

THE ALLIANCE CAPITAL SEMINAR

RICHARD D.LAMM

Governor Richard Lamm was born in Madison, Wisconsin, in 1935. He graduated with a BBA from the University of Wisconsin in 1957, and an LLB from the University of California, Berkeley, in 1961. He is both a lawyer and a certified public accountant. He was elected first to the Legislature in 1967, and was named by **Time Magazine** in 1974 as one of the outstanding young leaders in America.

Governor Lamm served three terms as Governor of Colorado and upon completion of his third term in 1987, he entered Iliff's Seminary and got a Doctor of Theology degree in 1989. He published his now famous book, **God Rule, Not Mob Rule/The Case For A Theocracy In The United States In 1990**, and was appointed by President Bush as one of the investigating team looking into the bank crash of 1989. He was an early supporter of Reverend Jerry Falwell for president in 1992. He was a delegate to the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1992, where he succeeded in rallying the forces for the adoption of a theocracy. President Falwell appointed him Grand Inquisitor early in 1993.

The audience is to remember that you were specially selected by President Falwell and the Grand Inquisitor to come to Camp Falwell Training Institute to be briefed on the information you are about to hear. Any disclosure of this information can and will be punishable by death.

May I present the Grand Inquisitor.

The Honorable Richard D. Lamm is Governor of the State of Colorado. This address was delivered before The Alliance Capital Seminar on Friday the 13th of September, 1985.

I've been asked by President Falwell to explain to you select group of opinion-molders the reasons for our new form of government. It is my passionate belief that most people in this country will soon become accustomed to our theocracy. Under the wise leadership of President Falwell, most people will not miss democracy or their freedoms. Let me explain why.

THE PROBLEM OF FREEDOM

First of all, democracy had the problem of freedom. Freedom was too heavy a burden for the citizens of the United States. Very few people were exercising their privileges under our democracy. Fewer than 50 percent of the eligible voters voted in elections, and fewer than 25 percent of the eligible voters elected President Reagan back in 1980 and 1984. It is hypocrisy to say that Americans want self-government. This claim goes against all of the available evidence that we have.

Let me take you back to the tumultuous years in the 1970's and 1980's. We see clearly now that the largest source of political information to the American electorate was the mindless 30-second spots on television. The American public wanted football and Hill Street Blues, not debates and disagreements. They were not interested in the merits of a candidate. They wanted to be entertained, not educated. The biggest correlation between victory in America was not a candidate's platform, not the integrity of that individual, but was how much money a particular campaign was able to amass -- most of it from narrow special interests -- most of it to purchase television air time. What is "free" about elections where political action committees contribute 44% of the funds? It is absurd to claim that democracy is something that will be missed when so few people were actually participating in it, ... when those who did were so easily swayed by T.V. ads, ... when Congress was full of million dollar P.A.C. men and women, ... when media advisors were more important than issue chairpersons, ... and when no problem had a time line longer than the next election.

Self-government, you see, exacted a higher price than the average American was willing to pay. It required too much self-initiative, too much self-education, too much self-discipline, ... too much energy.

Look at the results. In a period between 1980 and 1985, they doubled the national debt. By 1989, they had to raise \$750 for every man, woman and child in America just to pay the interest on the national debt. The trade deficit exploded. In the ten years previous to 1985, America bought from abroad half a trillion dollars more in goods than they sold abroad. They'd built up a number of systems that were absolutely out of control. The education system was correctly described as a rising tide of mediocrity, and what they had done to their education system was declared to be an act of "unilateral educational disarmament." The average age of an enlisted man retiring on a military pension was 39, the average age of an officer was 43, all indexed for inflation and provided with medical care. People retiring in the early 1980s with Medicare and a spouse that hadn't worked had actuarial benefits of Medicare that were 28.6 times what they paid in. The health care system took 11 cents out of every dollar spent in America and was rising at two times the rate of inflation.

Now, a responsible people would clearly understand that these systems were out of control and needed reform. Americans didn't, wouldn't and perhaps couldn't. The facts speak for themselves. Americans could not handle self-government.

We took away democracy because it needed a growing pie to maintain itself. It could only work by buying off people. Each generation had to be better off than its parents. Politicians had to promise a bigger pie to get votes and to keep the whole mechanism going. At first they paid cash, and then soon they put it on the national credit card.

We see now that democracy and abundance are siamese twins, that they share the same circulatory system. Thus, we find that freedom ultimately consumes itself. Toynbee observed that no civilizations are ever murdered, they all commit suicide. Our democracy self-destructed.

Freedom seems to destroy the inner discipline that alone makes freedom possible. As capitalism matures and the consumer economy develops, the goods it develops tends to promote a wasteful and hedonistic

society. This in turn leads to the weakening of the values that are necessary to maintain freedom. It encourages a listless and unrestrained attitude, and discourages the vigor and intellectual imagination that sustains progress. America lost the diligence, the discipline, the organization and the creative drive that were responsible for their country's prosperity. The times cried out for a new system. A French philosopher once observed that "Freedom is the luxury of self-discipline." Americans did not turn out to be a very self-disciplined people.

Here at Camp Falwell Training Institute, when it was the old decadent Aspen Institute, they had a plaque on the wall from Edward Gibbon's **The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire** which stated:

In the end, more than they wanted freedom they wanted security. They wanted a comfortable life and they lost it all -- security, comfort, and freedom. When the Athenians finally wanted not to give to society, but for society to give to them; when the freedom they wished for most was the freedom from responsibility, then Athens ceased to be free.

In the end, Americans -- like the villagers in **The Visit** -- found the temptations of a theocracy too great. We offered stability. We bribed them and called it justice.

THE PROBLEM OF BREAD

The second major problem that the Falwell administration had to face was the problem of bread. Some of you object that we have changed the biblical quote of "Love Thy Neighbor" to "Love Thy Nearest Neighbor." You shudder at our concept of tough love, in which we simply accept starvation in much of the Third World. The American rabble is asking how we can ignore those pitiful scenes of megafamine that we see on our television sets every day?

It is our sad and reluctant conclusion that the economy within the United States cannot keep up with all the problems outside the United States and that we are foolish to try. Our concept of "tough love" guides us to let God's judgment take place in the Third World and

leads us to understand that by trying to relieve the suffering, we actually exacerbate and postpone or prolong it.

We call these countries "developing countries," as if the use of a progressive adjective makes them progressive countries. Alas, it does not. The overwhelming evidence is that these are not developing countries, but are never-to-be-developed countries. The agonizing truth is that most of the world's poor will stay poor, and that there is nothing the developed nations can do to alter this. Our maximum generosity would not make a dent in their poverty. Some of these countries can and will help themselves, but most don't have the capital, don't have the culture, don't have the knowledge ever to become developed countries. The impoverished masses of these countries are destined to sink into squalor, poverty, disease, and death.

President Falwell warns of the "sin of softheartedness" and some may criticize him for this. But you must understand that we are imprisoned by the mistakes bequeathed to us by our myopic forebearers. Albert Schweitzer warned us that "We have lost the ability to foresee and forestall. We shall end by destroying the earth."

Alas, we didn't listen. Each year our population grows, the deserts creep, pollution seeps, the forests shrink, topsoil erodes, habitats degrade, and more and more species disappear. We have been destroying the earth that we rely on for life. We have been consuming our seed corn, we have been treating our one-time inheritance of capital as if it were an endless flow of interest payments.

Because we are clearly unable to alleviate all the stravation in the world, we must, like triage in war, decide which countries to help and which to let die.

Write me a happy scenario for Bangladesh, show me a happy outcome, a nice solution for a poverty-wracked nation that has 90 million people crowded into an area the size of Iowa. An average Bangladeshi woman has 14 pregnancies and produces 6.5 children. More than 60 percent of all women in that country have seven or more children. Many women have been pregnant 24 times or more. Please, my mind doesn't see it, what is a happy ending for a country like that?

Show me a plan which will achieve social justice in Mexico City in the year 2000, with 30 million people in a cramped, polluted basin. Or

in Calcutta, with 20 million, or Cairo, Tehran, or Caracas, with 14 to 16 million people. Does God give a prize to the city with the largest number of deserving poor?

Paint me an acceptable Christian picture for a world where most of the Third World populations have an average age of 15, and many are packed into shanty towns and barrios without adequate health or housing.

We face a new reality because previous generations did not come to grips with the problems they faced. Let me tell you of a parable. We all know the marvelous story of St. Martin of Tours, who gave away half his cloak to a naked beggar he met on the road. This has become a marvelous symbol of generosity and sharing, and it is part of our heritage. But the new analogy that we must consider is St. Martin, instead of meeting one starving beggar, meets 20 naked and starving beggars on his path. Would he now cut his cloak into 20 inadequate pieces? How would he choose among the 20 deserving and starving beggars? What standards and what values would he have brought to that decision? What happens when you have resources to save a few, but are confronted by many?

A number of years ago, the *New York Times* carried a story that illustrates our "sin of softheartedness." An American nun in Bangladesh, after a couple of days in the country, found a starving baby on her doorstep. She took in the baby, fed it and clothed it. The following morning, there was another starving baby on her doorstep. She gave that child shelter and clothing also. On the third day, she was confronted with yet another starving baby. Finally, her order told her to stop. The task was too immense, the numbers too gargantuan. "Leave them on the doorstep," ordered her superior.

These theologies may seem harsh to you, but we have been born in a time when we have nothing but Hobson's choices. The easy remedies for these problems might have been available back in the 1960s, 70s or 80s, but not today. A world of scarce resources makes hard choices not only necessary, but inevitable. Yesterday's tough decision, unresolved, became today's tragic choice. And we, alas, are faced with nothing but tragic choices here in the 1990's.

THE PROBLEM OF PEACE

Third, I'd like to discuss the problem of peace. The biggest shock of America's diplomatic history was the collapse of the Soviet Union. I cannot tell you how closely we averted disaster by our U.S./U.S.S.R. Controlled Hostility Treaty. We simply could not allow peace to break out. It would have been a disaster. Peace is a good slogan, but it is horrible economics. It is destabilizing; it is even dangerous.

It was clear that even as the United States was repeating many of the classic economic blunders of history, Russia too came close to committing all of them. Their "Vodka Communism" gave birth to a populace unorganized and unprepared for the 21st century, to a citizenry with poor work skills, terrible drinking habits and no incentives for excellence. The system was corrupt. Even their neighbors and allies hated them. They had a billion adversarial Chinese on one border, an unwinnable war in Afghanistan, Solidarity in Poland eating at the heart of the Communist system, an economy that didn't work, and satellite countries that hated them. Meanwhile the great Russians were fast becoming a minority in their own country. The southern Muslim population of Russia was growing five times faster than the great Russians.

The result of all these problems was predictable. The economy that Stalin built was the polar opposite of an efficient, effective economy. The Russians were practically oblivious to the technological forces sweeping Europe, the United States and Japan. The same force that made the industrial base of many of the European countries obsolete dealt a death blow to a large number of Soviet industries. Russia was a military giant, but a technological dwarf.

But we clearly couldn't allow Russia to fail. With one in ten jobs in America related to the defense industry, with major defense contracts in 350 of the 435 House seats, the stakes were too high -- we had to continue the arms race for the sake of international economic security. The future of the globe, of our nation cried out for clear directive and swift action. Jerry Falwell came forth.

THE PROBLEM OF GOD

The last problem that I'd like to discuss with you is the problem of God. Dostoyevski's Grand Inquisitor said that if any of the great religious prophets would come back to earth, they would have to be destroyed by the church hierarchy. The church, having undertaken to endure the freedom that people found so dreadful, could not allow a prophet to come back who threatened to increase human freedom instead of taking possession of it.

But unlike the first Grand Inquisitor, we do not need to deliberately murder the prophets among us. They will simply be ignored. Our citizens are too busy in their hedonistic pursuits to take God seriously. I have written a poem that sums up this attitude.

"But Deliver us from Unpleasantness"

One day, while everyone
Was sitting around doing nothing,
Christ came in.
Everybody said, "No,
Man, not again. We're
Really not up to it.
Why don't you go someplace else?"
He looked at them and showed
Them the nail marks on His hands
And feet, and they said,
"Man, that's real touching. Now
Go someplace else."
He showed them
His side where the
Spear had been, and the scratches
On his forehead where the
Thorns were, and they
Said, "sad, Man, real sad. Just
Go...someplace else."
Only he wouldn't go,
So they crucified Him again
And he just hung there.
They laughed and knew
He was faking, because
This time He didn't
Say "Father, forgive them..."

In summary, we learned the hard way that freedom was too burdensome for Americans, that they needed someone to make their hard

decisions for them, that they needed someone to keep their conscience, to provide their bread, to keep them secure from other prophets. It is our great fortune that history has granted us another chance, a chance embodied in the genius of Reverend Falwell. To his ever-lasting glory and credit, President Falwell has made our hard decisions for us. He is truly both a lion and a fox.

You are dismissed.

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.