

# DOMINION STRATEGIES

Vol. 1, No. 4

© Gary North, 1985

November, 1985

What program **is** I.C.E. actively promoting to deliver us from taxpayer bondage to public schools, fount of humanism's state religion?

None. I.C.E. is a non-profit educational institution. The only program I.C.E. pursues is publishing, seminars, and similar educational ventures. The question indicates that at least one I.C.E. supporter (and now, possibly, former I. C. E." supporter) does not understand the legal distinction between educational organizations and political organizations.

One of the first steps in Christian Reconstruction is to identify projects and match them with resources. To identify a political project, and then expect non-profit, tax-deductible educational organizations to promote it, indicates a weakness in planning.

Nevertheless, I.C.E. offers this general suggestion: You can't beat something with nothing. It is always futile to call for the abolition of a widely accepted program or policy unless you have something better to replace it with. So the best program to destroy tax-supported education is to offer higher-quality private education. Then wait for the deficits and mass inflation to destroy tax-supported educational institutions. This is what Christians are doing.

There is no political program that anyone can or has offered today that will roll back public schools, and to imagine that there is such a program is utopian. Let us not waste resources tilting at windmills.

Luther did not destroy the Roman Church; in certain areas, however, his followers promoted successful competitive alternatives. It took several hundred years for tax-supported churches to disappear. For Luther to have devoted his energies to the disestablishment of all churches in 1515 would have postponed the Protestant Reformation, or else eliminated Luther from any significant role in it.

In short, pick your targets carefully when you have limited supplies of ammunition. Don't waste it on windmills.

Should parents comply with home school regulations?

This is a question for a lawyer in a particular jurisdiction. First, ask yourself: What regulations? It may take a lot of time and trouble to find out. Play dumb. I like Grace Hopper's dictum: "It's easier to say you're sorry later than to ask permission now."

The civil government has asserted some jurisdiction over home schools. In many cases, the demands are minimal. Students may have to take an exam from time to time, to see if they are keeping up with students in the public schools. That shouldn't be much of a problem, even if a child is mildly retarded. If this is the extent of the law, and if the truant officer finds out about your school, then comply. It is **seldom**

worth the trouble to fight.

If the rules are discriminatory against home schools, and if compliance would be almost impossible, then refuse to comply on Constitutional grounds: freedom of speech and religion, etc. Be ready to hire a Christian lawyer, however. If they come to take your children away from you (as one county in Georgia did this year to a family I heard about), then move somewhere else. Why live under petty bureaucratic tyranny? Why subject your children to legalized terror? Find a better environment. It is **easier** to move. Let God judge the school officials.

What, exactly, do children owe their parents? Should each child contribute the same amount? What if the **parente** are profligate?

This, sadly, indicates that the reader has misunderstood the meaning of honoring parents. He asks: "What, exactly, do children owe their parents?" when he really means "How much money?" They are not the same question.

Children owe parents honor (Ex. 20:12). They must not strike them, the case law says, no matter how angry the children become, no matter how outrageous the parent's demand. To do so is a capital crime (Ex. 21:15). Children are not to curse parents. To do so is a capital crime (Ex. 21:17). Striking and cursing a parent is an act of **rebellion** against lawfully constituted family authority, and the civil government must enforce the death penalty against such **rebellion**.

Now, what about money? Money is owed by children for the support of otherwise indigent parents. So is shelter and other care. The responsibility for aid is divided up among the sons as a requirement, with the son who inherits the double portion (Deut. 21:17) having proportionately a greater requirement. Principle: from him to whom more is given, more is expected (Luke 12:48).

What if the parents are profligate? Then what they can leave to their children will be minimal. Knowing that the sons will support them in terms of the inheritance they expect to receive, the parents had better become **1ss** profligate. If sons are being asked to support parents, they can and should ask to receive their parents' goods, today, probably through the use of a trust instrument. Once parents become financially dependent, they **should** not insist on controlling their own assets.

Parents who plan on leaving a minimal inheritance should also plan on being supported in minimal **style** in their old age. Again, the principle is: from him to whom much is given, much is expected. Small inheritance = back bedroom or mobile home living at age 80. And take out the garbage while you're at it, Dad; you're still **healthy**. The exercise will do you good.

Can you point me to something that speaks" to the particular problems of farmers?

Several years ago, I assigned David Chilton the task of writing such a book. He found that it was easier to write *Paradise Restored* and a commentary on Revelation, which neither Calvin nor Luther dared to tackle.

There is no such thing as a good book on farming. If a free market writer writes such a book, he will always promote the wonders of debt, commercial fertilizers, and large-scale agribusiness. If an "organic farming" advocate writes it, he will seldom (if ever) describe the need to sever agriculture from all government controls, crop allotments, and government subsidies. A book written by a Department of Agriculture bureaucrat is, of course, self-serving. The same is true of books by professors of agriculture in state universities.

What is needed is a book by someone who advocates: low debt or 7-year maximum; organic farming; low pollution farming (no damage to neighbors); high technology (microcomputers, scientific management, artificial insemination); and no government controls, especially "parity"—coercive socialistic price supports that virtually every farmer advocates, especially the radical right and radical left populists. I have yet to see such a book.

How can a young person buy a house?

By using the Al Lowry, William Nickerson, Robert Allen techniques. They work. I had one housewife speak at my "Year 2000" conference on just how well she has done in the last three years — "bad" years for real estate. She is now a rich woman, having started with very little a few months ago.

Just structure your program to be out of debt in seven years.

Why **should** debts be shorter than eight years?

Because Deuteronomy 15 says so.

What is the proper balance between affluent lifestyle and obligations to children if you are **middle-aged**, with both **partners** working? Is it wrong to **enjoy** the fruits of their employment with travel and an affluent **lifestyle**, or should they **live frugally** and give **all** they earn beyond their needs for retirement emergencies and the Lord's work?

The proper balance is 10% of after-tax income to your church, 10% for savings, and the rest is up to you. The first 10% is required; the second 10% is basic **self-discipline** and good economics; and the 80% is a matter of personal preference.

I recommend finding ways to get other people to pay for

what you want to do. I travel abroad every year. I always run a tour and make a solid chunk of money, plus get my fare paid for. Of course, I'm in a position to do this (newsletters). But what about becoming a tour organizer, or working for a tour company? My high school civics teacher has found a good pre-retirement source of summer income, and he will retire early, collect his pension, and make even more money by running tours.

The point is, if something is worth doing well, it is worth doing at a profit. This includes play.

The parasite government is consuming its host (taxpayer). How can this be reversed?

The best example in well over a hundred years is the spectacular success that the Adam Smith Institute is having in Britain. Every working day in Britain, some public utility or publicly operated service is being sold to private, profit-seeking enterprise. The developer of this strategy, Dr. Madsen Pirie, told a group of us that he would do this back in 1975. It is now being done. He describes the program in his book, *Dismantling the State* (National Center for Policy Analysis, 7701 N. Stemmons, Suite 717, Dallas, TX 75209; \$6.95).

The second strategy is to begin to replace the failing government institutions by non-profit, voluntarily financed organizations. The best example is the growth of the private school movement since 1964.

In short, you can't beat something with nothing.

At what point is a Christian justified in "going underground," and ceasing to report income **earned** by moonlighting?

One obvious answer: when the Federal government ceases to be able to extract the money because of a collapse of one sort or another.

I have met a few Christian people who **claim** they have "dropped out" of the system. I never know how much is talk and how much is real. I know of no professional, **high-income**, high-productivity people who have done it. It takes too much time for them to worry about all the problems; they retain more money with fewer worries by concentrating on their calling, paying the tribute, hiring competent **legal** and CPA talent, and going about their business.

In short, for most people the question never arises. It will arise if a major crisis hits the nation, but for as long as the mails operate and newsletter publishers are **still** able to operate, my answer to the question is this: if you want to stay fully productive, pay the tribute, finance alternative ways of getting things done, undermine **people's** faith in the State, and bide your time. The day is coming when we **will** be able to pick up the pieces, or recapture an evil system and shrink it. Beating the system is a lot more important goal than cheating it.