 2013 CE, which until recently would have been referred to as 2013 AD. Thus the Latin 'Anno Domini', meaning "In the year of our Lord," has been replaced by the English 'Common

Era', meaning nothing, thus fulfilling the communist objective of removing Christ from the calendar. Now whether those behind this change were communists themselves or merely useful idiots serving their interests is beside the point. The fact is this was very much part of the communist agenda.

Besides disarming democracies, fomenting class-hatred between workers and employers and removing God from the public domain, another communist objective, if you recall, was to "destroy the bonds of domestic life by doing away with marriage."

Obscured (here) to comply with the government's freedom of speech, soul-crushing draconian Bill C-11.

(And here.)

in the classroom, and thus begin to undo the damage left in the wake of one Pierre Elliot Trudeau.

He, a confidante of Castro and an open admirer of Mao, was no mere communist sympathizer. Continuing my pillage of *FIX CANADA,* a woman he went to university with maintains he was then a proud card-carrying member of the Communist Party of Canada; a retired mountie stumping for political office revealed that our then future prime minister had the distinction of leading a delegation of communists to the 1952 Moscow Economic Forum; and a retired intelligence officer informs me that he spent $5.00/yr to maintain his Communist Party membership - *without interuption* - until the day of his death.

Not convinced? In his own words, "Between 1952 and 1960, I was several times forbidden to teach in the universities... because of my anti-clerical *and communist leanings"* (Pierre Elliot Trudeau, Federalism and the French Canadians, St. Martin's Press, 1968, p. xxi, emphasis added.) In the same book he claimed that "democratic socialism (the kind you vote for) may

be less efficient and far-reaching than the totalitarian brand" (pg.150). So the evidence for Trudeau's communism is overwhelming, and the communist objective to undermine the west has never exactly been a well kept secret.

So today we're governed by a Charter that was sponsored by a man who subscribed to a political system hell-bent on our downfall, and lo and behold, we're falling down. It can't be that hard to connect the dots.

South of the border, one Barack Hussein Obama supported and for twenty years sat at the feet of black liberation theologian Jeremiah Wright. Besides class warfare generally, stirring up the same among the negro population specifically was very much on the communist agenda. Like stirring up labour strife, promoting black liberation philosophy simply furthered the communist objective of promoting societal discord.

This is not to imply that America's 44th president was a communist like Canada's Trudeau, but his second act on his first full day in office was to reverse a Bush era ban on publicly financing organizations that provide or otherwise promote abortions. Being pro-choice a communist does not make, but note that Stalin did publish a detailed plan in 1932 for the destruction of the United States that very much included the "advocation of legalized abortion."[9]

And nor would the author accuse the then leader of the free world of being a terrorist sympathizer, but his first act that day was to provide comfort to the same by

ordering the closure of the military prison at Guantanamo Bay. On his second day in office he took a sledge hammer to the invisible hand of the marketplace when he signed into law a Pay Equity Act, thus magically enabling bureaucrats to determine the value of work.

At the end of Bill Clinton's tenure, eighteen percent of America's Gross Domestic Product was spent by the Fed. After eight years of George W. Bush, that had increased to twenty-one cents of every GDP dollar, but it can be argued that George was fighting Bill's war. (That's the one that arguably should have been initiated following the first World Trade Center bombing OR following the bombing of the USS Cole, after which Bill did precisely nothing, arguably contributing to 9/11.)

That twenty-one cents in 2008 jumped thirty-three percent to twenty-eight cents in 2009, lifting the onetime bastion of free enterprise into the socialist stratosphere. It took America 236 years to accumulate a debt of ten trillion dollars. It took Obama only four years to increase it by 60%! This, of course, makes his 2012 victory speech, that "We want our children to live in an America that isn't burdened by debt," particularly rich.

Obama may have never carried a communist card like PET, but he did appoint Carol Browner his "global warming czar" responsible for America's environmental and energy policies. Tellingly, she was also "one of fourteen leaders of the Socialist International's Commission for a Sustainable World Society"[10] which called for, among other things, a form of socialist global governance in which "rich countries must 'shrink their economies' to address (the bogeyman of) climate change"[11].

According to a former Marxist of the author's acquaintance, the Socialist International is nothing more than a communist front. Earlier you were asked if that bear was dead. If one can be judged by who they hang with and/or appoint, (William Ayers/ unapologetic terrorist, Van Jones/self-described "rowdy communist" appointed Obama's 'green jobs czar' and the aforementioned Browner, to name but three) the author fears it's alive and well and was foraging in the White House refrigerator during the Obama years. And the stolen Biden years too, of course, but that's a story for another day.

Conclusion

Earlier you read that defending the biblical record was not the purpose of this book but simply a means to an end. If the biblical record is sound and God is (and the author hopes that argument has been adequately presented) then policies arrived at by rejecting that truth are at least increasingly likely horribly flawed.

Communism, for instance, is based on Marxism, and it is noteworthy that Marx himself was very much influenced by Charles Darwin's godless theory of evolution. Darwin's book, originally entitled *The Origin of Species by means of natural selection or the preservation of 'favored races' in the struggle for life* (1859), (emphasis added) was extremely racist. Not only were humans merely advanced animals according to Darwin, but so too were some races more evolved than others. Marx was so moved by it that he dedicated *Das Kapital,* published eight years later, "To Charles Darwin, from a sincere admirer" – and he was far from alone in his admiration of the man and his philosophy.

In fact, every notable twentieth century mass murderer subscribed to it. In his twisted mind, Poles weren't as evolved as Russians, so killing 14,000 was all in a day's work for Stalin. Jews were on the bottom of Hitler's evolutionary scale, right below blacks. (If he had succeeded, they were next in line for the gas chambers.)

So Marx was heavily influenced by Darwin, and Marxism is inextricably linked to communism, and according to the council of Europe the murder of just

shy of a hundred million souls in the last century. The author's real objective in writing this book has been to show how many popular, liberal policies today have their roots in this murderous, freedom crushing philosophy.

Pierre Trudeau, a presumably full-on commie who led the Liberals for fourteen years described that party as merely "a means to an end." And what "end" was he referring to? When asked as prime minister about his views on communism, he replied that "under certain conditions a one-party state would be ideal." Looking back on the effects of his policies, it's clear that creating those conditions was the end that he sought.

Liberals, for instance, vociferously support gay marriage. Recall the communist agenda to undermine the institution of marriage, and one cannot help but see how the left relentlessly pushes that envelope.

Stalin advocated the promotion of abortion in the west. Trudeau legalized it north of the 49th, and Obama made financing organizations that promote it both at home and overseas a significant priority. Why? Because he studied Stalin? Perhaps, but it was most certainly to pay back his thousands of campaign volunteers from the National Abortion Rights Action League and Planned Parenthood.

Those activists weren't just out getting their exercise. They knew that the one U.S. senator to vote against the "Born Alive Act" (designed to protect children who survive abortions) would be happy to give them unrestricted access to the procedure they had devoted their lives to, and they hit the street running.

But was Obama's stimulus package at least the right thing for America? Bush's Troubled Assets Relief Program (TARP) was a targeted program aimed at removing toxic assets from the balance sheets of the major U.S. banks. This was an arguably acceptable response to the economic collapse in light of the fact that previous, mostly Democratic governments had forced those banks to take on those risks. (Carter had forced them to make loans in high risk neighborhoods through the Community Reinvestment Act, while Bill Clinton significantly reduced the requirements for qualifying for those loans, all of which forced banks to make bad loans to bad risks in bad neighborhoods.)

The Republicans aren't innocent here either, of course. There was a dearth of good regulations for which both parties are responsible, but there was also a plethora of bad, the responsibility for almost all of which can be laid squarely at the feet of the Democrats.

So TARP was about cleaning up the banks' books which had been significantly muddied by government itself. Obama's stimulus package, alternatively, was about protecting businessmen from their own mistakes and dramatically expanding government itself – to say nothing of its debt.

Obama remains popular in some circles today, but so was Pierre Trudeau. He was debonair and charming, and Canadians across the country sadly fell for the guy. It was called Trudeaumania. Americans likewise succumbed to Obama's spell, but popularity does not equate to good policy and the author suspects they'll be feeling the pain of their decision to elect him forty

years from now, much as Canadians continue to suffer the effects of Trudeau's ascension in '68.

He (Trudeau) inherited a relatively paltry $16 billion federal debt that year. Sixteen years later he would bequeath a debt more than twelve times that size to his successor and subject the Canadian public to a Charter that gelded our politicians and handed all power to an unelected judiciary, in the process turning our functioning democracy on its head. Trudeau's party and their 'Progressive' counterparts also spent thirty years emasculating our once proud Canadian military.

The bottom line is whether one bankrupts a country, tears asunder its social fabric or effectively disarms it through the neglect of its armed forces, that one is, knowingly or otherwise, furthering the communist agenda for the west. Do these things not significantly define both the Trudeau and Obama administrations?

It is said that communism gave birth to two equally defective offspring, socialism and liberalism, all three of which maintain that enlightened man has the answers: "Give us your freedom, your taxes and an ever increasing degree of your autonomy, and we'll give you earthly paradise."

The opposite of these, conservatism, simply maintains that man should be free to rise or fall according to his own efforts and abilities with as little interference from the state as possible. It is, at the end of the day, about freedom and the belief that the more men have, the more at liberty they will be to fulfill their God-given destinies.

And thus the battle between liberalism and conservatism continues. If Christ is for freedom, then it's safe to say that actual conservatives are on the side of the angels. The author will be disappointed if as yet unconverted liberals don't vociferously disagree.

In generations past, zealous debate was almost the preserve of religion. In our post-Christian culture, politics has filled that void. Islam vs. Christianity and the Papacy vs. Protestantism have become communism vs. capitalism and liberalism vs. conservatism. The issues change, but the author is convinced that these things are no more or less than the continuation of the conflict of the ages which began with a snake, a woman and an apple, and will only end when the last curtain falls on this present age, and the seed of the woman finally and completely puts the boots to that serpent.

Political philosophy doesn't save us, of course, but on that day the author hopes to be on the right side of history, with the angels, and with you the reader, but that's your call.

Bibliography

1. The Specious Origins of Liberalism: The Genesis of a Delusion, Anthony M. Ludovici, London Britons Publishing Co., 1967, p. 81.

2. Conflict of the Ages, Arno C. Gaebelein, Loizeaux Brothers Inc., revised edition, 1983, p.58. (orig. 1933).

3. Ibid., p. 69.

4. Ibid., p. 72.

5. Ibid, p. 91

6. The Downing Street Years, Margaret Thatcher, Harper Collins Publishers, 1993, p. 369.

7. Gaebelein, p. 101.

8. Ibid., p. 106.

9. Ibid., p. 106

10. Liberty and Tyranny, A Conservative Manifesto, Mark R. Levin, Threshold Editions, A division of Simon and Shuster, Inc, 2009, p. 145.

11. Ibid., p. 146.