

[CHAPTER THREE]

America's Accelerating Decline



Beginning in 1946, many dominant women with strong needs for achievement chose a life of accomplishment outside the home over motherhood. While the world's then-largest baby boom, 1946–1963, produced 76 million American children, there were actually fewer children destined for success. Child-rearing practices did not change in 1946; rather, high-achieving (dominant) mothers were having fewer or no children while low-achieving (nondominant) mothers were bearing and rearing our country's succeeding generations. Few Americans noted the missing (because unborn) achievement-oriented children until 1964, the year (when those born in 1946 turned eighteen) that ushered in the Age of Decadence.

America's general public was confounded by the events of 1964 and subsequent years. For instance, the sexual content of our culture changed more after 1964 than in the previous two centuries combined. Politicians knew better. They grasped the significance of Beatlemania, protests, riots, and 1000-fathom-curve cultural sea changes. Politicians competed among themselves to repudiate laws governing behavior. Immediate gratification, stealing, drug abuse, the breakup of the family, and acceptance of criminal looting in disregard of property rights were all embraced by knowledgeable politicians and many federal judges. Opinion-makers followed the

lawmakers in rushing to ride the disobedient, lawbreaking wave of the future.

During this period, more dominant women embraced their new freedom to achieve success outside the home. These women, whose maternal ancestors nurtured the builders of a splendid America, reared still fewer children while competing with men in business, politics, law, and medicine. These outstanding women became examples for others to emulate. But where in an earlier America dominant sons of dominant mothers flowed into the leadership of mainstream America, by 1988 the flow had become barely a drip.

(Coincidental with the withholding of children by dominant women, more Americans would rather adopt a canine puppy than a human child.)

Every great civilization in recorded history, once it attained affluence, followed the same pattern of lower birth rates among dominant women. And, ironically, since the dominance trait is gender neutral, this trend of success outside the home by dominant women faded away for the same reason: successful women failed to issue and rear sufficient replacements.

Whether the general public realized this at the time is immaterial — it happened. What is germane, and to you especially, is that the majority of officeholders were conscious of the decreasing numbers of high achievers in our society. They capitalized on the ease of manipulating a larger percentage of low achievers in a decadent America than a like proportion of high achievers in an honest America. Lawmakers knew that the average person's ability to control the conditions of his life would decrease, but they were unconcerned. Instead they worked hard to find dupes. This is why politicians could never look at one another without laughing; each knew the other shared an equal interest in presenting a pompous public countenance to give importance to the deceptions they perpetrated.

However, some Americans of my time saw officeholders as concerned only with immediate popularity and winning the next election. They believed that many politicians were neither intelligent nor farsighted enough to plan consciously for long-term manipulation of our culture.

In acts of propitiation, the sheep among the political schemers adopted the mannerisms, haircuts, attire, and demeanor of the counterculture of 1964. Concerned with winning the next election, they lacked the will to do otherwise. Whether done blindly to gain votes or knowingly to control the populace, politicians espoused the mores of decadence and dismantled the values of an earlier and more responsible America.

They enacted laws to strip away the tradition of family and parental accountability. American society accepted impregnation without accountability. A father could, because penalties were not enforced, dispute paternity, reject responsibility for his issue, or both. Maternity could not be denied, but child rearing could be ignored. Children "raised" themselves. Even though every mentally healthy child, regardless of ethnicity, has the capacity to be a genius, many of these disobedient, ignorant, and often violent products of procreation fulfilled the maxim that "The richest soil, if uncultivated, produces the rankest weeds."

Multiplying exponentially, these weed-children were foisted on the public school system. School boards armed with federal mandates pushed the near-impossible task of education onto unsuspecting school superintendents. Thus, child-rearing duties, started six years too late, were shifted adroitly from derelict families to foolish school superintendents. Public school administrators became political puppets for their school boards or naive proponents of the hopeless quest for a college education for all.

Dependent on enrollment for their existence, marginal colleges promoted the idea that public schools should be judged by the percentage of students graduated instead of by academic performance. At the insistence of politicians, public schools set goals to eliminate "dropouts," thereby increasing the flow to colleges. American officeholders knew that successful societies from the past also catered to the unlearned by creating undemanding universities for dunces who could not benefit from advanced education. Politicians, pretending that education and intelligence were synonymous, poured taxpayer money into a vast network of new colleges. Thus, affluence combined with lack of intelligence spawned the idea of advanced education for all. Mindless school curricula helped graduate illiterate primary and secondary stu-

dents. In 1995, the College Board, administrator of the Scholastic Aptitude Test, joined the academic charade by devaluing its test questions. And to sustain enrollment, colleges offered remedial classes for those who could not read and write or add and subtract.

Reacting to debased education and the violence prevalent at public schools, a few families began educating their children at home. Home schooling did not involve sacrifice; these parents set a higher value on their children's futures than on a second income. Even though many home-schoolers, particularly mothers, were devout Christians and patriotic Americans, state governments, backed by public schoolteacher associations and working mothers, maneuvered to derail the home-schooling movement. Politicians knew that the successes of children taught at home by mothers without a college degree in education would expose to all the failure of tax-financed public schools. State legislators tried to destroy the home-schooling movement but failed. The numbers of home-schoolers increased as home schooling became the fastest-growing segment of American education.

Beginning in 1964, American English was attacked. First it was fractured, then butchered, and finally neutered. An archive of adverbs dominated television and radio. "Basically" prefaced sentences when the speaker was unsure of the truth. "Hopefully" became a euphemism for desperation. Weak, unsupported, and many times false statements were saturated with the word "fact" — "a matter of fact," "the fact is," "it is a fact," "in fact," "the fact of the matter," "a number of facts." The ignorant adopted "you know" and "like" as fillers to string words together, to fabricate meaningless sentences. And many ethnic leaders hailed street language and dialect as "heritage" and "culture," as acceptable as, or even preferable to, standard American English. It was easier to legitimize and then teach dialect than to change the child-rearing practices that perpetuated bad grammar and ignorance.

Television and film offered increasingly more portrayals of graphic violence, thus providing ideas for mayhem and murder, since many viewers lacked sufficient intelligence to separate illusion from reality.

The country's reverence of entertainers was characteristic of

America's exploding population of nondominant people. A talk-show host was the highest-paid amuser in 1994–1995, grossing for those two years 425,000 gold ounces. Although dominant, Oprah Winfrey was no more so than any president of the United States, yet she made more in those two years than did all forty-two American presidents combined in 206 years.

* * * *

Converting the paper currency of my day to troy ounces of gold provides a more constant comparison of value over time. All governments throughout history debase their currency, whether metal or paper, to conceal a decline in affluence. Only their methods differ.

Ten generations before Christ, during the latter days of the Roman Republic, the silver content of the denarius was periodically reduced by adding alloy, and the aureus gold coin continued to shrink in size. In the latter days of the United States Republic, the government debased paper currency by exorbitant borrowing and deficit spending. The eroding value of the dollar makes earlier cost relationships based on the dollar without merit to my time and useless at your juncture.

Notwithstanding one to five year aberrations, both up and down, the value of gold inversely tracks, often precisely, the percentage of dollar debasement. Lawmakers were particularly devious in preventing the free exchange of dollars for gold and gold for dollars. Politicians knew full well that if dollars were freely convertible to gold, it would give their game away.

In my time, up to a 39-percent tax was assessed on each seemingly profitable gold transaction. No matter how high the value of gold rose in a year, only a portion of its inflated value was recoverable after taxation. This tax eliminated the dollar debasement safety of gold ownership. But only to a point. Once Americans realized that inflation neither would nor could be controlled, gold ownership and tax avoidance became prevalent. Fearing financial ruin, the prudent became dishonest.

Lawmakers lulled many Americans fearful of inflation with "inflation-proof bonds." Taxation on the inflation portion of these

bonds negated protection against inflation. Further, the bonds were registered in the name of the purchaser, making tax collection easier.

Politicians were ready to defend the dollar — first, they would threaten to sell the nation's treasury of gold bullion. This would hold down the value of gold temporarily. When, finally, the sale of government-owned gold bullion began, foreigners would compete with Americans to buy the country's gold reserves, the last vestige of American stability. Even in my time, the national debt was beyond repayment and therefore ignored.

Lawmakers refused to give up; they continued their irresponsible ways. Following the lead of fiscally unsound countries in recent history, politicians had a remedy against the time when American citizens would become desperate for the financial safety of foreign currency. Laws controlling currency exchange and the amount of money that Americans could legally take out of the country were waiting to be implemented.

* * * *

Throughout history public servants of failed civilizations distributed public largess during periods of affluence through welfare to the indolent and shiftless in order to buy their votes and attempt to purchase civil peace.

Lawmakers knew full well the consequences of "free" advanced education and government-funded "free" medical treatment for the poor. History abounds with examples. The first free public hospital was opened in Baghdad in the reign of Harun Al-Rashid, A.D. 786–809. During the reign of his son, Mamun, free public hospitals covered the Arab world from Spain to what is now Pakistan. The decadent and bankrupt Arab empire collapsed in A.D. 880, and its free public hospitals disappeared.

History reminded politicians that disposing of a country's wealth in this fashion did not originate in the United States. Not only were there historical precedents for their actions, they knew also from history that when previous civilizations followed this course, they failed, and such edifices crumbled. Lawmakers, while bestowing the earnings of the hardworking on the undeserving, knew that it was only a matter of time before the economy of the United States

could no longer sustain such benevolence. They knew that most American colleges would close and hospitals would follow to ruin. Still, without compunction they deceived hardworking Americans and bankrupted the country.

AFTER 1964, politicians encouraged the formation of activist organizations with agendas that would not threaten their political well-being. The soft-hearted view all evils as equally noxious; they rail against secondhand smoke with the same fervor as against murder. Animal rights groups protected the rights of animals so as to prevent human exploitation and physical abuse. At the same time, other activists agitated for the rights of the worst human "animals," abusers and murderers of other human beings, by slowing, then halting, imprisonment and execution.

In turn, politicians felt threatened when groups of citizens opposed to decadence and vacuous government emerged. Among these were devoutly religious families that banded together in rural areas in an attempt to regain control of their day-to-day living. These groups, labeled "militia" and "survivalists," were made uneasy by the decadence surrounding them and were confounded by laws that left criminals unpunished and special minorities rewarded unduly. They shared two beliefs: the most fundamental was a distrust of the federal government; the other, a fear of personal injustice at the hands of government. Alarmed by increasing national lawlessness, these groups considered themselves bastions of a long ago, self-sufficient America.

Following the lead of political and media propaganda, however, the general public lumped these clusters of militia and survivalists in the same evil bracket as groups of hatemongers and loners who committed terrorist acts. While a handful of militia and survivalist members did commit despicable acts, and more than a few were dishonest, the majority were politically unambitious, hardworking, decent Americans seeking only to be left alone and not oppressed.

Fueled by a fear of rebellion or uprising, the wrath of the failing federal government sometimes delivered unjust acts upon militia and survivalist adherents — the very people most fearful of injustice — thus making the circle complete. Still, their numbers grew.

OF course some politicians worked diligently to prevent laws designed to break America. These lawmakers were few, and, alas, their names are commingled and lost along with those of their deceitful and more prosperous colleagues. Mixed among the few builders and the many destroyers were would-be statesmen, clever but not bright. As H. G. Wells wrote, "The last thing they wanted to do was to penetrate below the surface of things on which they lived so agreeably."

Politicians did not unwittingly make stupid mistakes. On the contrary, these were calculated decisions made by bright people with other agendas. Many politicians will do anything to satisfy their needs to be loved, to be idolized, to be godlike, including pandering to voters for election and reelection. More than a few Americans believed that most incumbent lawmakers and their appointed federal judges knew — even though they pretended not to — at the time of their actions just how their decisions would humble the United States.

It could be, of course, that the actions of the agents of decline were historically inevitable. Whether the destruction was witting or unintentional matters little. Congressional officeholders were worse than the slimy incubi of earlier times. At the same time, they exploited and gulled honest, though gullible, Americans. Politicians had become pimps for a decadent America.